

Approved: 1/25/96
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, CONGRESSIONAL & LEGISLATIVE
APPORTIONMENT AND GOVERNMENTAL STANDARDS.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Janice Hardenburger at 1:40 p.m. on January 23, 1996 in Room 529-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Senator Wisdom, excused
Senator Ranson, excused

Committee staff present: Dennis Hodgins, Legislative Research Department
Gordon Self, Revisor of Statutes
Bonnie Fritts, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Dennis Hodgins, Research Analyst,
Legislative Research Department

Others attending: See attached list

Dennis Hodgins briefed the committee on the activities of the Special Interim Committee on Governmental Standards regarding lobbying restrictions (Attachment 1) and presented a copy of Proposal #38 (Attachment 2). This proposal contains background information, committee activities, committee proposals, conclusions and recommendations. There was discussion on the way expenditures are reported, all concerning the amount of money that a lobbyist or group can spend on a legislator.

Senator Hardenburger asked the committee to look at carry-over bills.

Senator Parkinson made a motion to have Proposal #38 become a committee bill. Senator Sallee seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Senator Bond made a motion to draft a bill on open primaries. Senator Sallee seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Senator Hardenburger asked for approval of the minutes of January 16 & 18.

Senator Sallee made a motion to approve the minutes of January 16 & 18. Senator Brady seconded the motion. The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 25, 1996.

MEMORANDUM

Kansas Legislative Research Department

300 S.W. 10th Avenue
Room 545-N -- Statehouse
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1504
Telephone (913) 296-3181 FAX (913) 296-3824

January 22, 1996

LOBBYING RESTRICTIONS

Under current law, hospitality and the giving of gifts to state officials (including elected officials) is subject to a \$40 limit in a calendar year when it could reasonably be believed that the gifts were given with the intention of influencing the recipient (K.S.A. 46-237). However, hospitality in the form of recreation, food, and beverages is presumed not to be given to influence a state officer or employee in the performance of such officer's or employee's official duties.

Historically, from 1974 to 1990 there was a \$100 gift limit by lobbyists, and they were required to list the legislator to whom a gift was given, the gift, and the value of the gift. Then, in 1991, the gift limit was reduced to \$40, but the provision requiring a lobbyist to report the legislator's name as well as the value of the gift was eliminated (this provision is current law). A Kansas Select Commission on Ethical Conduct was established in 1990 to study and review existing laws relating to all aspects of governmental ethics, including conflict of interest, public disclosure by public officers and employees, and campaign finance. The membership of the Commission consisted of 11 appointed members (four were members of the Legislature). The Commission completed its report and submitted its recommendations to the 1991 Legislature. Attached are the recommendations concerning lobbying regulations and a summary of lobbying legislation in the State of Kansas. A complete copy of this report is available from the Kansas Legislative Research Department. H.B. 2454 was the only bill enacted into law in the 1991 Legislative Session which was based on the Commission's recommendations.

In April 1993, former Governor Joan Finney established a Governor's Task Force on Ethics Reform to examine and make recommendations for changes on ethics laws in the State of Kansas. Specifically, the Task Force focused on campaign finance, ethics, and lobbying regulations. The Task Force report was never released to the public and remains in draft form. H.B. 3073 was introduced by the Committee on Federal and State Affairs in the 1994 Legislative Session and contains many of the recommendations of the Task Force. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Governmental Organization and Elections, where it died in Committee. The Task Force recommendations on lobbying regulations are attached to this memo. For a complete copy of the draft report, please contact me at the Legislative Research Department. The only bill to be enacted into law was S.B. 47 in the 1993 Legislative Session. This bill prohibited a person, who owes any civil penalty, from registering as a lobbyist until the fine is paid.

During the 1995 Legislative Session, a bill (S.B. 116) was introduced to prohibit the giving or acceptance of any gift, hospitality, recreation, food and beverage, or service from lobbyists to any state officer or state employee, or candidate for public office (legislators are included in the definition of state officer or state employee). The only exception to this prohibition would be hospitality in the form of

SENATE ELECTIONS
1-23-96
ATTACHMENT 1

recreation, food, and beverage to a state officer, employee or candidate for state office, if the aggregate value of the hospitality was not more than \$3 per day. S.B. 116 was heard, but not passed out of committee during the 1995 Legislative Session. The committee recommended an interim study on the current ethics laws concerning the giving of gifts, hospitality, and other gratuities by lobbyists and other persons to state officers and employees. The Special Committee on Governmental Standards was directed by the Legislative Coordinating Council to study this issue during the 1995 interim.

After conference calls to four states that have more severe prohibitions on gifts by lobbyists, and after considerable debate, the Special Committee Chair introduced three ethics proposals which had been drafted for Committee members to consider in their recommendations. The first proposal would ban all gifts no matter how insignificant in value. The second proposal would ban entertainment, *i.e.*, golf outings, tickets to sporting events or theater events, or anything involving entertainment with the exclusion of food and beverage. The third proposal would ban hospitality in the form of food and beverage, *i.e.*, it would mandate separate checks unless the legislator was on the program as a speaker, or in the case where the group invited the entire Legislature to a reception (a restriction of \$25 per year would be included in this proposal). All three proposals failed on a Committee vote. A proposal to limit gifts, entertainment, and recreation to a \$5 maximum also was defeated, as was a proposal to prohibit lobbyists from purchasing alcoholic beverages for legislators.

The Special Committee on Governmental Standards concluded that the issue of ethics reform is a complex issue, but also an important one to examine. The Committee recognizes the positive and the negative impacts of implementing ethics reform laws in Kansas. Considering these impacts, the Special Committee on Governmental Standards recommends the passage of H.B. 2601 which would require each lobbyist, expending an aggregate amount of \$100 or more for lobbying in any reporting period, to report the following:

- each individual expenditure for the purpose of providing entertainment and hospitality in the form of recreation or food and beverage to each legislator or the legislator's spouse;
- the name of the legislator who was the recipient of the expenditure;
- the purpose of the expenditure, *i.e.*, for entertainment, recreation, or food and beverage; and
- the event for which an expenditure for entertainment purposes was made.

The exception to the reporting requirement would be if expenditures for entertainment, recreation, food, and beverages were provided to members of the Legislature attending any function to which all members of the Legislature were invited, and if a notice of and invitation to the function had been published in the listing or schedule of events compiled by the Division of Legislative Administrative Services.

Proposal No. 38

STUDY TOPIC: *Review current practices in which hospitality and other gratuities are provided state agencies, state officers and employees, elected officials, and candidates for state office by certain persons and the adequacy of current regulations of those practices under current law; compare with the practices of other states in limiting the amount of such gratuities; and consider further limitation or prohibitions on such gratuities.**

BACKGROUND

During the 1995 Legislative Session, a bill (S.B. 116) was introduced to prohibit the giving or acceptance of any gift, hospitality, recreation, food and beverage, or service from lobbyists to any state officer or state employee, or candidate for public office (legislators are included in the definition of state officer or state employee). The only exception to this prohibition would be hospitality in the form of recreation, food and beverage to a state officer, employee or candidate for state office, if the aggregate value of the hospitality was not more than \$3. Under current law, hospitality and the giving of gifts is subject to a \$40 limit in a calendar year when it could reasonably be believed that the gifts were given with the intention of influencing the recipient (K.S.A. 46-237). However, hospitality in the form of recreation, food, and beverage means the provision of recreation and consumption of food and beverage to a state officer or employee while the state officer or employee is in the company of the donor or the donor's authorized agent. The provision of recreation, food, and beverage in any other manner to a state officer or employee constitutes reportable entertainment. (K.A.R. 19-60-3(e).) From 1974 to 1990 there was a \$100 gift limit by lobbyists, and they were required to list the legislator to whom the gift was given, the gift, and the value of the gift. Then, in 1991, the gift limit was reduced to \$40, but the provision

requiring the legislator's name as well as the dollar amount to be reported was eliminated. S.B. 116 was heard, but was not passed out of committee during the 1995 Legislative Session. The committee recommended an interim study on the current ethics laws concerning the giving of gifts, hospitality, and other gratuities by lobbyists and other persons to state officers and employees, including legislators. The Special Committee on Governmental Standards was directed by the Legislative Coordinating Council to study this issue during the 1995 interim.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Special Committee on Governmental Standards focused its study on prohibitions of lobbyists giving gifts and hospitality in the form of recreation, food, and beverage to legislators. Conference calls were held with officials in four states that have more restrictive prohibitions on giving by lobbyists than the State of Kansas, i.e., South Carolina, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota. A panel, including ethics commission staff, Representatives, Senators, and lobbyists, participated in the conference calls.

The Committee began its study by reviewing the expenditures for food and beverages, recreation, and other expenses by lobbyists to legislators in the State of Kansas for the years 1994 and 1995. The Executive Director of the Kansas Commission on Governmental Standards testified that \$452,521.39 was spent by lobbyists on food and beverage for legislators (and their spouses); \$29,000 was spent on gifts; and \$7,000 was spent on recreation (such as golf games) for a total of \$488,521.39 in 1994. The Director reported that a total of \$470,496 had been spent by lobbyists from January to April, 1995.

South Carolina. The Committee learned from the South Carolina conference call that the state has implemented into law a "no cup of coffee" rule, which basically prohibits lobbyists or lobbyist principals (groups of individuals who hire

* H. B. 260 accompanies this report.

lobbyists) from giving anything of value to a public official or a public employee of the state. The exception to this prohibition is hospitality, given by a lobbyist's principal, that does not exceed \$25 a day or \$200 a year and is offered to the entire General Assembly or to the entire House or Senate, or all the members of a legislative committee or delegation. Some positive effects of the new 1991 ethics laws, according to the conference call panel in South Carolina were: lobbyists who were better educated and more helpful to legislators on legislative issues; and fewer receptions in the evenings. One-on-one dinners between legislators and lobbyists had nearly been eliminated, but receptions open to the public still occurred. A more level playing field between the "have" and the "have-not" lobbying groups had been established. The legislative process had been improved, along with the public perception of legislators and the legislative process. A panel member who is a lobbyist expressed some negative aspects of the new law, e.g., a lobbyist cannot offer a public employee a meal, a ride in his/her car, or give him/her a campaign contribution. Also, lobbyists find the reporting requirements burdensome because of the expense itemization required, and in some cases, where a lobbyist hosts a small group in his/her residence, then that lobbyist must be sure no legislators are present in order not to violate reporting requirements. Overall, the conference call panel members supported the creation of stricter prohibitions, because, as a result of this legislation, a strong message had been sent to legislators and the public that the General Assembly would not accept the corruption of the state's political system.

Wisconsin. The second conference call was to the State of Wisconsin. The Committee learned that Wisconsin has one of the strictest ethics laws of any state, i.e., a complete ban on gifts and hospitality by lobbyists to legislators. The exception to this law is a provision that allows a legislator to accept a meal from a group of his/her constituents if the meal is in connection with an invitation to speak to that group. The Committee was informed that the Wisconsin Ethics Code encourages legislators to meet with clubs, schools, special interest groups, and other gatherings to speak about issues and the

legislative process. In instances where a legislator is invited to speak to a group, the sponsoring organization may pay the legislator's out-of-pocket expenses, including the cost of a meal and travel expenses. Otherwise, Wisconsin's law basically mandates "separate checks" when legislators meet with lobbyists.

According to the Executive Director of the Wisconsin State Ethics Board, Wisconsin's approach to ethics legislation is clear, straightforward, and easy to enforce and to administer since there is nothing to report. A Wisconsin legislator informed the Committee that the ethics law had built public confidence, because the public knows that legislators are not getting anything of value from lobbyists or lobbyist principals. However, he was concerned that the new ethics legislation may dissuade citizens from becoming legislators, because citizens' employment may be in conflict with ethics as it applies to legislators. In addition, he also was concerned that the ethics laws could be interpreted to extend to legislators' spouses and other members of their families who work for state agencies. In his opinion, the way to avoid this problem would be not to extend the ethics laws beyond legislators but rather to require a disclosure by legislators.

Another Wisconsin legislator informed the Committee that the Wisconsin ethics laws worked extremely well and that the only drawback was the inability of some legislators attending lobbyist events; they have to pay for their own meals and cannot afford it on their present low salaries. He feared that some legislators may be cut off from constituency groups.

A lobbyist on the panel informed the Committee that from a lobbyist's standpoint, the new laws were easy to understand, providing equal footing for lobbyists who prefer to make their "pitch" on its merit without the concern of providing a better meal than competitors. All panel members reiterated their belief that the Wisconsin ethics laws were a positive step in the right direction to create a positive public perception of the relationship between legislators and lobbyists, and that these laws had improved the legislative process.

Iowa. The third conference call made by the Special Committee was to the State of Iowa. The Committee was informed that Iowa has an almost total ban on the giving or receiving of gifts, including food and beverage, which is similar to the ethics laws of the State of South Carolina and the State of Wisconsin. A staff member of the Iowa Legislative Service Bureau explained to the Committee that the Iowa ethics law allows Iowa officials, among other exemptions, to receive monetary items valued at \$3 or less per day from lobbyists. (S.B. 116, which was sponsored by Senator Parkinson and Senator Brady in the 1995 Kansas Legislative Session, is patterned after the Iowa ethics law which bans gifts and hospitality but allows a \$3 per day exemption.) The Committee was informed by a former State Representative and Chair of the House Ethics Committee that the \$3 limitation on food and beverage had reduced the potential occurrences of questionable ethical conduct by members of the General Assembly, and that it allowed members the opportunity to study bills in the evenings instead of attending the many social functions that occurred prior to the new ethics law being implemented. She told the Committee that lobbyists could still sponsor social functions, but after the \$3 limit was imposed, the legislators would have to pay for the balance of the meal. In this way, access to legislators was not restricted.

The Committee was informed that one problem with this new law was the lack of an exception for meals during programs by constituent groups at which legislators might be present. However, if the legislator were invited as a guest speaker, then the group would be allowed to pay for his/her meal. A Senator who is currently serving as Chairman of the Iowa Ethics Committee told the Committee that he supported the ethics law because it has helped change the public perception of legislators. He suggested to the Committee that if legislators in Kansas are considering a similar ethics law they should make an exception in the definition to exclude persons or groups in the legislator's district from the ban on giving of hospitality in the form of meals. The Committee learned from a lobbyist in Iowa that he believes the public's perception has not changed since the new ethics law went into effect. He also testified that the real effect of the gift law has been to cause more difficulty for lobbyists and their

clients to get to know legislators. In addition, he added that the new gift law did not level the playing field in terms of accessibility to legislators, because there are no restrictions on "grass roots" work done for a legislator in his/her district, while the ethics law forbids any political contribution from lobbyists.

Minnesota. The final conference call was made to the State of Minnesota. The Committee was informed by the conference call panel members that the ethics reform law in Minnesota virtually bans all gifts from lobbyists or lobbyist principals to legislators unless the legislator gives the lobbyist or lobbyist principal something of equal or greater value in return. In addition, the Committee learned that a legislator can accept certain gifts such as, things of insignificant monetary value, informational material of unexceptional value, food or beverage if the legislator is required to make a speech as part of a program, and a gift if the legislator is a member of the group giving the gift and the gift is given to all members of the group. A Senator from Minnesota told Committee members that the new ethics law, in his viewpoint, does not restrict access to the legislative process; however, the method of access has been changed from meeting with legislators at dinner or at a reception to meeting in the legislator's office, or contacting the legislator by phone and mail. He informed the Committee members that there is no limitation on lobbyists and legislators wining and dining together, but each must pay his or her own way. The Committee members were informed by the Senator that social events during the legislative session had decreased since the implementation of the new law. Also, in his opinion the "playing field" between the "have" and "have-not" lobbyists had been leveled. For example, local school districts and other public institutions feel that the law has removed the disadvantage of them not having an expense account for lobbying activities. Another legislator on the conference call panel informed the Committee that a good reporting system by lobbyists would be a better approach than a ban, because specific disclosures of expenditures for legislators who are continually attending dinners and accepting gifts would become public information. These activities could become a campaign issue, allowing the public to vote an individual who had abused the system out of

office. He felt that a nearly total ban on gifts without provisions for disclosure would drive expenditures by lobbyists underground. In addition, a Minnesota Representative believes the ban has reduced the effect of some of the smaller lobbying groups because it has reduced accessibility by these groups to legislators. A lobbyist from Minnesota states that he could support the new ethics law if it improved the public's perception of the legislative process and legislators. However, he felt that the public's perception had not improved because, as reports of violations surface, the public belief that legislators are dishonest is reinforced. He informed the Special Committee that the new ethics law has not reduced the "playing field," because citizen lobbyists may not be deemed "lobbyists" under the technical definition and therefore would not be subject to the ethics law. These groups would have an advantage over lobbyists who are subject to the law.

Several conferees appeared before the Special Committee on Governmental Standards to express their support of S.B. 116 which proposes a total ban on gifts and hospitality worth more than \$3 per day. Several members of United We Stand America (UWSA) testified to the Special Committee that they supported the ban on gifts and hospitality as reported in S.B. 116 and the ethics laws in the states which participated in the conference calls. They supported especially the law in Wisconsin, because it has a total ban on gifts and, therefore, no complicated reporting requirements are necessary. They recommended to the Special Committee to implement the policy of "separate checks" when considering ethics reform. This approach, according to UWSA members, would eliminate loopholes in the ethics law and improve the public perception of legislators and public officials. Also, they felt that a ban on gifts and hospitality would "level the playing field" between "have" and "have-not" lobbying groups. A representative of the Organizing Committee for the Independence Party of Kansas informed the Committee that he supported an ethics bill that would prohibit gift giving, hospitality, and recreation to legislators by lobbyists. He felt that this type of legislation would equalize the opportunity of all lobbying groups to present their views to legislators. A representative of the League of Women Voters of Kansas testified before the

Committee in support of ethics reform as a means to promote citizen participation in the political process. He also recommended that the Committee adopt the best legislative model discussed in the conference calls. A representative of Common Cause of Kansas submitted testimony to the Committee supporting a ban on gifts by lobbyists as a means to prevent well-funded lobbyists from dominating the legislative process to the extent that the average citizen can no longer be heard. A representative from the Kansas Sierra Club testified in support of a gift ban saying it would "equalize the playing field" between small lobbying groups such as the group he represents and the larger, well-funded lobbying groups.

Several conferees appeared before the Committee as opponents of ethics reform, especially as it applied to prohibitions on gift giving by lobbyists to legislators. A representative of the Kansas Cooperative Council informed the Committee that he opposed S.B. 116 because he believed that it would deny access to legislators by representatives of special interests. According to this representative, some special interest groups could not afford to pay the cost of food and beverages to legislators and therefore, they would be denied access. Also, he questioned the constitutionality, under the First Amendment, of a bill prohibiting groups from giving gifts to legislators. A representative from Pete McGill and Associates also testified in opposition to the bill by stating if legislation is passed banning gift giving, then the Legislature would convey the message that there is something wrong with the legislative process. He said that he believed that there is no such problem in the Kansas Legislature. In addition, he testified that the salaries of legislators in Kansas are not high enough for some legislators, and as a result, they could not serve in the Legislature if meals were not provided by lobbyists. Finally, he told the Committee that hospitality functions offer the opportunity for constituents to come to the Capitol and communicate with legislators, or an opportunity for lobbyists to become acquainted with legislators. A representative from the Kansas Motor Carriers Association informed the Committee that the reformed ethics law in Wisconsin had created additional disclosure requirements for lobbyists, and that it had destroyed the social atmosphere between lobbyists and legislators to the point that it was no longer

conducive to good government. A representative from the Kansas Bar Association testified in opposition to S.B. 116 on the grounds that it violated constitutional rights, and would not create an equal playing field between lobbyists and non-lobbyists.

COMMITTEE PROPOSALS

The Special Committee Chair introduced three ethics proposals which had been drafted to provide the opportunity for Committee members to consider in their recommendations. The first proposal would ban all gifts no matter how insignificant in value. The second proposal would ban entertainment, *i.e.*, golf outings, tickets to sporting events or theater events, or anything involving entertainment with the exclusion of food and beverage. The third proposal would ban hospitality in the form of food and beverage, *i.e.*, it would mandate separate checks unless the legislator was on the program as a speaker, or in the case where the group invited the entire Legislature to a reception (a restriction of \$25 per year would be included in this proposal). All three proposals failed on a Committee vote. A proposal to limit gifts, entertainment, and recreation to a \$5 maximum also was defeated, as was a proposal to prohibit lobbyists from purchasing alcoholic beverages for legislators.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Special Committee on Governmental Standards concludes that the issue of ethics reform is a complex issue, but also an important one to examine. The Committee recognizes the positive and the negative impacts of implementing ethics reform laws in Kansas. Considering these impacts, the Special Committee on Governmental Standards recommends the passage of B. which would require each lobbyist, expending an aggregate amount of \$100 or more for lobbying in any reporting period, to report the following expenditures:

- ▶ each individual expenditure for the purpose of providing entertainment and hospitality in the form of recreation or food and beverage to each legislator or each legislator's spouse;
- ▶ the name of the legislator who was the recipient of the expenditure;
- ▶ the purpose of the expenditure, *i.e.*, for entertainment, recreation, or food and beverage; and
- ▶ the event for which an expenditure for entertainment purposes was made.

The exception to the reporting requirement would be if expenditures for entertainment, recreation, food, and beverages were provided to members of the Legislature attending any function to which all members of the Legislature were invited, and if a notice of and invitation to the function had been published in the listing or schedule of events compiled by the Division of Legislative Administrative Services.

HOUSE BILL No. 2601

By Special Committee on Governmental Standards
Re Proposal No. 38

12-20

10 AN ACT relating to state governmental ethics; concerning reports filed
11 by lobbyists; amending K.S.A. 46-269 and repealing the existing
12 section.

13
14 *Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:*

15 Section 1. K.S.A. 46-269 is hereby amended to read as follows: 46-
16 269. Each report under K.S.A. 46-268, and amendments thereto, shall
17 disclose the following: (a) The full name and address of each person who
18 has paid compensation for lobbying to the lobbyist or has paid for ex-
19 penses of lobbying by the lobbyist during the period reported.

20 (b) The aggregate amount or value of all expenditures made, except
21 for expenses of general office overhead, by the lobbyist or by the lobbyist's
22 employer for or in direct relation to lobbying during the reporting period,
23 ~~if such expenditures exceed \$100.~~ Individual expenditures of less than \$2
24 shall not be required to be reported under this subsection. Such expend-
25 itures shall be reported according to the following categories of expend-
26 itures:

- 27 (1) Food and beverages provided as hospitality;
- 28 (2) entertainment, gifts, honoraria or payments;
- 29 (3) mass media communications;
- 30 (4) recreation provided as hospitality;
- 31 (5) communications for the purpose of influencing legislative or ex-
32 ecutive action; and

33 (6) all other reportable expenditures made in the performance of
34 services as a lobbyist.

35 With regard to expenditures for entertainment or hospitality which is
36 primarily recreation, food and beverages, only amounts expended on a
37 state officer or employee or on such officer or employee's spouse shall
38 be considered to be for or in direct relation to lobbying. Notwithstanding
39 the requirements of this subsection and subsection ~~(e)~~ (d), no lobbyist
40 shall be responsible to report any expenditure by the lobbyist's employer
41 of which such person has no knowledge.

42 (c) *In addition to the information reported in accordance with sub-*
43 *section (b), each lobbyist expending an aggregate amount of \$100 or more*

1 for lobbying in any reporting period shall report the amount of each
2 individual expenditure made for the purpose of providing entertainment
3 and hospitality in the form of recreation or food and beverages to members
4 of the legislature. Such report shall state the name of the member of the
5 legislature, the amount of each expenditure made for such member or
6 such member and such member's spouse and the purpose for which the
7 expenditure was made, whether for entertainment, recreation or food and
8 beverages. If an expenditure is made for entertainment, the event for
9 which such expenditure was made shall be reported. The provisions of
10 this subsection shall not apply to expenditures for entertainment, recre-
11 ation or food and beverages provided to members of the legislature at-
12 tending any function to which all members of the legislature have been
13 invited if notice of such invitation and function has been published in the
14 listing or schedule of such events for members of the legislature published
15 and provided by the division of legislative administrative services for such
16 purposes.

17 ~~(e)~~ (d) Whenever ~~an individual~~ more than one lobbyist contributes to
18 a single special event, ~~such~~ each lobbyist shall report only the aggregate
19 amount or value of the expenditure contributed by such lobbyist.

20 ~~(d)~~ (e) Whenever more than one lobbyist is employed by a single
21 employer, the reports required by this section relating to such employer
22 shall be made by only one such lobbyist and that lobbyist shall be the
23 lobbyist who is most directly connected with the particular expenditure
24 or gift, honoraria or payment. No expenditure or gift, honoraria or pay-
25 ment required to be reported by this section shall be reported by more
26 than one lobbyist.

27 ~~(e)~~ (f) Records in support of every report or statement filed shall be
28 maintained and preserved by the lobbyist for a period of five years from
29 the date of the filing of such report or statement and may be inspected
30 under conditions determined by the commission.

31 Sec. 2. K.S.A. 46-269 is hereby repealed.

32 Sec. 3. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its
33 publication in the statute book.