like a--

CHAIRMAN MEEK: I will try and visit with these three fellow on this one, because this is in my territory up there and we will try to have something on that in the morning. If there is no other business, we will stand adjourned until 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon adjournment was taken until February 23, 1966, at 9:00 a.m.)

* * *

FEBRUARY 23, 1966

the meeting to order. We need a subcommittee to be working on that area yesterday, Republic, Cloud and Washington and bring in a report just as soon as they can and report back to this committee. This is the time table this morning, as far as I know. We will meet now and recess at 10:00 o'clock and reconvene at maybe 10:30 and work

until noon and we will see how far along we are at that time. But I would like to appoint on this subcommittee Mr. Boyd, Mr. Crow and Mr. Turner and in a few minutes or anytime they can go over in some other room and work out that district, if they will. We don't have anything of

a general nature to come before here ready for adoption

7 8

committee ready to report but they are not all here.

Mr. Golden and Mr. Finney are not here yet and they were both on different subcommittees. So you might as well adjourn to some other room around here and work that out, if you will, you three. In the meantime, if you don't mind, Mr. Fatzer has something he would like to present to this committee and we will listen to him at this time.

MR. FATZER: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. I have a little different version of the plan other than what is now on deck.

(Thereupon discussion was had off the record and adjournment was taken until 10:35 a.m.)

MR. GOLDEN: I have a statement I would like to have recorded in the record. On the map of the State of Kansas you will note in the northwest corner in the 39th Senatorial District there are ten counties with representatives from four of the districts being Democrats, six Republicans. All ten of the gentlemen got together at a meeting, which I called, and I asked them to submit a map. Then we met the following day. The map was submitted and eight out of ten maps submitted were exactly alike. And this is the way the district is comprised now. I have a mimeographed copy of the statement that was used in contacting the various counties and presented during

our hearing and I will quote it. "A suggested reapportionment of representative districts in the 39th Senatorial
District, complete with the Senatorial lines, January
25, 1966, suggested by the Chairman, Golden, and eight of
the ten representatives. The countles in the three districts are Cheyenne, Rawlins, Decatur and the northern
seven townships in Sheridan County, which comprise a
population of 16,978 people, or off the median of the
state of 3.43 per cent.

"The second district comprises the counties of Wallace, Sherman and Thomas with a population of 17,138, or 2.6 per cent off the state average.

"The third district comprises the counties of Logan, Gove, Trego and the balance of Sheridan, with a population average of 17,069 people or 2.97 percent off the state average.

"The townships in Sheridan County, which will be included with the northern district, are Sheridan, Adell, Prairie Dog, Bloomfield, Union, Sheldon and two that have been scattered in the present, comprising the population of 1,257 people."

We would call attention to the fact that the population of the 39th Senatorial District is 51,175 people, and that one-fortieth of the total state population is 54,945 people. Hence, our Senatorial District is 3,770

short in population, which is an area of approximately of seven per cent. We note also that this plan stays within the county lines with the exception of seven northern townships in Sheridan County.

Ladies and Gentlemen of this committee, I believe that this is the best that we can do for northwest Kansas and for our area and, boy, I tell you, it tears me up, it really does. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Thank you, Mr. Golden.

Do you want to move the adoption of that?

MR. GOLDEN: I move the adoption of this report.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Is there a second?

MR. BUNTEN: It is seconded.

chairman MEEK: It has been moved and seconded that we adopt this area as a final report on this section. All those in favor say aye; all those opposed no.

Motion is carried and so ordered.

At this time I want to excuse those gentlemen from northeast Kansas up there, Mr. Geiger.

(Thereupon discussion was had off the record.)

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Heath has a subcommittee report.

MR. HEATH: Mr. Chairman, your committee, composed of Representative Heath, Golden and Rogg being further requested to make further study of the proposed legislative reapportionment of Smith, Osborne, Jewell, Mitchell and Lincoln Counties submits the following report.

The delegation from Jewell and Republic Counties made a very fine presentation of their case. Representative Robinson presented a good case to the subcommittee in regard to Osborne County. We as a subcommittee would be very happy if we could give them what they wanted; however, we deem it advisable to keep the districts as drawn.

When you start changing a district, it involves other districts and it could become an endless task. We realize districts may not be perfect but we feel they have been fairly and honestly drawn.

If there is no question, I would move the adoption of the report.

MR. ROGG: I would second that motion.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Any questions?

MR. HOWARD: I don't know they are referred

to as drawn -- do we have how they are as drawn?

CHAIRMAN MEEK: What was the exhibit?

MR. HEATH: Exhibit A.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: On the map.

1	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Is it all right to
2	include that?
3	MR. HEATH: Exhibit A?
4	MR. HOWARD: Yes.
5	MR. HEATH: We will include that in the
6	report.
7	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Those in favor of accepting
8	this report signify by saying aye; those opposed no.
9	(The motion was carried unanimously.)
10	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Heath, you and Mr.
11	Joseph and Mrs. Newell were on another subcommittee; is
12	that correct?
13	MR. JOSEPH: It is completed but we haven t
14	written it up yet.
15	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Boyd, you were on a
16	subcommittee on Republic and Cloud.
17	MR. BOYD: Not quite ready to report yet.
18	CHAIRMAN MEEK: We have a request, I
19	would like to make a change in the district that is
20	comprised of Norton, Graham, part of Rooks, as it is on
21	the map, Exhibit A. That was a real small district,
22	15,000 and something. Dr. Beasley, would you check that
23	population on that map?
24	DR. BEASLEY: 15,816.
25	CHAIRMAN MEEK: We had a request to move

any objection to it? If there is no objection, we will--MR. HOWARD: Are these people in that
other area, is there any objection?

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Apparently not. I talked to Francis Jacobs. It was just a fact it was so small, just balance it a little better. Doctor, if you will make a note of that and give it to the reviser.

Mr. Boyd, are you ready to report?

MR. BOYD: Your subcommittee composed of Boyd and Turner suggests that three townships in Republic County be transferred from the Republic-Cloud County District to Washington and Republic County District, the sole reason being the difference in population. Before we considered this, the variation in population between the two proposed districts is 457 and as they stand now by transferring these three townships we have a variation of 112.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Do you have a map in front of you?

MR. BOYD: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Would you read the names of the townships,

MR. BOYD: Lincoln, Grant, Ellis.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Out of the original district?

MR. BOYD: Yes, they are out of the Cloud-

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

in?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Republic District into the Washington-Republic District.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: The problem here, Mr. Boyd, is that I don't believe that shows on that map over there, does it? That doesn't show on any official map or unofficial map that we have drawn up, so I believe I would like to suggest that you submit the names of the townships in Republic County that are in each district and then it will be clear.

MR. BOYD: I will have to read them off. The townships in the Republic-Cloud District -- I can't read all of this --

> I have got them. Big Bend --MR. TURNER: CHAIRMAN MEEK: Which district is that

This is in the Republic-MR. TURNER:

Cloud County District. Big Bend Township, the City of

Republic, Washington Township, White Rock Township,

Union Township, Courtland Township, Courtland City,

Scandia, Scandia City, Beaver and Norway, and Cloud County.

In the other district, that would be the Washington County-Republic County area, the City of Belleville, Washington County, and then in Republic County the following townships and cities: Liberty Township, Freedom Township, Rose Creek Township, Munden City, Fairview Township, Narka Township, Albion Township, Farmington

31	
1	Township, the City of Cuba, Richland Township, Elk Creek
2	Township and Agenda Township, together with Lincoln Town-
3	ship, Grant Township, Belleville Township and Jefferson
4	Township.
5	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Does that make a straight
6	line just from north to south right down across the count
7	MR. BOYD: Down to the Cloud County line.
8	CHAIRMAN MEEK: From the Nebraska line
9	to the Cloud County line?
10	MR. BOYD: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Thank you. Here is a
12	question.
13	MR. HOWARD: What is the population of
14	this district?
15	MR. BOYD: As they stand now?
16	MR. HOWARD: As changed.
17	MR. BOYD: 17,387, 17,409. 17,387 Repub-
18	lic and Cloud, and Washington and Republic is the other,
19	a difference of 112.
20	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Would you like to move
21	the adoption of this report?
22	MR. BOYD: I would so move.
23	MR. TURNER: Second.
24	CHAIRMAN MEEK: It is moved and seconded
25	that this report be accepted and adopted. Those in favor

say aye; those opposed no.

(The motion was carried unanimously.)

CHAIRMAN MEEK: The ayes have it, the motion is carried and it is so ordered.

Mr. Slocombe, are you ready to report?

MR. SLOCOMBE: We have asked for a little more time. Mr. Finney and Mr. Dempsey and I have a little disagreement on what Mr. Finney's opinion was and so we will ask for a little more time to either locate him or else we can make a little other arrangements with Mr. Dempsey.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: All right.

(Thereupon general discussion was had off the record.)

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Heath, would you like to report on your subcommittee?

MR. HEATH: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we haven't written it up. This subcommittee was composed of Representative Heath, Newell and Joseph and we report as follows: Mr. Fatzer has graciously withdrawn his plan and we will accept the plan which I guess is known as Exhibit A.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: That area?

MR. HEATH: Yes. Are there any questions?
MR. HOWARD: What is the size of that?

1	MR. MEEK: They are over there. There is
2	no change.
3	(Thereupon discussion was had off the
4	record.)
5	MR. HEATH: If there are no questions, I
6	would move the adoption of the subcommittee report.
7	CHAIRMAN MEEK: The subcommittee has
8	reported that there is no change from the original plan,
9	and as a report, Mr. Heath has moved the adoption of that
10	report. Is there a second?
11	MR. TURNER: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN MEEK: All those in favor say
13	aye; those opposed no.
14	(Motion was carried unanimously.)
15	CHAIRMAN MEEK: The ayes have it; motion
16	is carried and so ordered.
17	Mr. Slocombe wants more time on his report. Yes, sir,
18	Mr. Dempsey.
19	MR. DEMPSEY: I don't know whether time
20	is going to be in the element in this thing or not. All
21	I have to report is that we had a subcommittee meeting
22	yesterday where we unanimously agreed to have a report
23	to make which was based on the thinking and the suggestion
24	that I had made. It so happens that one of the members
25	of this committee is not here. So, this is the first time

that I have seen that all members of a subcommittee have to be present before a report can be made. At the present time I am told that somebody has gotten somebody and has asked that this remain as is on the wall, the map.

As I have said before, I have served my district which is normally Republican and I have tried to not inject politics into my endeavors in the Legislature, but it certainly looks like politics is being engendered into this, and overnight somebody has suggested that they pay no attention to the subcommittee report and that we leave the map as it is.

Now, if that is the way subcommittees are to report and function, please count me out of it, and I have never yet tried to apportion my county in respect to politics.

I have never conversed with my Democratic County Chairman in Leavenworth County, as of now, and I hate to see this done by some party chairman in the county without consulting me, who is a member of this committee, and who the chairman of this committee left Leavenworth County open on the map for us to work out a plan, and I was never consulted as to what procedure was, we had it worked dut, we were ready to submit it and all of a sudden this map appears. Now, if that is the way things are going to be worked out, please don't appoint me on any more subcommittees and just go ahead and apportion Leavenworth County.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: We had had no report from this committee.

MR. DEMPSEY: It was very easy to say "Have you reported?" We could have been contacted to see if we had reported.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Finney was not here this morning. I had no report from you. I thought we needed another member on the committee.

MR. DEMPSEY: Mr. Slocombe was the chair-man of it.

MR. SLOCOMBE: Mr. Dempsey, I hope you may be misunderstood, the purpose of having this committee was to come to an agreement. Now, it would be very easy if you talk about politics for this committee to over-ride the subcommittee's report, but I am doing my very best to do what is best for you and like you would like to have it. That is why I am asking for a delay so that we may contact Mr. Finney to see if that is exactly what he said.

MR. DEMPSEY: My only question is, does it take three in a committee to make a report. The chairman of the committee is here and two members of the committee.

MR. SLOCOMBE: If we wanted to play real politics we could just make a report and this committee

vote it down. We are trying to avoid that very thing. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 that you mentioned? 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 County. 17 18 19 against 1,583 in the City of Tonganoxie. 20 21 22 23 24

25

We want this thing to run as smoothly as possible. MR. DEMPSEY: I am saying politics has been engendered into it and you are not denying it has. CHAIRMAN MEEK: Let me ask you, Mr. Dempsey, what do those changes involve that you propose,

MR. DEMPSEY: The changes proposed puts the City of Tonganoxie with 1,583 votes back in--

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Votes or people?

MR. DEMPSEY: People, with 1,583 people back with the Township of Tonganoxie into the area that goes into Jefferson County. The area in Sherman Township comprising 1,240 votes would revert back to Leavenworth County, making a net gain of 343 votes for Jefferson

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Twelve hundred and how many? MR. DEMPSEY: 1,240 in Sherman Township.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Now, inasmuch as politics has been injected in here, I would like to suggest, if I might, that Mr. Boyd and Mr. Graber go down to the Secretary of State's Office, bring us the vote on the City of Tonganoxie and Sherman Township out of Leavenworth county.

MR. DEMPSEY: And they are strong Republicans all of them.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: That is what I want to know, if there is a difference in politics.

MR. DEMPSEY: I don't think there is a bit of difference.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: I thought that was the point.

MR. DEMPSEY: I am saying politics has been engendered as putting these back in as far as other areas of the county.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: I will tell you what I heard, Mr. Dempsey. I am not a member of the subcommittee or anything, but this is the point I heard and I talked to John Bower about it and that was that the City of Tonganoxie has a population partially or composed of people from Kansas City who work in Kansas City, that Sherman Township would be a more harmonious area to incorporate with Jefferson County; that it would be more of the type of people. That is the only reasoning I heard on it. There was no politics in that. That is why I raised this question.

MR. DEMPSEY: Why didn't you come to me and ask me about something like that? I live in it and I represented them for 12 years in the Legislature.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Yes, we will do that.

Mr. Fatzer has a statement he would like to incorporate into the record. He has withdrawn his objection to the district but he would like to incorporate this statement in the record. Is there any objection?

MR. VAN CLEAVE: What statement?

CHAIRMAN MEEK: I don't know. Is there

any objection? How long is this, Mr. Fatzer?

MR. FATZER: Will be short.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: You may proceed.

MR. FATZER: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. At the meeting of the subcommittee and myself I withdrew what is known as the Fatzer Plan. The plan was offered in good faith and had time permitted to balance the populated areas in Kansas, in Central Kansas to the more rural areas. I want to point this out to the committee that Edwards County-Pratt ratio is 2.7 votes to one in Edwards County to one in Pratt. I would like to point out that in Kiowa County the weight of voting is 2.64 as compared to one in Pratt. In Stafford County, adjoining counties, the weight of voting is 1.65 as compared to one in Pratt, and in Comanche County the weight of voting is 3.38 as compared to one in Pratt, and that these disparities do exist; that I do withdraw my objection and I thank you very much.

1	district.
2	CHAIRMAN MEEK: No, all of Jefferson Cour
3	is in there.
4	(Thereupon discussion was had off the
5	record.)
6	MR. SLOCOMBE: I urge you to vote for
7	this motion. If anyone wants to make a change, you can
8	do it on the floor. We would like to get these reports
9	in so we might get the typists busy so we may have this
10	bill introduced tomorrow.
11	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Do you second that, Mr.
12	Dempsey?
13	MR. DEMPSEY: I will second that.
14	MR. HOWARD: What are the figures on tho
15	two districts?
16	(Thereupon discussion was had off the
17	record.)
18	CHAIRMAN MEEK: All those in favor of
19	the motion say aye.
20	(The motion was carried unanimously.)
21	CHAIRMAN MEEK: The ayes have it, it is
22	so ordered. The motion is carried.
23	Mr. Euler, would you like to present the map from
24	the northeast corner?
25	MR. EULER: Mr. Chairman and Members of

 to the map which is numbered 1 in the series I gave you yesterday and it is in your proceedings as Exhibit No. 5. The subcommittee met with the representatives in this area affected and although there is some dissatisfaction with what I am going to state here, generally it has been agreed and I have been authorized to report to the committee as I am now going to.

On Exhibit No. 5, the northeast district, Doniphan County and parts of Atchison and Brown would remain the same, with 17,079 people in it. The Atchison County District, colored in green--you don't have the color--would be the major part of Atchison City, 16,285 people would remain the same, and the Jackson County with parts of Nemaha, Brown and Atchison with 16,378 people would remain the same, and then the north district, which on your map shows 16,229 people and comprising parts of Nemaha and Brown County would be altered to this extent: Included in this district on the west would be those two northwest townships in Nemaha County, Clear Creek and Marion. Clear Creek with a population of 293, Marion with a population of 597, which would then give that district 17,119 people.

Now moving over into this Marshall County area, since this does not affect your plans with reference to Marshall County, I think the population figures show Marshall County with a total population of 15,189, To this the subcommittee has suggested that you add the Nemaha County Townships of Center, Home, exclusive of the City of Centralia and Neuchatel. Home has got 253 persons, Neuchatel 253.

Neuchatel has got 200, and I don't have that figure herecenter has got 326. Also to the Marshall County District you would add from Riley County the two north townships, Swede Creek of 234 people and the Township of May Day with 188.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Would you give Mr. Cubit the information on Riley County.

MR. EULER: Going back to Riley County,
you would add to Marshall County the two townships in
Riley County, Swede Creek with 234 people and May Day with
188. This would then make a total population in that
Marshall County District of 16,390 people. I think that
concludes the report unless there are questions.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Thank you, Mr. Euler.

Any questions that you would like to ask Mr. Euler? Mr.

Yunghans?

MR. YUNGHANS: I didn't have any questions.

I would like to give a minority report.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: What was your question,

Ken?

(Thereupon discussion was had off the record.)

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Any other questions?

record.)

Nemaha and Brown. I have a map that would preserve the identity of Nemaha and still leave Brown. The map that I have would let Nemaha County retain an identity, Jackson County, Atchison and Doniphan. In other words four out of five counties. Like I said, I am sorry, the map is coming in and I don't have it to show you now. The population for all districts is above 16,000 and although I hesitate to ask you to delay this to see the map, why, I would appreciate it if we had time to look at it in more detail than I would prefer to try to explain it here standing before you.

MR. HOWARD: Is that being prepared?

MR. YUNGHANS: It is being prepared.

(Thereupon discussion was had off the

MR. GOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I renew my motion to accept the Euler Plan, Exhibit No. 5.

the bait here. I don't like to do something without hearing these people who are so concerned over this. We are going to have to take action on this, so let's all be here and be here on time. We have to get this done and down to the reviser. So we will stand recessed until 1:30.

(Thereupon the noon recess was taken until

1:30 p.m.) 1 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Yunghans, would you 2 like to proceed with your argument? 3 MR. YUNGHANS: Mr. Chairman, have I 4 adequately supplied the members? Is there any member 5 that doesn't have a copy of the map? 6 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Shall we designate Yung-7 hans map as Exhibit 8. 8 (Thereupon Exhibit 8 was marked by the 9 reporter for identification.) 10 MR. YUNGHANS: All I would do in conclu-11 sion with my presenting of the map is to ask you to 12 consider this one point, that this map maintains the 13 identity of four counties out of the five rather than 14 three out of the five. That is all I have to say. 15 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Thank you. 16 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Mr. Chairman, referring 17 to Exhibit 8, you say this preserves identity of four 18 out of the five? 19 MR. YUNGHANS: Four out of the five 20 21 counties. MR. VAN CLEAVE: Which are those counties? 22 MR. YUNGHANS: Nemaha, Jackson, Doniphan 23 and Atchison. 24

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Yunghans, I have a

different directions, when we have the second largest

county in that particular group. I have no complaint in the world about giving Atchison County a district, period.

My map will show that. But I think in the matter of decency or something, name it whatever you want to, that we shouldn't be cut up but into two pieces. I don't even think I am being unreasonable at all about that.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Van Cleave.

MR. VAN CLEAVE: Mr. Geiger, is there any way that you know of in this northeast area of Marshall County, Nemaha County, Jackson County, Brown County, Doniphan County, Atchison County, is there any type of compromise that all of you can live with?

MR. GEIGER: I have already just made the statement, Mr. Van Cleave, that I would be very happy to accept it. I don't like it, of course, to have my county cut up in two ways, but at least we could start to live with that. As far as retaining our identities, out of the six counties, here, of course, I was sort of lead to believe—that doesn't really enter into it too much—Marshall County will still retain its identity, Jackson, Doniphan would, and of course Atchison would have a complete district over there and there would be two of us cut up. My map will show Brown County cut right down through the center as nearly as you can do that, which means it would be roughly around 7,000 people in each

1	area. I can't say that that is retaining our identity
2	even at that.
3	MR. VAN CLEAVE: Mr. Chairman, on this
4	map, Doc, Nemaha is cut up three ways; is that right?
5	MR. GEIGER: That is right.
6	MR. VAN CLEAVE: As I understand it, all
7	of the representatives involved have been working at this
8	matter and there is no way that you know of that you can
9	come up with a plan suitable to all of you; is that right?
10	MR. GEIGER: No. I think that is an
11	impossibility.
12	MR. JOSEPH: You would rather have it
13	yes or no or a compromise? See, here, if you fellows can
14	get together, we would rather vote on that or the other,
15	rather, those of us that are not in the area. Your plan
16	may win and may not. I don't know.
17	MR. GEIGER: Out of those six people, I
18	don't believe there was any vote.
19	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Any vote did you say?
20	MR. GEIGER: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN MEEK: We have had so many plans
22	out of that corner
23	(Thereupon discussion was had off the
24	record.)
25	CHAIRMAN MEEK: The motion is on this one

plan by itself. If it is adopted, that will be the one we will take. If it isn't adopted, we will have to go to another one.

MR. GEIGER: I believe Mr. Euler was called upon to make this report and I don't know about Mr. Yung-hans or Mr. Stutz, or even Mr. Nowlin. I can say one thing, Mr. Euler was not representing me.

MR. EULER: I did not purport to be.

MR. GEIGER: I am assuming, Mr. Chairman, that I had sort of assumed that situation, since you immediately took the thing up and somebody made a motion to accept that plan.

room there, when we were in the other room? I was under the impression that that was the most agreeable plan when I left the room in there, the most agreeable. I knew that you didn't all agree upon it but it was the case of most agreeable or more agreeable. That was the impression I had when we were in the room there awhile ago.

MR. EULER: I think it is important that the record and the committee know about the position of representatives in this area that are affected. Now, they are all here, Mr. Nowlin is here, Mr. Stutz and Mr. Yunghans and myself and Doc Geiger, and for the benefit of the record, the report I gave is the plan which

I am in agreement with. Now, these other gentlemen can speak for themselves.

MR. GEIGER: I think that bears out what I said, I don't believe that this thing--I think it kind of proceeded a little bit fast there since there was not any vote taken, to my knowledge, among the six of us.

Another one shook his head back there.

MR. HOWARD: Well, how do they feel then?

MR. EULER: Mr. Nowlin, why don't you

make yourself known here.

MR. NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee I will agree with Mr. Euler on his plan.

That is the one that I like the best of all of them that I have seen. That is the one that is marked No. 5.

MR. EULER: As amended.

that this is the right procedure here in front of the whole committee. I think if we would have been doing that we should have proceeded outside the committee and it should have been brought in. You have all been allowed to testify, if you cared to. Is Mr. Stutz in the room?

MR. STUTZ: Yes. I haven't got anything I am in favor of the--I thought that is what we agreed on when we met with the subcommittee that we agreed on that, that that is the one we would present.

The state of the s
I came out of there with.
MR. STUTZ: I don't want to get into
politics. If you want to get into politics, the map for
my district, the map that Mr. Geiger has would be a lot
better for me, if you want to get into politics, but then
I don't like it for my county because I want to keep more
of the rural part of the county in the district.
MR. VAN CLEAVE: Then as I understand it,
Mr. StutzMr. Chairman, may I ask a question?
CHAIRMAN MEEK: Yes.
MR. VAN CLEAVE: Do I understand then
what you are stating is you favor the map submitted by
Mr. Euler which is marked as Exhibit 5 as amended?
MR. STUTZ: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN MEEK: I am going to eall the
question.
MR. HOWARD: Will this be secret?
CHAIRMAN MEEK: If you want it secret.
MR. VAN CLEAVE: This is a yes or no vote
This is for the adoption of Mr. Euler's map.
MR. GEIGER: I don't believe the whole
contingent was exactly called upon to state their opinion
You heard from three people other than me.
CHAIRMAN MEEK: Well, we had three.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: That was the impression

MR. GEIGER: Yes, but there are six.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Originally we started

out without Marshall County and then we included it in.

MR. GEIGER: That makes six.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: We will hear the other two. I don't mind hearing them.

MR. GEIGER: Is this a matter to put each one of these boys individually on the spot in front of everyone?

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Not necessarily. If they want to testify or indicate how they feel. Dr. Ott.

DR. OTT: Mr. Chairman, if I may, Members of the Committee. You haven't heard anything out of me regarding how you were to cut this piece of pie up in the northeast part of Kansas. I have seen a good many maps floating around and I am here to tell you that I could pretty well agree with any of them. I feel that we are all going to have to give a little bit and we are all going to have to take a little bit somewhere along the line. And as long as I don't have to go any farther down than the first two townships in Riley County in this Swede Creek area, I can go along with any of the plans that you have concerning my county, and I would like to have that stated in the record because I am not opposed to anything that you do that is going to work out to the

salvation of this thing, and I will be real happy with any of the things that I have seen up to date except going any farther south into Riley County. And I have visited with the representative from Riley County and he said he wouldn't get along with me if I was allowed to go any farther south than the first tier of the townships, too. I would like to keep in good with him, too. But how you take care of the east part of me, I will go along with any of these gentlemen sitting here. I don't think I could be any more fair than that.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Thank you, Carl. Bob, you already expressed yourself. Do you care to express yourself again?

MR. YUNGHANS: I will pass.

MR. DEMPSEY: Mr. Chairman, in order to give them all a fair break on the committee voting on their exhibits, I would make a substitute motion that we vote on Mr. Yunghans' and Mr. Geiger's exhibits before we vote on the motion that Mr. Golden placed and then we would see if we had any support for either one of them, and at least they would feel like they got a clear break on the committee acting on their maps.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Is there a second to the substitute motion?

MR. CROW: I will second that.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Which one of those did

MR. DEMPSEY: Doesn't make any difference. 2 Just so we vote on both of them prior to John Golden's 3 motion. 4 There is a substitute CHAIRMAN MEEK: 5 motion that those who prefer the Yunghans Blan, that is 6 Exhibit 8, that it be adopted. That is the motion, isn't 7 it? That it be adopted? 8 MR. CUBIT: Do you have a second to that? 9 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Yes. 10 MR. CUBIT: Can I make a substitute? 11 12 CHAIRMAN MEEK: No, not considered. MR. SLOCOMBE: I thought the motion was 13 to be considered. 14 15 CHAIRMAN MEEK: What was your motion now, 16 state it again, Mr. Dempsey. MR. DEMPSEY: The motion was that we act 17 on these to see the feelings of the committee. I don't 18 19 see any other way of acting than to vote. 20 CHAIRMAN MEEK: All this is just a motion 21 on this one bill. 22 MR. TURNER: To make it perfectly clear, Mr. Chairman, those in favor of Mr. Dempsey's motion would 23 vote aye; those opposed will vote no? 24 25 CHAIRMAN MEEK: That is right.

you put first?

1	MR. CUBIT: We haven't voted upon this
2	motion yet.
3	MR. TURNER: What I was trying to get at
4	is how we were going to vote on it.
5	(Thereupon discussion was had off the
6	record.)
7	MR. EULER: Would you restate the question
8	CHAIRMAN MEEK: The substitute motion was
9	that we vote favorably or unfavorably on Mr. Yunghans!
10	plan.
11	MR. MYERS: Mr. Chairman, if this carries,
12	that is it; is that right? Is that the way I understand
13	ît?
14	MR. HOWARD: Right.
15	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Let's get this all squared
16	now.
17	(Thereupon vote was taken.)
18	CHAIRMAN MEEK: The vote is 13 no and
19	3 yes. The motion has failed. We will vote on the Geiger
20	map. We are voting on whether or not we favor the Geiger
21	map, Exhibit No. 9.
22	(Thereupon vote was taken.)
23	CHAIRMAN MEEK: The vote is 14 no and
24	2 yes. We will proceed with the original motion, if you
25	desire to favor Mr. Euler's plan. That is Exhibit what,

Exhibit No. 5.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Thereupon the vote was taken.)

chairman MEEK: 14 year and 2 nays and one abstinence. The motion is carried. I almost forgot, we have one more little matter of business here, or request to hear--I don't know how little it is, I didn't mean to demean it or anything, but Mr. Richard Harper had a point he wanted to bring up.

MR. HARPER: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I have only a minor change that I would like to have the committee consider at this time and I haven't prepared any map because it involves only three townships in Crawford County. First of all, my constituents in Bourbon County with a population of 16,100 would much rather be left in a district of their own. But if we do have to pick up additional territory we would rather have the Townships of Walnut and Sherman in Crawford County which is an agricultural area rather than the Township of Lincoln which is a coal mining area. It would be much easier for us to get along together, I think, and represent the one interest rather than the two conflicting economies. The population difference is only 90, so if we would shift Sherman Township over to Bourbon County we would have a population of 17,754 and it would create no problem at all there in Crawford County's population.

Now, as I stated, we would much rather leave Bourbon County in one district with 16,100, if we could. These people in Walnut and Sherman Townships are much nearer our agricultural interest than the people in the mining area of Arcadia and Mulberry and Lincoln Township.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Harper, was this presented to Mr. Cubit?

MR. HARPER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MEEK: Jim, would you like to comment?

MR. CUBIT: I might say this, that this was presented to our subcommittee first, I believe, by the Crawford County group and we had no great feeling in it. However, we, I think, left it this way because the feeling in the committee was that Crawford County was the county that was giving up the territory. That is about all I can say. We didn't have any--

MR. VAN CLEAVE: Mr. Chairman, was there any disagreement between the two counties?

MR. CUBIT: There is a disagreement between the two counties.

MR. HARPER: Yes, I think there probably is, but as I stated, there are much smaller districts on the map--several smaller districts on the map than our present 16,100. So we would prefer to be left in a

district of our own if at all possible. 1 MR. CUBIT: Dick, what would that leave 2 the remainder of Crawford County outside of Pittsburg? 3 I haven't figured. 4 MR. HARPER: I think you split the City 5 of Pittsburg anyway. 6 MR. TURNER: What would be the size of 7 your district under your plan? 8 MR. HARPER: 17,754, and it is 17,839 9 there now. 10 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Cubit. 11 MR. CUBIT: He means to take the other 12 two townships of Crawford, but I understand him to say 13 they prefer to stay just one county rather than to take 14 Arcadia. Then what would your district be? 15 MR. HARPER: 16,114. 16 MR. CUBIT: We thought that would be too 17 small, and as I say, we had to make the choice between 18 taking the two and Pittsburg had submitted this and it 19 was the subcommittees -- I think the only reason that they 20 did this is because Pittsburg is giving it up. Personally, 21 I have no feeling on this myself. If the committee wants 22 to change it, that is up to them. 23 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Myers. 24

25

MR. MYERS: Dick, does this change -- I

1	didn't quite follow thisdoes this change one for two?
2	MR. HARPER: Yes.
3	MR. MYERS: But the population in two
4	is larger than it is in the one?
5	MR. HARPER: It is practically the same.
6	It is a little smaller. It is about 90 smaller in fact.
7	MR. VAN CLEAVE: As I understand the
8	situation now, Dick, your first choice is to just have
9	your own county.
10	MR. HARPER: That is right.
11	MR. VAN CLEAVE: Your second choice is
12	this plan you presented here?
13	MR. HARPER: Yes, Sherman and Walnut
14	Townships in place of Lincoln Township.
15	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Boyd?
16	MR. BOYD: It would seem to me about like
17	six one way and half a dozen the other way. For the sake
18	of getting this thing on the road, I move this change be
19	made.
20	MR. MYERS: I second it.
21	CHAIRMAN MEEK: You have heard the motion
22	Those in favor say aye.
23	(The motion was unanimously carried.)
24	CHAIRMAN MEEK: The ayes have it, motion
25	carried, and it is so urged. Are there any questions on

1	this original Exhibit A?
2	MR. CUBIT: Mr. Chairman.
3	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Cubit.
4	MR. CUBIT: I would move that we move out
5	this plan as is now mapped out for the whole state with
6	the recommendation it be passed.
7	MR. ROGG: I will second the motion.
8	CHAIRMAN MEEK: It has been moved and
9	seconded that we recommend the plan as it now exists with
10	recommendation that it be passed, that we pass it out wit
11	a recommendation that it be passed as our Reapportioning
12	Bill. All those in favor say aye
13	MR. HOWARD: Is there any discussion on
14	CHAIRMAN MEEK: Just a minute.
15	MR. HOWARD: I just have one question.
16	Doctor, now, what does this make our high district and
17	low district?
18	DR. BEASLEY: The low one is still 15,609
19	and I haven't check this last addition but of the one
20	that is on the map now is 19,521.
21	MR. HOWARD: That is what, approximately
22	3,900-4,000?
23	DR. BEASLEY: Yes.
24	MR. HOWARD: What per cent would this
25	be?

MR. TURNER: Dr. Beasley, do you have any 2 idea how many representatives will be in the House after 3 this? 4 DR. BEASLEY: You mean of the present 5 ones? 6 MR. TURNER: No. What I am getting at is 7 have you made 125 districts? 8 DR. BEASLEY: Yes, as far as I know. 9 MR. VAN CLEAVE: As I understand, Mr. 10 Cubit's motion was, and that is why I want to get some 11 clarification, how long will it take to have this printed? 12 CHAIRMAN MEEK: I hope by tomorrow morning 13 it will be printed. 14 MR. VAN CLEAVE: What I was getting at is 15 I think everyone should have an opportunity to look at it 16 because there will have to be some triple checking. 17 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Are you ready for the 18 question? 19 MR. DEMPSEY: I have a question. 20 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Dempsey. 21 MR. DEMPSEY: In our counties, as composed 22 of numbers, we have one with 18,000 -- what is it Dr. Beasley, 23 in the rural areas? 24 DR. BEASLEY: Yes. 25

me to it.

MR. DEMPSEY: Eighteen thousand what? 1 DR. BEASLEY: 18,281. 2 MR. DEMPSEY: 18,281. I feel, and I 3 haven't check on the precincts that have been put in this, 4 but I do feel this is going to be out of line real soon 5 because we have areas in the southern part, Lansing, 6 Basehor and in other areas that are building quite 7 rapidly, and I do think that we should have gotten that 8 county more in line before it is accepted, because it is 9 going to be out of line real quickly. 10 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Thank you. 11 MR. GOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like 12 to discuss this future growth of counties. 13 CHAIRMAN MEEK: John, let's leave that 14 15 open right now. MR. TURNER: Ready for the question. 16 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Ready for the question. 17 The question is on the recommendation of this plan. 18 19 in favor say aye; contrary no. The ayes have it, the motion is carried and it is 20 21 so ordered. We are adjourned. 22 23

24