

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

March 6, 1963

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, who introduced Rep. Harder to discuss H.B. 260, a proposal to establish a Kansas Youth Authority. He states that he is especially interested in such a Commission because of his work with underprivileged youth in East Topeka; that he has done a great deal, working through churches and other organizations, and with a limited budget, but that prevention is the key; not punishment and interment; that a small amount spent on prevention could save a great deal of money, considering the cost of keeping a youngster at BIS, or later, at Hutchinson or Lansing. He discussed the bill section by section and explained what it proposed to do. Further, he stated that after the Commission got "off the ground" considerable money could be expected from grants, and specific groups could be expected to take over certain aspects of the program. Mr. Ford inquired about the initial cost, and Mr. Harder stated that in St. Louis, the cost is \$24,000 per year, and again pointed out that interment costs a minimum of \$1500 per year, and that saving just a few boys could result in saving in the long run.

Mr. Yount, representing the Kansas State Federation of Labor, et al, stated that the labor movement of Kansas is behind this proposal. He pointed out that a raise in unemployment is expected and that this Authority could be supplemented by trade schools for those who are unable to attend higher educational facilities, or for those who are not college material; that this would help take care of the drop-outs and prepare them for some useful place in the community, as well as provide them with a livelihood. He pointed out how increased earning power would result in additional income taxes and help the state economy; thinking of this program in the long run. After questions by the committee, the sponsors were dismissed.

Senator Sanborn appeared to discuss his proposed SB 159, a local bill to permit Republic County to sell its county farm, stating that there were groups wanting to buy and lease this area; that it is for the good of the county. There were no questions and Mr. Sanborn asked favorable consideration of the Committee.

The Chairman stated that the Sedgwick County representatives had first prepared amendments to H.B. 288 which the Committee passed out; that they were so extensive that it was deemed advisable to redraft the bill, which they had done, and were asking the Committee to introduce it as a new bill, specifically to take care of zoning around the Cheney reservoir. Mr. Marshall

inquired if this new bill applies specifically to HB 288, and it was established that the provision is already on the statute books but this would permit a county to operate under two statutes instead of just one. Mr. McCarthy, the Sedgwick County Counsel, explained the proposal in detail. Mr. Unruh inquired what the metropolitan board felt about this and it was stated that they had no objection.

The Chairman called for action on SB 159, and H.B. Brown moved that it be recommended favorably. Motion was seconded by Mr. Fribley and passed unanimously.

Mr. Mikesic presented a proposed bill, stating that it was proposed by the Eagles, concerning employment, asking for equal consideration for applicants over 40 years of age. Mr. Fribley moved that the bill be introduced and referred to the Committee of the Whole. Motion was seconded by Mr. Riddle and carried unanimously.

Mr. Gardner discussed HB 307, a bill introduced by the Municipalities Committee. He stated that it is a measure dealing with retirement for the firemen and policemen in second and first class cities. He stated that hearings had been held and that these people wanted to get their retirement system out from under home rule. He stated that admittedly the cities are in bad shape and something should be done about this and that if this bill is passed the legislature probably has the obligation to ask for a study during the next two years. Mr. Baringer asked if it was possible the cities could discontinue these programs and Mr. Gardner stated that under the present law they could if they wished; and that is why these groups are asking to get out of home rule. Mr. Gardner discussed a major amendment that he felt would be advisable.

The meeting was adjourned.

HOUSE BILL NO. _____

BY COMMITTEE ON STATE AFFAIRS

AN ACT relating to ~~the~~ ^{MEMBERS} employment, retention and discharge of

persons over the age of forty.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:

Section 1. No employer shall refuse an opportunity of inter-
^{any}view to applicant for employment, nor discharge without just cause
any employee, between the ages of forty (40) and sixty-five (65)
who is physically able to perform the duties and otherwise meet
the established requirements of the industry and laws pertaining
to the relationship between employer and employee.

Sec. 2. This act shall take effect and be in force from and
after its publication in the statute book.