

Douglas County Republican, Lawrence

It was stated by Ed Abels that in the last session of the Legislature, this proposition didn't have a "Chinaman's chance" of going through and he didn't believe it would this time. The Commissioners agreed that even if our present method costs more than a full time assessor, we would still want it because we would have it at "home".

Arguments that hold true for a full-time assessor also fit the case of combining the offices of the county clerk and the Register of Deeds. This, too, is an example of centralization of power. The cost of providing suitable quarters for this would be considerable. Under the present conditions, it is very doubtful that vaults could be obtained. The Commissioners were in agreement in their opposition to this.

Chairman Griffith brought up the matter of needed legislation empowering the Boards of County Commissioners to license carnivals and tent shows locating outside of the incorporated cities. At the present time, such shows require additional police guards which means a nice little sum of money out of the county's pocket. Mr. Griffith believes that such expense should be borne by the shows, and it appears that the feasible way to do this would be to license said shows, with a fee large enough to take care of such expenses. This was met with approval by all persons present, and it was suggested by the legislators that the Board enlist the aid of the County Attorney to draw up a bill on this which could be submitted to the House of Representatives.

The relief situation in the state provoked considerable discussion and the administration of this, both state and national, was condemned bitterly by the Commissioners of both counties. Criticism issued by the commissioners left no room for doubt that the counties were provoked and "fed up" with policies, rules, and regulations as set up by state officials. As said by Guy Shultz, the present State Social Welfare Board has actually placed relief clients on a plane above the taxpayer, which is a bitter pill to swallow by most taxpayers. These people are put into what may be called a privileged class. There is no doubt that the Boards of County Commissioners wouldn't deny a deserving person clothing, food and shelter, but to be forced to give relief to clients who the local authorities know are not deserving for various reasons certainly does not meet with the approval of the county boards.

County Commissioners are resentful of the dictatorial attitude of the State Board in regard to welfare cases. Although contrary to regulations as submitted by the State, welfare hearings on appeals by clients have been heard by the State Board without the formality of the client first making his application for appeal and having his hearing before the county board. The Commissioners first hear of such an appeal by letter from the State appeal saying that the county board cannot do "such and such" to a relief client. The Commissioners believe that such letters should be disregarded and that no consideration should be given to such a hearing for the client due to the irregularity of its holding in Topeka. The State Board insist that the counties be a sticker for formalities and that "this and that" must be done in a certain way, then let them follow their own rules. Guy Shultz was very emphatic in his admonition: "Let's get a new State Board in Topeka!" It was suggested by Mr. Sanderson that a county commissioner or a former county commissioner should be a member of the State Board. Commissioners know what are going on in their counties. All heartily agreed that this should be done.

A specific relief case was related by Mr. Griffith where a relief client spent almost his entire assistance check in a beer joint, and because of state regulations the county was unable to get him off the case load. At the present time, there seems to be no feasible way whereby a check-up could be made on such clients. Jean Clark, Welfare Director from Jefferson County remarked that the State "jumps all over her" for this same thing in her county, but she cuts down the checks just the same. She said that under the law, we cannot refuse to grant them cash assistance, but she cuts this down to \$1.00 and still stays within the letter of the law.

Bussing suggested that some representative of the county select certain isolated relief cases and appear before the committee on welfare at the Legislature to explain these in a complete but concise manner. He did not believe that a discussion on welfare cases in general would get very far.

The discussion touched lightly on the grain tax law, which the Commissioners believe is unconstitutional and certainly a headache to the county clerk and the assessors. All agreed that this law should be repealed. The cost of assessing, collecting and distribution far exceeds the revenue derived from this source of taxation.

After the completion of discussion, the meeting adjourned, the Douglas County Board to meet in regular adjourned session Friday, December 18, 1942.

ATTEST:

T. H. Gohart
T. H. Gohart,
County Clerk.

L. H. Griffith
L. H. Griffith, Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners.

December 18, 1942.

As per adjournment, all members of the Board of County Commissioners and the County Clerk met in the regular meeting rooms of said Board.

The Board passed Orders as follows:

No. 273: "CANCEL personal property tax in the amount of 40%, based on a tangible valuation of \$30.00, charged to Fritz Co., 8th New Hampshire, Lawrence, Kansas. Kanwaka Tax Roll, School District #15. Page 119, Line 27. Erroneous assessment."

No. 274: "CANCEL personal property tax in the amount of \$11.07, based on a tangible valuation of \$310.00, charged to the Kent Oil Company, Salina, Kansas. City of Lawrence Tax Roll, Page 302, Line 33. Duplicate assessment."

No. 275: "On the City of Lawrence Tax Roll for 1942, Page 349, Line 21, CANCEL personal property tax in the amount of \$20.18, based on a tangible valuation of \$565.00, charged to E. E. Welsh, 1033 N. H. Street, Lawrence, Kansas."

In lieu of the above, EMER on 1942 Lawrence Personal Property tax roll, tax in the amount of \$13.04, based on a tangible valuation of \$365.00, charged to E. E. Welsh, 1033 N. H. Street, Lawrence, Kansas.