

October 13, 1944.

Mr. Richard L. Becker,  
Attorney-at-Law,  
Coffeyville, Kansas.

Dear Mr. Becker:

I have had a conference with Superintendent Dean in regard to the proposed bill. He and I are of the opinion that Section 4 is a little ambiguous. The word "unless" in the line next to the bottom of the paragraph, it seems to me, should read "provided". I am a very poor lawyer and if I have been incorrect just forget it. Otherwise I see no objection to the bill.

In going over the points that you raise, I agree with your No. 1 item, and on item No. 2 I would certainly suggest that the commission should have express authority to accept gifts, money or property in the name of the city with the express provision that the money is to be used for the benefit of recreation.

And in item No. 3 I would suggest that in these moot points which might arise the Board of Education would appoint one member from their board and the City Commission one from their commission, and that the two should elect the third member. And further, that the organization of chairman should be elected from the three. In this way the differences can doubtless be reconciled.

In item No. 4 I concur that one-half mill authorized levy would be O.K. I also concur in item No. 5 because under our arrangement the superintendents and other administrators will have great difficulty in getting in community recreation, whereas they are using all their money now. Perhaps this will stimulate discussion and argument and all of this may bring out a very favorable situation in that some citizens will be prompted to give money, gifts or property for the thing that they are in need of. Always when moot points are discussed someone with property or bonds will see the need and give it.

I do not believe a levy outside the limit would do the job because it would put recreation out as a target to be shot at.