

MINUTES OF MEETING
STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
March 29, 1961

The meeting was called to order, and discussion continued on S.B. 134. Mr. Fribley made detailed statements about the original study and recommendations concerning a diagnostic center for offenders. Amendments to the bill were presented and approved by the Committee, which removed the "commission clause" and gave power to the Director for the reason that this is a new venture, and the director should not be burdened with a commission regulating policies; that later on it might be found that a commission would be helpful. Mr. Behee made various statements about his feelings concerning the location of such a center, and pointed out why he felt that other locations might be more desirable than Topeka. It was established, however, that psychiatrists and psychologists just cannot be enticed to positions at other locations; that they desire and need consultants and in order to provide such a service at other locations the staff would be too large and expensive. Mr. Johnson explained why he supports this measure, because he feels that such offenders as check writers or alcoholics should be evaluated and steps taken to get to the "seat of their problem" rather than placing them with hardened criminals who will have a bad effect on them, and tend to add to the problem rather than to rehabilitate them. After considerable additional discussion concerning the center itself and possible "follow up" on the offenders, Mr. Marshall pointed out that this is only a start; that it is only an initial diagnostic center where the offender is evaluated and then sent to the institution deemed most suitable in his situation, and that later on probably steps will be taken to give treatment in the institution itself, in addition to the initial evaluation. Mr. Ford stated that this is the start of a new program; that Kansas is behind the times in this field, and he feels that this is a good proposal. Mr. Fribley moved that S.B. 134 be recommended for passage as amended. Upon second by Mr. Gardner, the committee voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Discussion was resumed on S.B. 357. Investigation had failed to reveal why the exempted counties, and since it has been in the bill since 1938, it was determined not to be concerned. Thereupon it was moved by Mr. Peppercorn, seconded by Mr. Ford, and unanimously approved that the bill be recommended favorably.

Discussion was then resumed on S.B. 46, the scholarship bill. Mr. Johnson discussed further the "need" proposition in the scholarship field, and stated that New York had solved the problem by actually setting up regulations and establishing an income scale on eligibility. Almost every member of the committee expressed views concerning the advisability (or lack thereof) for favorably considering this measure. Mr. Behee asked about the possibility of making it a "loan" instead of "scholarship" fund. He inquired if a Legislative Council study and recommendation had been made concerning the loan aspect, and it was determined that it had not been done. Mr. Marshall stated that this would have the effect of paying students to attend school; that we have provided institutions with tax money and that he is opposed to using tax money for this purpose. Thereupon, it was moved by Mr. Marshall and seconded by Mr. Unruh that this bill be passed out adversely. Upon vote, the motion carried by a vote of 7 yes to 5 no.

Meeting was adjourned.