

MEMORANDUM TO COMMITTEE

FROM: Research Department, Kansas Legislative Council  
TO: Joint Committee on Legislative Facilities June 23, 1967  
RE: Notes on bill printing procedures recommended for consideration of the Committee by officials of the State Printing Plant.

June 21, 1967

At its last meeting, the Committee directed the Research Department and the State Printer to work out plans for showing bill printings through the various stages following two different procedures. One procedure was to show the "net effect" of the bill at each stage, including the addition of a committee report when amendments are made. The other approach was to use a combination of print styles and procedures to set out each stage at which an amendment or a change was made. After developing a procedure for carrying out the Committee's request, the Research Department asked the State Printing Plant to draft cost comparisons based on 1965 bill printing data to show the Committee what cost would be involved if either of the two printing procedures were adopted.

While preparing these data, the printing plant staff came upon an idea which it thought ought to be presented to the Committee for its consideration. The procedure would show the changes now being considered by the Committee with the potential of being much less expensive than is presently the case. They recommended that the Committee give approval for them to prepare a bill showing each change made as the bill passes through the legislature using this new proposed method to be compared with the proposed method presently before the Committee for cost comparison purposes.

Proposed Alternative Printing  
Procedure

Under the newly proposed change in the printing procedure the boldface type could still be reserved for the House, boldface italics for the Senate. Other combinations would also be possible.

After introduction, any subsequent amendments in a bill would appear, being printed in the left margin whether the amendment is only one word or whether it involves several lines or paragraphs. The appearance of the amendment in a bill printing would basically be as follows:

If a line read:

1. "assessors of each county to check such lists against the"

And it were amended by Committee to read:

1. "assessors of each county to check such ~~lists~~ compare data against the"

Then, under the suggested new procedure it would appear this way:

1. "assessors of each county to check such ~~lists~~
2. compare data (boldface or boldface italics)
3. against the
4. (This line would then pick up the text of the bill as it was last printed).

In other words, the effect of this procedure is to isolate the amendment as well as to reduce the time involved in resetting bills when they have been amended in the House or Senate. At the present time, when some material is stricken and new words are added in a paragraph, the printing plant must reset the remaining portion of the paragraph wherever a change is made. Under the suggested new procedure:

- a) a line of original text would end where the change occurred,
- b) the amendment would be set apart or isolated by beginning it at the left margin on a new line and continuing it until it was finished,
- c) the original line being interrupted would be completed on the line directly below the amendment,
- d) the original text would be continued in subsequent lines.

The major effect of this change for the reader is that the bill would be somewhat longer because of the way the amendments are isolated and its appearance is less neat than is now the case.

From the printer's viewpoint the operation is made more efficient because isolating amendments makes possible bill preparation with much less hand operation of the printing machines. Anytime when three type faces such as roman, italics, and boldface appear in the same line, the mix can be accomplished by the use of the printing plant machinery, but it involves considerable time spent in performing hand operations. Most hand operations can be eliminated by isolating the amendments.

Following the printer's suggestion, the amendments would be set out first in a certain kind of type and then the machine operator can go through the bill and reset only the lines where amendments occur. The operator then simply drops in the amendment lines in the proper spaces. In preparing amended bills, the printer would be able to use five machines rather than the two that must be used when the more complex mixtures of type faces are required.

Under the proposed printing procedure, in every case where only one word is added to a sentence, the printer could reset two lines of type where presently he must reset the entire remaining portion of the paragraph. On this point, the printer believed that considerable time and composition costs could be saved.

On another item, the printing plant suggested that the procedure for printing Committee reports should be reviewed. At the present time, a new section is printed in the text of a bill in type showing that it is an amendment, and each section also is reprinted in italics in the Committee report. The suggestion is that all whole new sections be noted in the Committee report as having been added to refer the reader to that portion of the bill. This would eliminate the need for two complete printings of new sections which are added to a bill by standing committee action.