

Other **Viewpoints**

Online licensing good for everyone

At least something good has come from the state's disastrous software switch at county auto tag offices, which has led to long lines and delays for taxpayers: the decision to waive for a year the convenience fees to pay tags with a credit card.

Previously, the state's tag offices charged \$3 to process an electronic check or 2.5 percent of the transaction to process a credit card online or at the tag office. The fees are excessive and have served as a deterrent to those who would prefer to pay their tags online but aren't eager to pay for the privilege.

Maybe the state will realize in the coming year that eliminating the online transaction fee will result in more people paying their tags online, which will reduce the number of people who physically travel to the tag office to have their tags and taxes processed. That, in turn, might reveal that county tag departments could operate more efficiently, maybe even with a reduced staff and a reduced cost to Kansas counties.

In an age when people can buy just about everything online with the click of a button, it is beyond understanding that state government can't find a way to offer that same convenience to consumers at a cost that mirrors the private sector.

More than 400 companies provide credit card processing, and likely one of them offers a lower rate than the 2.5 percent the state currently charges. Furthermore, private-sector merchants for the most part absorb the cost of credit card processing as part of doing business and in an effort to meet the demands of a largely cashless society.

The state should follow the business world's lead in this respect. It would make it easier to pay a required tax, and the state might even find that absorbing the cost of credit card processing is less than the money spent on staff, time and paperwork needed to handle the long lines of grumbling taxpayers. - The Hutchinson News, via the Associated Press

Where to write, call

U.S. Sen. Pat Roberts, 109 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510. (202) 224-4774 roberts.senate.gov/public/

U.S. Sen. Jerry Moran, 354 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510 (202) 228-6966. Fax (202) 225-5124 moran.senate.gov/public/

U.S. Rep. Tim Huelskamp, 126 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. (202) 225-2715 or Fax (202) 225-5124. Web site: huelskamp.house.gov

State Sen. Ralph Ostmeyer, State Capitol Building, 300 SW10th St., Room 225-E., Topeka, Kan. 66612, (785) 296-7399 ralph.ostmeyer@senate.state.ks.us

State Rep. Rick Billinger, Docking Building, Room 754, Topeka Kan., 66612, (785) 296-7659 rick. billinger@house.ks.gov

Write us

The Colby Free Press encourages Letters to the Editor on any topic of general interest. Letters should be brief, clear and to the point. They must be signed and carry the address and phone number of the author.

Colby Free Press

155 W. Fifth St.

(USPS 120-920)

(785) 462-3963

Colby, Kan. 67701 fax (785) 462-7749 Send news to: colby.editor @ nwkansas.com

State award-winning newspaper, General Excellence, Design & Layout,

Columns, Editorial Writing, Sports Columns, News, Photography. Official newspaper of Thomas County, Colby, Brewster and Rexford.

Sharon Friedlander - Publisher

Kayla Cornett - Sports Reporter colby.sports @ nwkansas.com

Marian Ballard - Copy Editor

Sam Dieter - News Reporter colby.editor @ nwkansas.

Christina Beringer - Society Reporter colby.society @ nwkansas.com

> <u>ADVERTISING</u> colby.ads @ nwkansas.com

Kathryn Ballard

Advertising Representative kballard @ nwkansas.com

Kylee Hunter - Graphic Design khunter @ nwkansas.com

BUSINESS OFFICE

Office Manager

Evan Barnum - Systems Administrator support @ nwkansas.com

<u>NOR'WEST PRESS</u>

Richard Westfahl - General Manager Jim Jackson, Jim Bowker, Gary Meyer, Pressmen Lana Westfahl, Judy McKnight, Kris McCool, Stacy Brashear, Tracy Traxel, Mailing

THE COLBY FREE PRESS (USPS 120-920) is published every Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, except the days observed for Memorial Day, Independence Day, abor Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day and New Year's Day, by Nor'West Newspaper, 155 W. Fifth St., Colby, Kan., 67701.

PERIODICALS POSTAGE paid at Colby, Kan. 67701, and at additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Colby Free Press, 155 W. Fifth St., Colby,

THE BUSINESS OFFICE at 155 W. Fifth is open from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday to Friday, closed Saturday and Sunday. MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, which is exclusively entitled to the use for publication of all news herein. Member Kansas Press Association and National Newspaper Association.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: In Colby, Thomas County and Oakley: three months \$35, one year \$85. By mail to ZIP Codes beginning with 676 and 677: three months \$39, one year \$95. Elsewhere in the U.S., mailed once per week: three months \$39, one year \$95. Student rate, nine months, in Colby, Thomas County and Oakley, \$64; mailed once per

week elsewhere in the U.S. \$72

Opinion



Senate the last bastion of moderates

Now we know: the conservatives won the fight to control the state Senate.

The results will determine a lot about the future course of state government, though the battle has been waged largely out of sight.

The Senate was the last bastion of the "moderate" wing of the Republican party, a group that by and large has run things in this state for many years. Moderates like to trace their heritage back to Gov. Bill Graves, President Dwight Eisenhower and Gov. Alf Landon.

Until recently, the faction controlled the leadership in both houses of the Legislature, the governor's office (except when a Democrat happened to get elected) and the party.

Over the last decade, the party's conservative wing has been ascending, however. First the conservatives took over the House of Representatives, then with the election of former U.S. Sen. Sam Brownback as governor, the

After this conservative surge, the forces that be on the right set their sights on the moderate leadership of the Senate, which stood in the way of conservative goals. Even so, the conservatives seemed to have

their way, passing massive tax cuts and a budget that not only balanced, but included the required reserves to tide the state over any rev-

derstand the "one/two/three party" system in Kansas politics.

In our state, in reality, there's only one party,

Steve Haynes Along the

Sappa

long, dating back to statehood, that no one remembers why we have so few Democrats. Second, while we have, officially, two major political parties, the Democrats seldom win a

statewide office and almost never control the Legislature. A lot of people who would be Democrats in most states register and run as Republicans here. But the Republican party is split between conservative and "moderate" or liberal factions.

With the Democrats on the outside looking in, the two Republican "parties" slug it out for control of our government. It's like having three parties, only one doesn't count. And the dominant party is split into conservative and liberal wings, the "moderates" backing bigger government and more spending, the conservatives wanting to put a stop to all that after years of moderate control.

A few exceptional Democratic candidates win statewide races, including the conserva-To understand all this, first you have to untive Dockings, father and son, and the liberal Kathleen Sebelius, a superb political creature who grew up in the governor's office in Ohio.

But the main lesson of history is, if you want the Republicans. They've been in charge so to hold office in Kansas, be a Republican.

No party can survive and be as dominant as the GOP in Kansas and maintain any semblance of unity, however. Nature abhors a vacuum, and in politics, unity is a kind of vacuum, to be filled by those with a lust for power.

It's not just principle that's at stake here, either; billions of dollars in spending ride on the outcome, and the potential recipients want that money.

This year, the conservatives, flush from huge victories, decided to take on the Senate leadership. The goal set by the state Chamber of Commerce, through its political action committee, and other conservative groups was in control of all three. Conservative House members were recruited to run against key Senate

Not surprisingly, the "mods" fought back, piling up a huge war chest from unions, including the Teamsters, and the teachers, who stand to benefit from bigger state spending. With them are the Greater Kansas City Chamber and the state's highway contractors.

Now we know who won. My guess was the conservatives might have overreached. Their play of recruiting House members to unseat the Senate mods may seem too much like a power grab to voters. It prompted a heavy reaction from the crowd lined up at the public trough. But in recent years, the voters have been in a conservative mood. Apparently, they still are.

Now we will see if the conservatives, with control of both houses and the governor's office, can run things in a way the voters approve and in a way that makes the state prosper.

How should the winners govern?

When I first went to Washington in the 1960s as a novice congressman, the Democratic Party was clearly in control. It held the White House and enjoyed big majorities in both houses of Congress.

So big, in fact, that a sizable group of Democratic politicians argued that when it came to crafting legislation, the most important value was to attain large majorities and push through an ideologically pure agenda without even consulting the minority. Compromising in order to get Republican votes would mean surrendering core principles.

This might sound familiar to you. Although today, of course, the positions are reversed: it's the Republicans in Congress and on the stump who argue that sticking to core principles ought to be their highest priority.

Political campaigns are not just about who will govern, but also about the candidates' vision and how they plan to achieve it. This is not the first time in our history that two very different approaches to wielding power were

The first has characterized most of our nation's history: a willingness to engage in robust debate over competing ideas, work across ideological divides, negotiate differences, seek consensus, and above all, find a way to strike a deal and move forward. Its emphasis is on problem-solving and finding workable solutions to the problems that confront our nation.

Its motivating philosophy is that politicians' ultimate responsibility is to make the country work – not merely to satisfy their own partisan beliefs. It is what has made possible most of the great pieces of legislation that have shaped this nation - everything from rural electrification to federal highways.

Other **Opinions**

Lee H. Hamilton

In recent months, the U.S. Senate has moved toward this approach, voting to overhaul the U.S. Postal Service, find ways to pay for transportation programs, confirm judges and in other ways try to make government work.

The other approach has been on view more often than not in the House, and was prominent in the Indiana Republican primary that recently ended in the defeat of Sen. Richard Lugar. It holds that in order to achieve policy goals, it's crucial to purify the party, purge it of moderates and work hard to reach overwhelming, possibly even permanent, political victory.

It rests on a belief that the political philosophies at large in the country right now are irreconcilable and that reaching a compromise in the interest of moving legislation is impossible without betraying core principles.

In this view, Washington does not need more collegiality, but less. It does not need cooperation, but confrontation. It needs purists who will stick to their fundamental beliefs, do their best to keep winning elections and ultimately control the White House, the House and a filibuster-proof majority in the Senate.

This is not an irrational or illegitimate approach to governing. There are plenty of politicians of both major parties who have, at one time or another, advocated this approach.

But there's a practical problem with it: It is hard to make it work. The kinds of majorities that make ideologically pure legislating possible don't come along very often - and when they do, they don't tend to last long. The old catch phrase that "nothing is ever really settled in Washington" is true – because the political agenda is always changing.

Moreover, our system is designed to make it difficult for majorities to have their way. That's what the separation of powers is about, and the pivotal notion of "checks and balances."

Indeed, legislation that has bipartisan support tends not just to be more durable and of a higher quality, it is also easier to implement. As a governing tactic, ideological purity has enormous practical difficulties.

Nonetheless, in the upcoming election these two approaches – negotiation and flexibility vs. unyielding dedication to an ideology - will both be part of the package of issues that voters must weigh. Which makes it crucial that candidates talk not only about policy, but also about process - not only about where they want the country to go, but also about how they expect it to get there. Which approach do they favor? If they get into office, how will they govern?

Their answers will make a difference in how we as a nation tackle the challenges that confront us. So as the campaign season gets under way and the candidates who would represent you start showing up to ask for your vote, don't let them off the hook: Ask them not just what they want to accomplish, but how they'll go about it.

Lee Hamilton is director of the Center on Congress at Indiana University. He was a member of the U.S. House of Representatives for 34 years.

Mallard **Fillmore**

Bruce Tinsley

