

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

March 29, 1965

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman who introduced Senator Arthur to discuss S.B. 190, stating that this would control the matter of unneeded duplicate records, and define what must be retained and what may be destroyed; that they had asked for publication because it would save money in duplication and storage. Mr. Griffith inquired how much would be saved and Mr. Arthur stated that he didn't know exactly, but that storage is a major item. Mr. Jelinek inquired about what will be destroyed, and Mr. Arthur advised him to read Line 26 which describes this.

Senators Barr and Bell appeared on S.B. 226, the corporate farming bill. Mr. Barr stated that there is a lot of corporate farming in the state today under the limitations of the law; that this would give more leeway, and let families engage in this type of operation without the expense that would otherwise be involved. Mr. Rome of Gove County stated that all the people who appeared (see list attached) are in favor of this proposal; that the Farm Bureau and the Kansas Livestock Association are both sold on the proposal; that the present law is discriminatory and that this would be another means of keeping the individual operations going. Mr. Harry Coffman, an attorney from Lyndon and former member of the House, stated that his practice is 75 to 80% farmer and rancher practice; that he has been trying to get this bill to its present stage for about 8 years; that he is very much in favor of its passage. Mr. Golden and Mr. Shrewder both appeared in support of the proposal.

Rep. Robinson appeared to discuss S.B. 97, stating that it is a local bill; that his county needs it and asked that it be considered favorably.

Mr. Fribley discussed S.B. 14, the municipal Housing bill; stating that it would be of great benefit not only to low income families, but to older folks. He discussed the possibility of amending the bill to include all cities. The Chairman then stated that he would like to have action on these three bills if it was the wish of the Committee. Mr. Unruh then moved that S.B. 190 be recommended favorably. Mr. Ford seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Fribley moved that S.B. 226 be recommended favorably. Motion was seconded by Mr. Rogers and with 14 yes votes and none opposing, the bill was declared passed.

Mr. Fribley moved that S.B. 97 be recommended for passage. Motion was seconded by Miss Jacquart and carried unanimously.

The Chairman stated that discussion would be resumed on House Bills 831 and 832, and introduced Mr. Sargent to introduce whomever he wished. M. W. Watson a contractor from Topeka, stated that he had operated in a great many states and that in many places out of state firms are discriminated against. He cited a job in Missouri where after the bids were let and his firm had been awarded the contract and started work, there were many requirements made such as using local materials at a premium price, when they had figured their bid on the best price for the materials they intended to use; that Oklahoma states they will give equal opportunity but somehow the bid just never gets up for consideration; that New Mexico and Wyoming have a gimmick whereby there must be a resident office licensed to do business and the licensing board just never seems to meet at a time when bids are going to be let. He states that Kansas should have reciprocal discrimination.

Mr. Don Enoch of Wichita, past president of the Wichita Indep. Businessmen's Association and the operator of a Brush and Chemical Company, spoke on behalf of an effort to keep the business with Kansas firms. He states that the Purchasing Department has always treated him fairly and he has no complaint but that we are always talking about new industry and here is an opportunity to keep our money at home by providing the 5% differential on bids, and then the local businessman will pay taxes on this money and keep more employees, thus keeping more money in Kansas. He suggested that other factors be taken into consideration in accepting bids, i.e. greatest value so far as service, and speed of delivery, etc. He states that about half of our neighboring states provide this type of protection for their instate businesses.

Rep. Don Joseph appeared on S.B. 142, stating that he would like to see it tabled because of some overlapping proposals on another bill. The Chairman asked if he would like it tabled permanently and he stated that it would be all right.

Mr. Corrick appeared on S.B. 95, explaining that this bill proposes to centralize the rules and regulations of the various departments; that they are in fact "law" in many cases, and that his department would compile, print and bind these regulations for distribution and sale. He stated this would cost in the neighborhood of \$70,000. with an additional cost of about \$1,000 for binders; that some 10 million regulations are involved and are on file. Mr. Fibley stated when the Council discussed this they weren't thinking of some fancy binder that would cost like this. Mr. Corrick stated that is out of his realm; that the Secy. of State has jurisdiction over this. Mr. Woodworth suggested that

many lawyers had old binders that could be used for this purpose and maybe they should be available with or without binders.

Bill Mitchell appeared to ask that the Corporation be exempt from this proposal, because sometimes the Commission has to act at once and that it wouldn't be practical in this case. Mr. Bob Anderson appeared on behalf of Mid-Continent Oil Company, stating that he would like to see this part of the Corporation Commission exempt from the bill. The Chairman asked if they would get together and present their proposed amendments.

Mr. Rogers then discussed H.B. 1067, stating that he and the subcommittee, Mr. Doyen and Mr. Buchele, had worked on the proposed amendments handed them by the individuals who appeared last week and there was some discussion concerning stock ponds and watershed reservoirs. Mr. Doyen stated that in the Council there was a lot of discussion about limitation on abatement but that they couldn't agree. Mr. Buchele stated that he felt there should be a limitation but when you are talking about only 40% he doesn't know if that is enough; that some of the easements have been taken on the basis of full exemption. Mr. Fibley moved the adoption of the amendments. Motion was seconded by Mr. Ford and carried without dissent. Thereupon, Mr. Rogers moved that H.B. 1067, as amended, be recommended for passage. Motion was seconded by Mr. Buchele and carried 14 to 1.

The Chairman asked for action on H.B. 831, and Mr. Jelinek moved that it be passed favorably. Motion was seconded by Miss Jacquart and lost with 6 yes to 7 no votes. Mr. Fibley then moved that it be recommended adversely. Motion was seconded by Mr. Ford and carried 7 to 4. Mr. Marshall asked to explain his vote, stating that he believes there is some merit in such a proposal, but believes that the Purchasing Department should be given more leeway to consider services, and certain other factors where just a small amount is involved.

Mr. Unruh moved to table H.B. 832. Motion was seconded by Mr. Buchele. Miss Jacquart stated that she thought it was terrible that an out of state contractor had built our office building; that she believed we should promote our own business people. Mr. Turner said this sounds good but it wouldn't be long before they would take advantage of the fact. Upon vote, the bill was declared tabled with 9 yes and none in opposition.

Mr. Doyen moved that H.B. 813 be recommended favorably. Motion was seconded by Mr. Unruh and lost with 3 yes votes. Thereupon it was moved by Mr. Doyen that the bill be reported adversely. Upon second by Mr. Fibley the motion carried 9 to 3. Mr. Ford asked to be on record as stating he was certain it was the feeling of the Committee that the House just didn't have time to debate this big issue at this time so late in the session with so much controversial legislation still to be considered.

Meeting was adjourned.

Farmers appearing to support SB 226

Wall R Rogers  
Geo Simpson  
Ella Anderson

Hene West

El Goddard

George Works

Gay H Kelsey

J. Kaw Quin

Raymond Farmer

W. Jamison

Ray G Beesley

Walter W. Grecian

Jack Works

Hub Campbell

Alvin J. J. J. J.

A J Sanges

Laruna Rupp

Phillipsburg Kans  
Hill City, Kan  
Scranton Kans.

Wa Keeney Kansas

Penokee Kans.

Humboldt, Kans

Rossville, Ks.

Holton Ks

Gove Co.

Gove co

Gove C

Graham Co

Humboldt, All<sup>ing</sup>

Bellevue Ks.

Hill City, Kans

Morland Ks.

Manhattan



## PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY  
300 WEST VICKERY BOULEVARD ROOM 2072  
FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76104

March 10, 1965

Honorable Herbert A. Rogg  
House of Representatives  
State Capitol  
Topeka, Kansas

Dear Representative Rogg:

This letter is written to you at the request of Mr. John A. O'Leary, Jr., President of the Peoples State Bank and a City Official of Luray, Kansas. Mr. O'Leary informs us that the City of Luray is interested in obtaining financial assistance from the Public Housing Administration to construct housing for low income elderly families in his community. We have received inquiries from a number of other smaller Kansas cities. However, we are unable to render financial assistance for the reason that the Municipal Housing Law of Kansas authorizes cities of the first class only to establish housing authorities eligible to obtain financial assistance from this Agency.

We understand that there is a bill now pending in the State Affairs Committee of the Kansas House of Representatives to amend the Municipal Housing Law of Kansas, which bill is designated as S-14. Mr. O'Leary informs us that he has requested your assistance in obtaining an amendment to S-14 to delete the restriction to cities of the first class now contained in Section 17-2339(o) of the Kansas Municipal Housing Law as codified in the General Statutes of Kansas. It is, of course, the prerogative of the Kansas Legislature to restrict participation in the low-rent housing program by Kansas cities in any manner it sees fit. It is not our intention to interfere in the legislative processes of your State. The information we are setting forth below is being transmitted at Mr. O'Leary's request for the purpose of providing information that may be of interest to you and to the House State Affairs Committee.

The Kansas Municipal Housing Law is the only one in the eight States in this regional area which prohibits the smaller cities from participating in the low-rent housing program. A number of the States, including Missouri, Colorado, Arkansas, New Mexico, formerly had such restrictions. However, the 1960 Federal Census on housing demonstrated that the extent of substandard housing, and particularly the need for better housing for low income elderly persons, is actually greater in the small cities and rural areas than in the larger cities. Thus, there has been a marked tendency to remove the restriction against participation by the smaller cities.

It would appear that a similar situation exists in Kansas. According to the 1960 Federal Census on housing, there were 209,549 renter-occupied dwellings in the State of Kansas. Of these 45,638 or 21.8 percent were substandard. The Census disclosed that the percentage of housing classed as substandard in the renter-occupied rural non-farm areas was 24.8 percent, or substantially higher than the State-wide average.

Under the Census regulations a dwelling was classed as substandard if it did not have (1) modern plumbing, (2) if it was delapidated, i.e. in need of major repairs or (3) was structurally unsafe. The Census regulations defined the term "rural non-farm" as including small cities of 2,500 or less population.

It is also interesting to note that the 1960 Census reflects a rather large elderly population in Kansas, particularly in the rural non-farm communities. According to the Census the number of persons 60 years of age and over in Kansas increased from 279,722 in 1950 to 331,864 in 1960. Approximately 45 percent of Kansas elderly citizens lived in the rural non-farm communities in 1960. We do not have data immediately at hand about the housing conditions and incomes of elderly citizens in Kansas, and suggest that you contact the Kansas Department of Public Welfare for this information. Nationally, the incomes of elderly citizens is very low and in most States there is a serious need to improve the housing conditions of elderly persons in the rural non-farm communities.

In conclusion, we would emphasize that the amendment suggested by Mr. O'Leary would merely authorize the smaller cities in Kansas to establish housing authorities and participate in the low-rent housing program if the local governing bodies of such cities determined that such action was appropriate. The Kansas Municipal Housing Law involves no expenditure of State funds and, in essence, merely grants to Kansas municipalities the right of self-determination as to whether they desire to seek Federal financial assistance to improve the housing conditions of low income elderly and other low income families.

We are enclosing five copies each of pamphlets concerning the low-rent housing program for the elderly and for other low income citizens together with a list of cities in the Southwest Regional Area that are participating in the low-rent housing program. You will observe that in other States, the smaller cities are actively participating.

If you desire any additional information, or if the House State Affairs Committee would like to have a representative of this Agency attend a committee meeting for the purpose of furnishing additional information, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

G. A. PARKER  
Regional Attorney  
Fort Worth Regional Office

cc:  
John A. O'Leary, Jr.  
The Peoples State Bank  
Luray, Kansas

831 +

H.B. 832

Rep. Graham

Rep. Sargent

Noble Drake, State Chamber

MAX M. Coe, Coe Surgical Supply, Wichita

H.B. 813

Rep. Bower