

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
January 17, 1968

The meeting was called to order and Mr. Hayes appeared to discuss H.B. 1689. He explained that this is a local bill, pertaining only to Reno County; that some highway work is being done on Highway 50 and that the right of way goes across the property belonging to the county home and county farm; that they would simply like to use the proceeds from the condemnation to buy more land and make improvements.

Mr. Linde explained H.B. 1702, proposing a Kansas Legion of Merit; that it seemed to him there was often adverse publicity about Kansas and that the image could be improved. He stated that this bill would set up a means to recognize outstanding people in the many fields of achievement in Kansas; that a suitable awards occasion would be set up with the recipient getting a medallion, scroll and plaque and \$1,000 honorarium and that there would be no more than ten in any two year period. Also, that there would be no more than two in each category receiving the award. Mr. Bunten expressed the opinion that maybe the money was unnecessary. Mr. Mikesic inquired if members of the Legislature would be precluded.

Mr. Grant also explained HB 1704, and stated that when he introduced the bill he had no idea that the Governor's office expected to introduce something similar; that he believed it is needed; that several states have laws like this and that he and the Research Department had picked the best features of those laws. He stated that he believed the Legislature should have gone further when it enacted the Conflict of Interest bill, and that this bill sets out certain things that would be considered unethical by legislators; that it sets up three committees on ethics--one in the House, one in the Senate and one for the agencies, and that he believed the people would do better to control themselves. Mr. Andrews inquired in section 2 (a) wasn't pretty restrictive and cutting a pretty fine line to say that a gift or hospitality of \$50 would be unethical. Mr. Grant explained that it is difficult to set a line but that some states had set it at \$25. Mr. McGill inquired about intangible things like trips arranged by municipalities, and Mr. Grant explained that he would be willing to work toward changing the language. Mr. Turner expressed the opinion that a bill cannot be drafted to control this--that the only way you can control it is to make everything public. He stated that he is having a bill drafted along some of these lines, making it a misdemeanor for employees or members to disclose any information pertaining to legislative business. Mr. McGill inquired why Mr. Grant feels the need for the bill, and Mr. Grant replied that he knew of no specific instances of violations but that it could easily arise and 14 other states feel that it arises often enough to pass a law.

Mr. McGill stated that governing bodies have always tried to legislate morality and it isn't going to make honest men out of elected officials or anyone else; that it is just an attempt to hoodwink the public; and in fact it might call to the attention of the public that things are not always what they seem.

Mr. Rogers stated that he believed when citizens elect legislators, that they are elected from all walks of life; that all professions are represented and the theory is that a diversified group turns out good legislation. He then inquired if most of these states enacting such laws were not fulltime legislatures. Mr. Grant agreed that Certainly this was true in California but he didn't know about the others. After additional discussion it was agreed that Legislators would not come under the section governing the agencies since they are part time state employees.

Mr. Grant also discussed HCR 1026, stating that he did not believe this would be a partisan matter; that the situation is different now than it was in 1963 and 1965; that the House is now apportioned and the Senate is in the process and that this changes the picture. He stated that he believed we need to keep the U. S. Constitution as it is, amending it under Article 5 as we have always done; but that if there was a Constitutional Convention he feared that they would virtually rewrite the Constitution and that it could have very dire consequences.

The Chairman called for action on HB 1689, and Mr. Brown moved that it be reported favorably. Upon second by Mr. Ford, the motion carried unanimously.

The Chairman then stated that he had "goofed" concerning SB 82 and 83; that the lobbyists say they understood we were going to introduce something else for them in lieu of these bills and asked permission of the committee to do so and refer it back; and explained that then the committee could then kill it or do whatever they wanted. Mr. Doyen moved that it be introduced and referred back. Motion was seconded by Mr. Fribley and carried unanimously.

The Chairman appointed a sub-committee of Mr. Doyen, Mr. Unruh and Mr. Buchele to consider the credit union bill, and the meeting was adjourned.