

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
February 5, 1968

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman who asked Mr. Bunten to make any statements he desired concerning H.B. 1681. He stated that a great many people had expressed different concerns about this proposal, and therefore, he presented nine amendments which he believed took care of most of the objections. Among other things, he proposed to add a grandfather clause, and an exemption for corporations who use certain electronic equipment, closed circuit TV, etc., who maintain their own equipment. Mr. Jelinek inquired about radios and stereos and Mr. Bunten explained that this bill dealt exclusively with TV. Mr. Unruh inquired about adding a performance bond, and Mr. Bunten expressed the opinion that he would be glad to talk with him about it.

Mr. Hinkle from Salina, appeared to express his delegation's fears about the proposal. He stated that radios, stereos and all other kinds of home entertainment equipment should be included if they were going to control TV repair. He also expressed dissatisfaction with the 5-member board, stating that it didn't give enough representation, and proposed 11 members. He expressed concern about who would administer this proposal and how certified technicians would be selected. He was concerned about the word "unstable" on Page 2, line 14, and also on the same page, about the duties of the Board. He stated that he had a petition from dealers in Salina recommending that further action on this bill be delayed to give time for more study and consideration, and that a committee be appointed specifically to study the question.

Mr. Kenneth Johnson stated that he is in the appliance business and that he maintains his own service department; and expressed concern for the small communities. He stated that he believed some consideration should be given to the business of installing antennas, especially in communities where the weak signal requires a complex antenna. Mr. Shelton, stated that some of his concerns had already been voiced, but that he would urge getting into other fields of electronics if this kind of legislation is going to be passed.

Mr. Mac Metoyer appeared as one who lives in Missouri but does business in Kansas....see attached.

The next order of business was HB 1837, and the Chairman introduced Mr. Turner with the Hearing Aid Association. He in turn introduced Mr. McCarter, Mr. Kent, Mr. Rice, Dorothea Klein, Bob Lee, Vern Blue, Al Nottern and Mr. Coffman who are in this business. He explained proposed amendments which he believed would improve the bill; he stated that it is a proposal from the interstate cooperation commission and that other states have adopted similar legislation. He stated that he believed this bill would do away with misleading advertising and fraudulent practices; that Kansas is relatively clean in this area, but

if they don't cooperate, that Kansas could become a dumping ground for all kinds of practices that are not good. Mr. Jack Turner inquired if the Board of Healing Arts could not police this industry and Mr. Turner explained that it is a highly technical field and that they would not presently be equipped to handle it. Mr. Turner stated that he believed it was better for an industry to police itself; that there is a code of ethics and the industry will watch it. Mr. Turner expressed concern about the people getting "diagnosis" from dealers without ever seeing a physician to see what kind of deafness he might be experiencing; that maybe surgery would be indicated instead of an aid. Mr. Turner explained that these people often refer the clients to medical assistance because they are in fact ethical people. Mr. McCray expressed concern about advertising in magazines, etc. and Mr. Turner replied that that would be controlled under Interstate Commerce, and that people in Kansas are locally controlled.

Mr. Kent testified that with the increased sophistication of present day hearing aids, the industry is interested in competency. Mr. Roland McCarter of the Better Business Bureau of Kansas stated that there is a trend toward licensing such as this in other states; that he believed the bill is in the public interest.

Mr. Jim Clark, representing optometrists, stated that there was one concern of his people, page 5, line 12, dealing with attachments on frames, etc. and that this could get into the lense business; that they neither oppose or support this bill, but would like to look at it some more.

The Chairman announced that the Committee would vote on several matters on the 6th.

The meeting was adjourned.