

Approved 3-4-91
Date

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Elections

The meeting was called to order by Representative Tom Sawyer at
Chairperson

9:07 a.m./p.m. on Wednesday, February 27, 1991 in room 521-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Representative Mary Jane Johnson, excused

Committee staff present:

Pat Mah, Research
Arden Ensley, Revisor
Ellie Luthye, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Pat Hubbell, Kansas Railroad Association
Pete McGill, Pete McGill and Associates
Jim Edwards, KCCI
Howard Tice, Kansas Association of Wheat Growers

Chairman Tom Sawyer called the House Elections Committee to order at 9:07 a.m. on Wednesday, February 27th, 1991.

He stated hearings would continue on the ethics bills and called on Pat Hubbell to present his testimony.

Mr. Hubbell presented the committee with a list of the contributions made by Kansas Railroad over a twelve month period, representing three railroads. (Attachment 1) He stated they do not use these contributions as a lobbying tool but rather to create good will. He further stated he had been a lobbyist for twenty three years and had not seen the need for such strict lobbying laws, however, he would be able to live under whatever laws the committee passed and would adjust to them.

Next to appear before the committee was Pete McGill of Pete McGill & Associates. He presented written testimony stating his views and asked the committee to be sure to design bills in such a manner that gets the information needed and at the same time being very careful not to complicate reporting procedures or extract information that serves no public purpose. (Attachment 2).

Jim Edwards stood for questions from the committee on his testimony on Tuesday, 2-26-91 on behalf of the KCCI. He also presented written testimony on behalf of Harriet Lange, President of KSAE, who was unable to appear before the committee. (Attachment 3)

Howard Tice, Executive Director of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, requested permission to speak to the committee. He stated that lobbying was not his only responsibility and that he would have a hard time determining what percentage of time was spent on lobbying only and also what percentage of expenses were related to running the Wheatgrowers Association. He further stated in seven years as a lobbyist he had never seen anything illegal and felt much of the perception the public had of the legislature, and lobbyists, was due to the press and he would like to see more responsible reporting.

Karen France, Kansas Association of Realtors, was unable to appear before the Committee but submitted written testimony. (Attachment 4)

Following questions by the committee, the Chair closed hearings on the ethics bills.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Elections,
room 521-S, Statehouse, at 9:07 a.m./p.m. on Wednesday, February 27, 1991.

The minutes of the meeting on February 25th were presented for approval. Representative McKechnie made a motion to accept the minutes, seconded by Representative Stephens and the motion carried.

The House Elections Committee was adjourned at 10:30 a.m. by Chairman Sawyer. The next meeting will be held on Thursday, February 28th, 9:00 a.m. in Room 521-S.

Contributions made by Kansas Railroads over 12 Months

Friends University	Wichita	3,810.00
Hesston College	Hesston	300.00
Ks. 4-H Foundation, Inc.	Manhattan	1,000.00
Ks. City Chamber Orchestra	Prairie Village	2,500.00
Ks. Independent College Fund	Topeka	8,000.00
Ks. State Assoc. of Future Farmers of America	Manhattan	500.00
Ks. State University KSU Foundation	Manhattan	300.00
Mental Health Association of Johnson County	Lenexa	5,000.00
Mid America Nazarene College	Olathe	200.00
Pittsburgh State University	Pittsburgh	100.00
Southeast Kansas Education Service Center	Girard	5,000.00
United Fund of Augusta, Inc.	Augusta	100.00
United Fund of Augusta, Inc.	Augusta	100.00
United Way of the Plains	Wichita	100.00
United Way of the Plains	Wichita	100.00
University of Kansas	Lawrence	10,000.00
Young Men's Christian Assoc.	Kansas City	3,500.00
Bethany College	Lindsborg	9,000.00
Fourth installment of a grant of \$45,000.00.		
Donnelly College	Kansas City	5,000.00
Final installment of a grant of \$10,000, payable in two equal installments in 1989 and 1990, to assist in upgrading the college's IBM Systems 36 computer.		
Kansas Independent College Fund	Topeka	27,500.00
Kansas State University Foundation	Manhattan	10,000.00
University of Kansas	Lawrence	10,000.00
Menninger Foundation	Topeka	12,500.00
St. John Hospital	Leavenworth	8,000.00
Second installment of a grant of \$24,000.		
Abilene Area United Way	Abilene	1,000.00
Atchison Area United Way	Atchison	3,000.00
Coffeyville United Way	Coffeyville	4,000.00
Ellis County United Fund	Hays	1,000.00
United Fund of Hoisington	Hoisington	2,000.00
United Way of Reno County, Inc.	Hutchinson	1,000.00
United Way of Junction City-Geary County	Junction City	1,000.00
United Way of Douglas County	Lawrence	1,100.00
United Way of Riley County	Manhattan	1,000.00

Osawatomie Community Fund, Inc.	Osawatomie	4,000.00
United Way of Salina	Salina	7,000.00
United Way of Greater Topeka	Topeka	6,000.00
United Way of the Plains	Wichita	3,500.00
The Arts Center of Topeka, Inc. - Second installment of a grant of \$45,000.00	Topeka	15,000.00
Frontier Army Museum Association - Third installment of a grant of \$100,000.00.	Fort Leavenworth	20,000.00
Kaw Valley Arts Council	Kansas City	1,000.00
Wamego Historical Society, Inc. - To assist with the restoration of six large oil paintings on the wall of the Columbian Theatre.	Wamego	1,500.00
Boy Scouts of America, Heart of America Council	Kansas City	10,000.00
Capper Foundation for Crippled Children - A grant of \$10,000/2, to provide services to handicapped children throughout Kansas	Topeka	5,000.00
Dickinson County Child Care Center, Inc.	Abilene	5,000.00
Hays Art Council, Inc.	Hays	1,000.00
Kansas University Endowment Association - A grant of \$200,000/5, to establish an endowed chair in the Department of Geology.	Lawrence	40,000.00
Martin Luther King Urban Center	Kansas City	1,000.00
Smoky Hills Public Television	Bunker Hill	5,000.00
United Way of Greater Topeka	Topeka	45,000.00
United Way of the Greater Kansas City	Kansas City	22,950.00
Harvey County United Way	Newton	9,560.00
United Way	Emporia	4,000.00
United Way	Arkansas City	3,060.00
Future Farmers of America		39,500.00
National 4-H Educational Awards Program		57,000.00
National Hispanic Scholarship Fund		5,000.00
National Merit Scholarship Corporation		90,530.00

Junior Achievement of Northeast Kansas	Topeka	2,000.00
The Menninger Foundation	Topeka	10,000.00
Services for Alcohol Related Problems	Topeka	1,000.00
Topeka Youth Project, Inc.	Topeka	2,000.00
Agricultural Hall of Fame Assoc. of Community Arts Agencies of Kansas	Bonner Springs Oberlin	1,000.00 1,000.00
Dickinson County Arts Council	Abilene	1,000.00
Kansas City Symphony	Kansas City, MO	3,000.00
Kansas State Historical Society	Topeka	15,000.00
Kansas State Historical Society	Topeka	8,000.00
Sunflower Musical Festival Washburn University	Topeka	3,000.00
Topeka Civic Theatre, Inc.	Topeka	5,000.00
Topeka Festival Singers	Topeka	2,500.00
Topeka Symphony Orchestra	Topeka	3,000.00
Benedictine College	Atchison	1,600.00
Berean Academy	Elbing	4,750.00
Bethel College	North Newton	2,000.00
Donnelly College	Kansas City	1,000.00
Emporia State University	Emporia	4,600.00
Kansas Newman College	Wichita	400.00
Kansas State University	Manhattan	8,000.00
Kansas State University Foundation	Manhattan	9,600.00
Kansas University	Lawrence	1,700.00
Manhattan Christian College	Manhattan	4,400.00
Maur Hill Prep. School	Atchison	1,000.00
Mid-America Nazarene College	Olathe	9,700.00
Ottawa University	Ottawa	500.00
Saint Mary College	Leavenworth	1,000.00
Tabor College	Hillsboro	3,000.00
Washburn University of Topeka	Topeka	1,600.00
Association of Community Arts Agencies of Kansas	Salina	500.00
KANU	Lawrence	1,700.00
KTWU	Topeka	3,800.00
Topeka Civic Theatre	Topeka	1,200.00
Topeka Friends of the Zoo	Topeka	260.00
Topeka Genealogical Society & Library	Topeka	1,450.00
The Topeka Performing Arts Center	Topeka	5,300.00
Topeka Symphony Society	Topeka	600.00
Menninger Foundation	Topeka	1,500.00
Prairie View, Inc.	Newton	1,050.00
TOTAL		\$669,020.00

TESTIMONY
OF
PETE MCGILL
OF
PETE MCGILL & ASSOCIATES
BEFORE THE
HOUSE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE
REGARDING ETHICS
FEBRUARY 27, 1991

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

My name is Pete McGill of Pete McGill & Associates, and I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today. I am not here on behalf of any client, nor am I here as a proponent or opponent of the proposed legislation you are considering.

I am here to share with you some facts and personal observations that may help clarify some concerns, since I am told my name has repeatedly surfaced in the various subcommittees during the deliberations of these bills.

First of all, let me share with you a little bit about our business. Two years after getting out of the legislature, I established my present lobbying firm and have been in this business for the past twelve years.

Our firm is an independent contract lobbying firm that represents numerous clients with varied interests, and even though I have three lawyers in the firm, we practice no law – we are a full-time lobbying firm.

When I started this business, there were no full-time, year-round contract lobbying firms in Kansas, and there are not more than two or three today. When the present statutes about lobbying were written, I can tell you no one envisioned my type of business because there were none in existence. Most lobbyists represented associations or one or two clients, and many of those were attorneys who practiced law the balance of the time.

Our firm has seven full-time lobbyists, all registered with the Secretary of State in full compliance with the law. This is one section of the statute that has been of concern to me, the Secretary of State, and the Public Disclosure Commission for the past four or five years.

46-265 of the statute states that every lobbyist shall register, and specifically how they will register, and I quote:

"Such registration shall show the name and address of the lobbyist, the name and address of the person compensating the lobbyist for lobbying, the purpose of the employment, and the method of determining and computing the compensation of the lobbyist."

Since I hire all the lobbyists in our firm and I pay their entire salaries, to be in compliance with the law, I contend they should register for only Pete McGill & Associates. I, as Pete McGill & Associates, register with the Secretary of State for all the clients that contract with our firm.

The members of our firm are never hired by the clients, they sometimes never talk to a client, and they do not know the fees or how compensation is paid. They work for me, Pete McGill & Associates. Because of this controversy, I have on file a letter from my attorney (who was a former member of the Public Disclosure Commission) in which he said I would be in violation of the law if I asked our employees to register for anyone other than Pete McGill & Associates.

However, if you check the records at the Secretary of State's office, as some of you have done, I asked Pat Hurley, our Chief Executive Officer, to register for all our clients, and I asked some of our employees to register for areas of primary responsibility.

For the sole purpose of letting each of you know whom we represent, we sent you a list of our clients early in the session and followed with an update.

Because a number of you have asked, I will tell you a little about our business.

Pete McGill & Associates does not, and never has, solicited business other than responding to inquiries made to us. That is to say, we have never advertised our services or actually contacted possible clients soliciting their business. There are firms that attend legislative meetings and hearings, determine potential clients that might be in jeopardy, and then write or call soliciting their business.

Many of our clients come from references of legislators, the staff at our colleges and universities, and inquiries made of our existing clients.

We do not accept all the potential clients who inquire about our services. We screen our clients as well as they probably screen us. Regardless of the fee involved, we will not accept a client we feel has less than a 50/50 chance of achieving their objectives.

If the mission of a potential client is something we cannot in good conscience philosophically support, we will not accept them as a client. If their mission is something we would not feel comfortable asking legislators to support, we would not accept them.

We require our clients to maintain the same high ethical standards required of our own staff, and we have such a clause in most contracts. We have terminated contracts and refunded fees because of such violations on the part of our clients.

What do we charge and how do we charge? One thing is certain -- we do not lobby on a contingency basis -- that is prohibited by law. It depends on the objective of the client. Some are on a flat fee basis, some are on an hourly basis, and some are on a retainer plus an hourly rate. Nearly every client is different.

Of that list I provided you, several want monitoring services only unless they discover a bill that impacts them one way or another.

In the event of an inquiry from a potential client, we do have a brochure we send them outlining the nature of our services.

How and what do we report? We file a monthly report with the Public Disclosure Commission listing our expenditures by client as required by law.

There are possibly other things you would like to know about our business I have neglected to mention, and I will be happy to respond to questions in a moment.

Two years before I became a lobbyist, I was a legislator. I served in the House for 14 years, the last four as Speaker. In all my years in the legislature, I was never approached by a lobbyist in an unethical or illegal manner, nor have I ever known a legislator who was.

I have known several freshman newspaper reporters who come to work the legislature for the first time and spend endless hours trying to find all the graft and corruption they have heard exists in this process, but they just can't find it. Eventually, they just give up and start reporting on personalities, marital problems, or financial problems of legislators.

Almost without exception, for the past 30 years freshman legislators do some of the same things. They get their names on bills to send back home to tell the home folks "I am going to clean up that mess" because they have heard their high school or college government teachers talk about the corruption that exists in government at all levels.

I am here today to tell you I was never more proud than to have had the opportunity to serve in this body, and I think each of you will share in that feeling if you don't already. Kansas has the cleanest and best legislature in the United States.

Some will say, "If this is the best, God help the rest of them." You have to look no further than to our neighbors to the east in Missouri, or to our neighbors to the south in Oklahoma, Texas, or Louisiana to see how vastly different it is. Several legislators were indicted this month in Arizona, and the same occurred in South Carolina a few weeks ago.

I am not so naive as to say it will never happen in Kansas, but it hasn't happened yet and I don't think it will. Keep in mind that all the laws you pass will not make honest people out of those that are morally corrupt.

In 1974, while I was Speaker, I was one of the principal architects of every major piece of legislation now on the books relating to campaign finance, lobbying control, and governmental ethics. Many of those bills were drafted right downstairs where the Speaker's office is today in conjunction with Bob Bennett, then President of the Senate, Jack Steineger, Senate Minority Leader, and Pete Loux, House Minority Leader.

They were not drafted because of anything we knew was wrong, unethical, or illegal -- it was because there was inadequate legislation on the books to govern such activities. It was in the aftermath of Watergate and because of the extensive coverage given to activities in Washington, D.C., the public perception of all public officials was at an extremely low level.

The guiding theme behind all of this legislation was "Public Disclosure" and adequate reporting procedures.

As a result of our efforts, the following year Kansas received National recognition as the best or most improved legislature in the United States. The following year, we traveled to Williamsburg, Virginia to receive that award in the House of Burgesses -- probably the proudest moment of my legislative career.

Following that, I traveled to more than 30 states in the next few years, many times at the request of N.C.S.L., to help other states improve their legislative operations.

The bills I mentioned to you a few moments ago were adopted by many states as model legislation since we were the first state to make such a major overhaul in these activities.

This is not to say this legislation was perfect, then or now. As I testified in both houses last year and the previous year, and before the special committee this summer, these bills served their purpose but the time has come that they should be reviewed and updated.

However, I respectfully suggest as you continue your work and make your final recommendations, make certain you don't do something that would discourage good people from running for elective office.

Design your bills in such a manner that gets the essential information you want, and at the same time being very careful not to complicate reporting procedures or extract information that serves no public purpose, thereby discouraging qualified people from seeking public office.

I personally have no quarrel with anything you choose to do in amending lobbying control legislation. We are fully aware that many legislators, some

lobbyists, and media people carefully scrutinize our activities since we have the highest visibility in that arena. If you should determine there should be no legislative hospitality, that is fine by me. If you should determine to allow legislative hospitality but list the names of all legislators who participate, that too would be all right with me as that would effectively eliminate all hospitality. I want to see you explain that to your local school boards, insurance agents, real estate people, livestock people, bankers, lawyers, judges, and all those who host events in Topeka only to find no one attends.

The Public Disclosure Commission was never created to be a fee agency. Lobbying registration fees were created for the purpose of covering the cost of badges and the paperwork in the Secretary of State's office. Any significant increases would obviously be passed on to the clients.

I can tell you with some degree of certainty, the lobbyists that I observe working with State government in Kansas, with very few exceptions, are people of extremely high integrity and are very scrupulous about complying with all the laws that have been set forth.

When the present laws were written, legislators had no office space, no secretaries, no staff, no legislative budget division, and very limited resources. Your only office was on the floor of the House at your desk and you shared a telephone. If you needed a secretary, you summoned one from the secretarial pool behind the Speaker's podium. Your budget figures were all prepared by the Governor's budget staff. You didn't have access to extensive computer runs for school finance runs.

Committees had very limited professional staff without any legal assistance in some committees.

Be assured lobbyists for any client are very likely to provide you with completely accurate information that puts their client or their cause in the best light, and may not provide you with any of the negatives.


You now have adequate professional staff to provide you with both sides of any issue if you choose to avail yourself of their expertise.

I have talked long enough, Mr. Chairman, and I apologize for taking so much time, but I would be pleased to respond to any questions.



TO: Members of the House Elections Committee

February 27, 1991

FROM: Harriet Lange 
President

RE: Ethics Reform

The Kansas Society of Association Executives (KSAE) is a not-for-profit professional society whose membership consists of 160 professional members who represent 100 different trade, professional, philanthropic and advocacy organizations; 65 associate members who represent suppliers to associations; and 55 legislative agents not "on staff" of an association, but who represent clients before the legislature.

KSAE's primary purposes are to develop and encourage high standards of service and conduct for association executives (see attached "Standards of Conduct"), to increase public understanding of associations and their economic importance, to promote the common interests of association executives, and to promote the accomplishments of voluntary associations.

KSAE's Public Affairs Committee Chairman Jim Edwards has presented to you KSAE's positions on ethics reform. We appreciate your consideration.

The purpose of this memo is to acquaint you with associations in general, most being not-for-profit and guided by elected volunteer boards of directors who develop and establish policies and positions for their respective associations.

You are familiar with many of our professional members who manage not-for-profit associations, simply because they also represent their members before the legislature. Collectively, they represent the same constituency that each of you represents. The majority of Kansans belong to one or more associations or organizations, many of whom provide member representation before this legislature.

One of the fundamental functions of many associations is to provide a unified voice on legislation and regulations affecting a particular industry or profession. You, as lawmakers, rely on associations for information and hopefully recognize that intelligent decisions involving complex issues require input from a variety of associations and cause-oriented groups.

For most associations, political education consists of educating their members about proposed legislation and informing lawmakers about its impact. And political education consists not only of influencing pending legislation, but also of explaining new regulations and guidelines to their members.

Associations exist to serve common needs of their members, and in the process, help government officials write and carry out sound laws and policies. And associations advance the political process in other ways. They frequently encourage their "grass-roots" members to discuss public issues with their elected officials, thereby strengthening responsible representation and democracy.

Political activity, however, is only one of the services provided by associations to their members. A recent survey conducted by the American Society of Association Executives found that the average association spends less than ten percent of its expenditures on political activity. Associations also make substantial economic contributions and foster product and professional standards, ethical codes, community service, research, and education.

It is our hope that as you consider ethics reform, you will keep in mind the valuable contribution that associations make, not only to the legislative process, but also to society in general.

House Elections Committee

KANSAS SOCIETY OF ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVES Attachment 3

2-26-91

KANSAS SOCIETY OF ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVES

Standards of Conduct

As a member of KSAE, I pledge to:

Maintain the highest standard of personal conduct.

Promote and encourage the highest level of ethics within the industry or profession my association represents.

Maintain loyalty to the association that employs me, and pursue its objectives in ways that are consistent with the public interest.

Recognize and discharge my responsibility and that of my association to uphold all laws and regulations relating to my association's policies and activities.

Strive for excellence in all aspects of management of my association.

Use only legal and ethical means in all association activities and in influencing legislation or regulation.

Comply with all state and federal statutes governing lobbying and political activities.

Serve all members of my association impartially, provide no special privilege to any individual member, and accept no personal compensation from a member except with the knowledge and consent of my association's governing board.

Maintain the confidentiality of privileged information entrusted or known to me by virtue of my office.

Refuse to engage in, or countenance, activities for personal gain at the expense of my association or its industry or profession.

Always communicate association internal and external statements in a truthful and accurate manner.

Cooperate in every reasonable and proper way with other association executives, and work with them in the advancement of the profession of association management.

Use every opportunity to improve public understanding of the role of associations.

This Code of Standards of Conduct for members of the Kansas Society of Association Executives has been adopted to promote and maintain the highest standards of association service and personal conduct among its members, and serves to assure public confidence in the integrity and service of association executives.



Executive Offices:
3644 S. W. Burlingame Road
Topeka, Kansas 66611
Telephone 913/267-3610

TO: THE HOUSE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE
FROM: KAREN FRANCE, DIRECTOR, GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DATE: FEBRUARY 27, 1991
SUBJECT: ETHICS REFORM, HB 2454

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony. I apologize for not being at the hearing in person, however, I have a schedule conflict which prevents me from being available.

First the Kansas Association of REALTORS® acknowledges the project which you have tackled. We want you to know that we have no problem with your efforts to keep our government in Kansas honest. We have no problem with many of the provisions of this bill. However, there are some which we feel are, at the very least in conflict with each other and others which are self defeating. My testimony only addresses portions of this comprehensive bill.

The Kansas Association of REALTORS® supports making the state agency responsible for watchdogging this process a stronger one and enabling it to do what most people thought it should have been doing all along. We have no objection to paying a fee for registering our political committee. We understand that it takes money to operate an agency and it is logical to get that money from those whom the agency regulates. The same is true for paying an additional registration fee for lobbyists.

We would like to point out that, as the bill is now written, there are conflicting provisions. Section 11(a) on page 9 provides for the limitations on

House Elections Committee
Attachment 4
2-27-91



Executive Offices:
3644 S. W. Burlingame Road
Topeka, Kansas 66611
Telephone 913/267-3610

TO: THE HOUSE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE
FROM: KAREN FRANCE, DIRECTOR, GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DATE: FEBRUARY 27, 1991
SUBJECT: ETHICS REFORM, HB 2454

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony. I apologize for not being at the hearing in person, however, I have a schedule conflict which prevents me from being available.

First the Kansas Association of REALTORS® acknowledges the project which you have tackled. We want you to know that we have no problem with your efforts to keep our government in Kansas honest. We have no problem with many of the provisions of this bill. However, there are some which we feel are, at the very least in conflict with each other and others which are self defeating. My testimony only addresses portions of this comprehensive bill.

The Kansas Association of REALTORS® supports making the state agency responsible for watchdogging this process a stronger one and enabling it to do what most people thought it should have been doing all along. We have no objection to paying a fee for registering our political committee. We understand that it takes money to operate an agency and it is logical to get that money from those whom the agency regulates. The same is true for paying an additional registration fee for lobbyists.

We would like to point out that, as the bill is now written, there are conflicting provisions. Section 11(a) on page 9 provides for the limitations on

contributions for candidates for various offices. That, in Section 12(b) on page 11 it provides that no one other than an individual can contribute money to a candidate.

It appears that the general intent of these provisions is to prohibit or further limit contributions to candidates by political committees. We oppose this concept. Political committees carry out the same function as the colonists who put on warpaint and dumped the English tea into the Boston Harbor. They organized a group of like-minded citizens to right what they felt was a political wrong. Political committees are groups of citizens who organize to raise money to help elect or defeat candidates running for public office. What could be more American?

While the argument is presented that political committees reduce political participation, we see it from a different point of view. In our experience, political committees increase grassroots participation. More people in the real estate industry participate in the political process by participating in our political committee. They participate because their political awareness about the impact of politics on their livelihood has been raised, and they want to have a say in that process.

We base our fundraising goals, not merely on raising money, but upon encouraging larger number of our members to participate. Our goal, the last few years, has been to have at least 70% of our 7,000 members participate in RPAC. This means having people contribute who might not normally ever participate in the political process. Over 75% of our members make contributions of \$15 or less to our political committee, we ask only for a fair share contribution of \$10. These kinds of contributions do not match the pictures of big rich political committee contributors which many would like to paint.

We also feel that political committees help candidates get elected, who, without our contributions, would not have the financial capability to get

elected. The cost and sophistication of campaigns is increasing, and the ability to run a campaign from only "grassroots" contributions is becoming more and more difficult, particularly in some of the more depressed districts in the state.

We feel that further limitations, such as the ones proposed here, will prevent many citizens of the state of Kansas, who are not independently wealthy or who do not have wealthy friends, from being able to run for elected office. The State of Kansas does not gain anything by narrowing the number of citizens who can run for public office.

We want to point out that, while a political committee may help a candidate finance a campaign, a candidate must still meet their constituents and gain their respect and earn their vote. Political committees do not cast the ballot on election day, individual voters do.

With regard to the lobbyist expenditure reports in Section 39 of the bill, while we understand the line of thinking which produced the proposed changes, we would like to point out that there are different kinds of lobbyists. I am the Director of Governmental Affairs for the Kansas Association of REALTORS®. I am a full-time, salaried staff member for the association. My job duties are not limited to lobbying. I also have a variety of staff responsibilities on a year round basis. I assist in coordinating our quarterly board of directors meetings, I assist the membership in answering legal questions concerning real estate contracts and procedures, I am the liaison between our NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS® and the state and also our local boards, and I write articles for our monthly membership publication. I tell you all of these duties, because I do not know how, under the proposed bill, I would begin to report to the state what my salary would be "in direct relation to lobbying" during the reporting periods, given the diversity of my job description. I am sure that there are other lobbyists like myself who would have a nearly

impossible job of accurately reporting under this provision, as distinguished from those who are actually on retainer. We would hope that you remove this portion of the bill.

I have just hit the highlights of the bill. There are many more details which I am sure others will point out for you. Once again, I apologize for not being able to testify in person. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.