

1           BE IT REMEMBERED that on the 22nd day of February,  
2 1966, the House Committee on Legislative Apportionment  
3 again met for public hearing; whereupon the following  
4 proceedings were had.

5  
6           CHAIRMAN MEEK: The meeting will come to  
7 order, please. The purpose of this meeting as you know  
8 is to hold a hearing for some of the residents and  
9 citizens of Republic County or any of the other of those  
10 counties up in that area that are interested in our  
11 problem and their own problem as a result of this prob-  
12 lem of ours.

13           There are two gentlemen here I would like to intro-  
14 duce to some of you newer members of the Legislature,  
15 the Honorable former House Member and Senator, Chris  
16 Green, and Mr. Royal Henderson, former House Member.  
17 I will let these two gentlemen take care of the intro-  
18 ductions a little later on. Maybe now is a good time  
19 for that, and then I will explain just a little bit about  
20 this map. Men, if you will introduce those of your  
21 constituents who are here from Republic County.

22           (Thereupon Mr. Lervold introduced the  
23 following:)

24           Royal Henderson, Belleville, Cattleman

25           Cliff Monk, Belleville, Grocery Business

1 Paul Fulcomer, Belleville, Banker  
2 Jim Tibbets, Belleville, Funeral Director, Furniture  
3 Chris Green, Banker  
4 Fred Swoyer, Belleville, Attorney  
5 Harold Richardson, Belleville, Chamber of Commerce  
6 Clyde Reed, Mankato, Soil Conservation  
7 Vic Tuller, Former Commissioner, Jewell County  
8 Walt Campbell, Mankato, Farmers Home Administration  
9 Carl Westin, County Superintendent

10 MR. LERVOLD: Now, are there any others?

11 I guess not. I believe that comprises our delegation.

12 Mr. Chairman, I might tell you that just to be real  
13 frank and quick, we are not satisfied with your map.

14 (Laughter)

15 We also felt that Jewell and Republic County had a  
16 lot in common--irrigation. I remember I was on the  
17 county board and the two boards worked close together,  
18 so we felt like we were pretty much in common then, and  
19 I have been informed that it is impossible, practically--  
20 I will not say impossible--for us to have that union,  
21 so we are down here as a group to have you explain to  
22 us why not. I will give you the floor if you will take  
23 over that map and give us a simple discussion of how you  
24 have worked at this, how you do work at it. That might  
25 help us if we know how you have arrived at the work you

1 have put in. So I will yield the floor to you.

2 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Ben, you know you and  
3 Erich have given me more trouble than anybody in the  
4 Legislature on this one thing here. I think Ben is  
5 part Swedish or something, I don't know.

6 MR. FINNEY: Irish.

7 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Is he Irish? Anyway, I  
8 would like to explain to you gentlemen, if I can, how  
9 we arrived at this proposition that we have up there  
10 on the wall.

11 First, I want to say that nothing has been finalized,  
12 but we are going to arrive at a point pretty soon where  
13 we do finalize something in order to get this special  
14 session over with and resolve the problem that we have.

15 Mr. Jess Taylor, as most of you probably know,  
16 is the Chairman of this Committee and he has been sick  
17 since Thursday, but he started this plan by dividing  
18 the state into subdistricts, and when this committee  
19 was chosen there were representatives of each of the  
20 Congressional Districts on the committee. So, roughly,  
21 when he divided it up he divided it by Congressional  
22 Districts or maybe a little lap over one way or another  
23 for one reason or another, and my area and Mr. Heath's  
24 area was the northeast corner of the state from Smith  
25 County on the west edge of Smith County, Osborne County

1 over to Lincoln County and Ellsworth County and down  
2 below Saline County and up around Dickinson County,  
3 Geary County, Wabaunsee County, up around Shawnee County,  
4 including--it took in Jackson County, Jefferson County,  
5 Leavenworth County and up to on out on this side of  
6 Wyandotte County.

7 We started in the northwest corner, for one or two  
8 reasons, I think. In the first place, that northeast--  
9 and that is the northwest corner of our subdistrict--  
10 working it out from there, and the northeast corner  
11 has been--and we knew it would be--one of the toughest  
12 spots to divide up of any area in the state, because  
13 it is an irregular shaped area and is boxed in on two  
14 sides, that is, from the north to the south. There are  
15 only two directions to go. We have tried to divide this  
16 into equal districts as near as possible and districts  
17 that--well, they are all contiguous, any district that  
18 has been laid out is contiguous. We had hoped that there  
19 would be a compatibility of interest, a unanimity of  
20 interest within the areas as much as possible. Some of  
21 them have larger cities than others, but we started in  
22 with Smith County when we laid this out. We just went  
23 from there--we knew we had to arrive somewhere near a  
24 median of 17,583 for each district, and we also knew  
25 that it would be impossible to be exact, so we divided

1           it out as nearly as we could on that basis which, of  
2           course, meant cutting counties. It is just a question  
3           of which county was cut and maybe sometimes maybe there  
4           was no particular reason except the next county had to  
5           be cut. We had to have a starting place and, as you  
6           know, we had to finish up.

7           I am real glad that you gentlemen had the interest  
8           to come down here. I know we are going to listen to  
9           what you have to say, and if we don't do anything else  
10          than get Erich and Ben off my back for treating me so  
11          bad, this meeting will have been a hugh success as far  
12          as we are concerned.

13                   MR. VAN CLEAVE: Mr. Chairman, I notice  
14                   there is a question mark on the population of that  
15                   district. Do we have a figure on it?

16                   MR. LERVOLD: I think that question mark  
17                   was "What do we do with it?"

18                   CHAIRMAN MEEK: We have it. Have you  
19                   got all three?

20                   MR. PENNER: This is Republic and Jewell.

21                   CHAIRMAN MEEK: Republic 9,402, Jewell  
22                   7,219, Mitchell 9,163, Cloud 14,065. Ben, why don't  
23                   you take over, you and Erich and introduce anyone you  
24                   would like to have testify.

25                   MR. LERVOLD: I have a map or two or three

1 or four of that with the populations on. I might tell  
2 you that I drew enough maps and I draw out some and use  
3 that manual that gives the population of the townships  
4 and cities until--well, I threw most all of them away,  
5 practically all of them, as I finished them, I threw  
6 them away.

7 For Jewell and Republic, we will be short, if you  
8 stay within that five per cent range, oh, I don't know,  
9 about 250 people, reasonably close.

10 MR. PENNER: Eight per cent.

11 MR. LERVOLD: Is it eight per cent?

12 MR. PENNER: Yes.

13 MR. LERVOLD: I might ask you, Mr. Chair-  
14 man, as we go along, is there some of these down in  
15 here--maybe they are not that short but maybe they are  
16 eight or ten per cent over. In other words, what is  
17 our median here?

18 CHAIRMAN MEEK: 17,583.

19 MR. LERVOLD: How far can we vary from  
20 it?

21 CHAIRMAN MEEK: That is the question.  
22 The Courts didn't lay us down any guide lines on this,  
23 so we are trying to--we originally started out to hold  
24 the deviation within ten per cent, either way, from  
25 the median, which would be approximately 16,000 to 19,000.

1 We are trying to get it closer.

2 MR. LERVOLD: Jewell and Republic come  
3 16,621 but 17,500 is the median?

4 MR. HEATH: It is about five and one-half  
5 per cent.

6 MR. LERVOLD: That is what I wondered,  
7 if we weren't close enough that it would go by. Now  
8 we have got quite a big irrigation district there and  
9 we are coming in for some new industries, two new packing  
10 plants, butchering plants, so we have got every chance  
11 in the world of growing, so if we are a little bit under,  
12 we will soon be over, and our delegation is down here  
13 pleading and asking that you really consider that we be  
14 included together.

15 Some of the delegation here may have something to  
16 say. Beginning over here, do you have something to say,  
17 Royal?

18 MR. HENDERSON: Well, I can't say that I  
19 do very much only that we do hate to lose our identity  
20 up there. Some of the maps that have been drawn, which  
21 I presume were all tentative--it looks like we would be  
22 cut up pretty badly and it would take approximately half  
23 of our county and we felt like the Jewell people and  
24 ourselves, that we had a pretty ideal situation. I think  
25 then we would be about 800 to 900 under the average, and

1 that was the proposition that I think the men here wanted  
2 to present today.

3 MR. LERVOLD: I will just go right on  
4 down the line. Did you have any comments? Senator  
5 Green, do you have some comments?

6 SENATOR GREEN: Mr. Chairman, and Members  
7 of the Committee, I was just thinking back to the years  
8 when I used to sit on this committee and be on the other  
9 side of the table and it is kind of hard to be on this  
10 side and sell something. We are very much interested in  
11 that part of the country and the reapportionment and  
12 I know the difficulty that is confronting you men in  
13 trying to satisfy everybody.

14 We are trying to preserve our identity as a county  
15 and the two counties of Republic and Jewell have the  
16 same interests. We have a big irrigation district up  
17 there which is in the western half of Republic County  
18 and the east half of Jewell County. Our school system  
19 is intertwined and so far as we are concerned up there  
20 it makes one of the--if we are going to lose our complete  
21 identity as a county, it gives us an opportunity to be  
22 represented in the Legislature. You know, we are going  
23 to lose a lot of representation any way you weigh it  
24 in the western part of the state, as you men know.

25 I noticed that question mark up there that was on



1 the map. Apparently it is the only question mark, at  
2 least that I saw on that map. So when you start in your  
3 consideration of this realignment, I hope you will give  
4 some attention to the fact of how these two counties are  
5 interrelated. Of course, we could have an alternate  
6 plan, but this is very, very important. I realize just  
7 as well as you do that you can't satisfy everybody and  
8 I trust your judgment in this thing because I served  
9 14 years in here and I always thought that most of the  
10 members of the Legislature were men of good judgment.  
11 I am strong for you in whatever stand you take, but I  
12 hope you will give consideration to preserving our  
13 county and not slicing it up as I saw on some of the  
14 maps. It just looked like you were emasculating the  
15 county. I surely would hate to see that.

16 I think if it actually was put to a vote in the  
17 two counties, 95 per cent of the people in the two  
18 counties would vote to consolidate those two counties  
19 for representation here in the Legislature.

20 We do have an alternate plan if that isn't accepted,  
21 but that is the one that we prefer to have. Thank you  
22 very much.

23 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Senator, has it occurred  
24 to you people that even though you are cut in two, you  
25 will get two representatives out of this, actually?

1           When a problem comes up, you will have two representatives  
2           instead of one.

3                       SENATOR GREEN: Explain to us how that  
4           comes about.

5                       CHAIRMAN MEEK: Half your county or a  
6           third or whatever it is will have one and the other  
7           representative will have the interest of your county at  
8           heart. He may not be right from your county but he is  
9           representing you.

10                      SENATOR GREEN: I hope so. Yet I saw  
11           some of the maps in which you would take a few townships  
12           and put it onto another county quite away off. It  
13           may be done but I wouldn't like it. Mr. Turner.

14                      MR. TURNER: If it would help you put  
15           your mind at rest, I am from Sedgwick County. Apparently  
16           we have four overlapping senatorial districts coming  
17           in from all sides, with the senators from these districts  
18           residing outside the county. At first blush when we look  
19           at this plan enacted several years ago, we were somewhat  
20           disquieted as you are now. As this thing has progressed,  
21           we had a freshman delegation in the Senate down here  
22           but in addition to that our overlapping districts brought  
23           in the Minority Leader of the Senate, Senator Joseph,  
24           the Chairman of the Education Committee, Senator Harder,  
25           and the distinguished gentleman from Kingman, Senator  
          Cox, and they have served the county beautifully. It

1 has strengthened us and hasn't hurt us a bit, if it  
2 will put your mind at rest.

3 SENATOR GREEN: Did you ever give any  
4 consideration to the plan that Florida has?

5 MR. TURNER: Yes, sir.

6 SENATOR GREEN: Every county gets a  
7 representative, doesn't it?

8 MR. TURNER: I don't believe that is  
9 exactly the Florida Plan.

10 SENATOR GREEN: It is my understanding it  
11 was.

12 MR. TURNER: It has worked out for our  
13 county very well.

14 SENATOR GREEN: I have lots of confidence  
15 in the judgment of this committee. Of course, we will  
16 have to abide by your judgment. Thank you.

17 MR. LERVOLD: And, Mr. Swoyer, did you  
18 have any comments to make?

19 MR. SWOYER: Mr. Chairman and Members of  
20 the Committee. Mr. Green has pointed out these two  
21 counties, Jewell and Republic, both have common interests  
22 almost as much as any two counties you could find in the  
23 state. That has been true throughout the years and has  
24 been since way back when he was County Commissioner.  
25 They had a lot in common then. They have enough in common

1 that the people from Jewell County and the people from  
2 Republic County have asked us to come down here today  
3 in an effort to try to convince this committee that they  
4 would like to have the two of them put together in one  
5 district if it is at all possible. And I dare say there  
6 haven't been too many counties who have appeared before  
7 this committee saying "We want to join with another county,  
8 a specific county."

9 I don't envy your jobs at all. In fact, I know  
10 you can't please probably anybody as far as that is  
11 concerned, but nonetheless both of these counties--when  
12 I say the counties, I am talking about the people residing  
13 in both of those counties--they are both definitely  
14 opposed to being cut in two and both of these counties  
15 which are adjacent, are being cut in two or probably  
16 will be cut in two under most of the plans which have  
17 been advanced up to this time. The two of them, if we  
18 can get together and be put in one district, will be  
19 just about the average or a little under, but they will  
20 be close enough.

21 Of course, I don't know what the courts will say,  
22 your ten per cent may be fine and maybe one per cent,  
23 I have no idea. But I do know this, that both counties  
24 feel real bad if they are going to be cut up, especially  
25 when both counties feel that with their common interests

1 they could go together as one representative district,  
2 and that is what we are asking this committee to consider  
3 and that is the way we would like to end up if at all  
4 possible.

5 We do appreciate your giving us this time to come  
6 down here.

7 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Van Cleave has a  
8 question.

9 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Do I understand that you  
10 have submitted plans?

11 MR. LERVOLD: Excuse me. Mr. Penner and  
12 I have asked--I imagine we asked you--

13 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Yes.

14 MR. LERVOLD: --I don't know how many  
15 times, that the two be put together.

16 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Have you submitted a  
17 plan that would be consistent with two counties that would  
18 be consistent with an overall state plan?

19 MR. LERVOLD: Well, I might tell you no,  
20 and I will tell you why. We have been informed that it  
21 is just simply impossible with the setup like it is and  
22 that you would have to go out and change every one of  
23 these from here on west, and so we have got a cold shoulder  
24 on the two joining and that is the reason why we haven't  
25 come up with a plan.

1 MR. TURNER: I think if you want to take  
2 the time and go to the trouble to go through that I will  
3 sure take the time and trouble to sit here and go over  
4 it. I am sure the whole committee would be willing to  
5 do it.

6 MR. VAN CLEAVE: We want to get the best  
7 job we possibly can.

8 MR. LERVOLD: I am sure glad to hear that,  
9 fellows.

10 MR. VAN CLEAVE: I don't know whether it  
11 is possible or impossible.

12 MR. LERVOLD: That goes for me. But we  
13 don't want to overlook it.

14 MR. FINNEY: It isn't very helpful for  
15 us, except to know your sentiments. I think you have  
16 made this real clear. But you kind of have to show us  
17 how we can work around it.

18 MR. LERVOLD: We will get up on the ball,  
19 but up to now we have been informed that it would have to  
20 go from there and change all this in this direction and  
21 possibly change it from there on east again.

22 MR. JOSEPH: We can see it in our solution  
23 not only in your case but the other case beside you.

24 MR. FINNEY: It isn't simple.

25 MR. LERVOLD: Any of you other fellows have

1 any comments? How about you, old school mate? We went  
2 to school back in 1917 and 1918, same class.

3 MR. WESTIN: Mr. Chairman, I could point  
4 out to you here where this would be very beneficial to  
5 the Republican Party if these two were joined together.  
6 I am a Democrat. We are not looking at it from a political  
7 angle at all. We are looking at it as a benefit to two  
8 counties, and I just have been thinking a few weeks there,  
9 how does it just come that everything just surrounded and  
10 come to a close right in the north central part of Kansas  
11 and there it was gerrymandered all kinds of ways. What  
12 reason could be for that?

13 MR. LERVOLD: You answer that.

14 CHAIRMAN MEEK: When I first made my  
15 remarks awhile ago, I told you about subdividing the  
16 state. Mr. Taylor subdivided it and he gives us this area  
17 starting with Smith County in the corner down to Osborne  
18 and then cut across there. But we just started at Smith  
19 County and we went from there right on. Smith was the  
20 corner county of what we had considered.

21 MR. TULLER: Our group today is a real  
22 minority group as our group is concerned. There are  
23 many people in our county who have studied this and worked  
24 with it far more than we have. On short notice it was  
25 impossible to get them here. I would, like Mr. Green,

1           having served as County Commissioner for eight years, if  
 2           I multiplied my troubles by one hundred I would be about  
 3           where you fellows are. We appreciate the time you have  
 4           given us to talk here. I think one thing you surely have  
 5           considered was the survey made by the college a few years  
 6           ago, where the people play, where they go to church, where  
 7           they shop, buy their machinery, and where they travel. I  
 8           think this should be part of this consideration. I at  
 9           this time wouldn't oppose or amend any plan, but I think  
 10          it is well that you let us express our views here. Like  
 11          any county, of course, we would like our county as a  
 12          unit, but if it can't be done, we will make the best of  
 13          it.

14                   CHAIRMAN MEEK: I am sure you all realize  
 15          some counties have to be cut under this decree or order  
 16          of the Supreme Court. It is just simply a must, it must  
 17          be cut. So it just so happens we started up there in the  
 18          corner and we were boxed in from there on west, so that  
 19          is why we started at Smith County and came down this way.

20                   MR. TULLER: Might further add that al-  
 21          though we can work excellently with Republic County, all  
 22          of our counties are pretty much the same way.

23                   MR. HENDERSON: I presume in looking at  
 24          the map you started with Smith and Osborne. I presume you  
 25          lacked some, didn't you, evidently? And I haven't known



1 where you went to get it. I am just wondering about  
2 that.

3 CHAIRMAN MEEK: We started with Smith and  
4 Osborne. We also had in there Mitchell, Lincoln and  
5 Jewell, five counties. So we had to divide that into  
6 about two representatives. Since then, we have arbi-  
7 trarily taken a few off of the west edge of Osborne and  
8 moved them west to increase the size of that district  
9 there. But that was after we did this originally.

10 MR. HENDERSON: I knew when you had told  
11 me that you had Smith and Osborne, I could see that they  
12 lacked. I was wondering.

13 CHAIRMAN MEEK: We reached over in Jewell  
14 and picked up a few. It is just a natural thing to do,  
15 I think. Then we went clear on across.

16 MR. HENDERSON: I think we all realize  
17 the problem you had, of course.

18 CHAIRMAN MEEK: By the same token, when  
19 you change one up there, then you may have to change all  
20 the way across. Maybe not.

21 MR. HENDERSON: That was the question I  
22 wondered, whether you had taken it to make Smith and  
23 Osborne.

24 CHAIRMAN MEEK: This is what the research  
25 department drew up without any consideration for county

1 lines. They did observe precinct lines to try to stay  
2 within a one per cent tolerance, deviation. So each one  
3 of those districts in the state is within one per cent.  
4 We didn't cut any precincts. Some townships had two  
5 precincts.

6 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Here is a five per cent  
7 one (referring to map).

8 MR. CUBIT: I might tell these men they  
9 are not the only people to have this problem. We had  
10 four of these subdistricts and I happened to work in one  
11 and we had some people in my area that had gotten the same  
12 treatment, and I know that we can't please everybody this  
13 way. There is an adding machine available over here.  
14 If you want to get together with Ben and if you can put  
15 this jigsaw puzzle together so you can keep your counties  
16 together, I am sure we would be happy to consider it.

17 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Dr. Beasley is here.

18 MR. CUBIT: Dr. Beasley is here and he  
19 can probably guide you a little bit there.

20 MR. VAN CLEAVE: He is an expert in this  
21 field.

22 MR. CUBIT: But it is real hard to fit  
23 them in. Like a jigsaw puzzle, you think it is going to  
24 work but it won't.

25 MR. LERVOLD: Now, Representative Penner,

1 I will yield the floor to you. You may have a few words.

2 MR. PENNER: Mr. Chairman, Members of  
3 the Committee. You may wonder why I have sat back here  
4 and kind of kept still. For two reasons: Ben said he  
5 would clobber me if I got out of line, and the other, he  
6 has seniority. This is about his fifth term and this is  
7 my first one. As a beginner, some of you remember, he  
8 got up to the mike in the earlier part of the session--  
9 I finally found out who he was--but I hollered at him  
10 anyway. So I am going to express viewpoint just a little  
11 in connection with this combination.

12 The gentlemen from Republic County came over last  
13 Saturday to Mankato and we had a meeting there and as was  
14 previously mentioned a number of our delegates who hoped  
15 to be here are in Omaha trying to get through another  
16 industry for our area, meat packing processing. Belleville  
17 and in that area have also gained an industry. If our  
18 area keeps on going tentatively as it has, we are going  
19 to have plenty of population. We have interests along  
20 36 Highway, both next to the Nebraska line. We don't hope  
21 to get annexed over there, we can't get north, that is  
22 a sure thing. We have similar industrial interests, we  
23 have similar farming interests. It is just the same in  
24 one community as the other. From that viewpoint we feel  
25 that on the basis of our interests, economic, social,

1 so on, that we want to stay together as a county unit.  
2 Every county wants to do that. Earlier--which kind of  
3 kept me from doing a little projective thinking--earlier  
4 I saw a trial map floating around here that had us a  
5 little different situation. I kind of indicated that  
6 one would be all right. That one disappeared. Then I  
7 found out next our county was cut in two, and of course  
8 by that trial map, by that computer, it was cut in three  
9 pieces. As our eminent Chairman says, we would have three  
10 representatives then instead of two or one. I can't quite  
11 go along with that theory. Now they have conceded to  
12 give us two instead of three, so I don't know what the  
13 object there was.

14 We would like to keep intact as a county and we  
15 would also like to be associated with our sister county  
16 to the east, Republic County, because of our similar  
17 interests there.

18 Now, if you will notice the combination of the popu-  
19 lation, Jewell and Republic County 16,621. Gentlemen,  
20 I have noticed on that map areas, particularly a little  
21 bit west, with 16,000. If that is okay, why aren't other  
22 combinations also acceptable within the ten per cent or  
23 eight per cent or whatever per cent it might be as a  
24 guide line as far as we are concerned?

25 Now, this has nothing to do with our setup here, but

1 as I understand in Nebraska they have accepted as much as  
2 19 per cent deviation from our reading. I don't believe  
3 the deviation has much to do with it as the possibility  
4 of starting on one point and another and finally the  
5 alligator jaws come together and if you are caught in a  
6 squeeze play you are in there.

7 Our object here today, as Representative Lervold has  
8 stated, and the gentlemen who have spoken, is to try to  
9 be united as counties as a whole adjacent to each other  
10 with similar economic, social and political problems to  
11 try to stay intact. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Thank you, Erich. Any  
13 other comment any of you gentlemen would like to make?

14 We do sincerely appreciate your coming in and  
15 testifying and this is going to receive consideration.  
16 We will see if we can work it out and we will sure have a  
17 go at it. Sometimes it is surprising what you can do if  
18 you try. We will see what we can do and again we thank  
19 you for coming.

20 SENATOR GREEN: Mr. Chairman, we want to  
21 thank you and the committee for giving us this permission  
22 to appear before you.

23 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Excuse me, Mr. Robinson  
24 might want to say something.

25 MR. ROBINSON: I would like to say just a

1 word. It applies only to Osborne County. I notice that  
2 you have the western of townships over into Rooks. We  
3 are like everyone else, we hate to be split, but consider-  
4 ing the natural interests of the county and the regions  
5 taken, I would like to get together with someone to  
6 figure out another combination if it is at all possible.  
7 It is not a valid reason but the northwest corner school  
8 districts all go to the Osborne District. The southwest  
9 part, they are a unified district down there by themselves.  
10 They have a few oil wells and that makes their interest  
11 just a little different than the north, and if it is at  
12 all possible I would like to do a little figuring with  
13 the committee on changing the boundaries on that western  
14 of counties.

15 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Thank you, Mr. Robinson.  
16 Is there anyone else who would like to contribute a com-  
17 ment to this particular area that we have been consider-  
18 ing? If not, I think the session has started, if any of  
19 you gentlemen are interested in attending this session.  
20 If not, I don't know how much of importance there is down  
21 there, but the committee will go into session on this next  
22 proposition.

23 (Thereupon a recess was taken, after which  
24 the following further proceedings were had.)

25 CHAIRMAN MEEK: I would like to call the

1 committee to order. I might ask the committee, we did  
2 mention that we would read the minutes that were taken  
3 this morning by Mrs. Gentry and correct them and approve  
4 them. She left about a fourth of it unfinished, those  
5 minutes. Do you still want to have them read? She can  
6 read off her shorthand notes, I am sure, what aren't typed  
7 up. Is it the desire of the committee to reread the  
8 minutes of the meeting this morning?

9 MR. TURNER: Speaking for myself, Mr.  
10 Chairman, I would waive the reading.

11 MR. JOSEPH: What is to be gained by that?  
12 We are all here.

13 CHAIRMAN MEEK: To make the record straight.  
14 We have this court reporter here now and from here on he  
15 will be taking over that part of it.

16 MR. GOLDEN: I feel that this Johnson  
17 County situation is probably one of the most difficult  
18 we have faced yet in the State of Kansas and it is very  
19 important to a great number of people that at sometime  
20 those minutes are inserted in the court reporter's  
21 record. I feel it is very important that they are included.

22 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Yes, I think we all were  
23 here and so I think we know what they are. Is it possible  
24 for you to get together with him and then you can give  
25 the minutes to him so it wouldn't be necessary to read

1           them at this time; is that satisfactory?

2                       MR. GOLDEN:    Right.

3                       MR. TURNER:   I move then we waive the  
4 formal reading of the minutes now and have them inserted  
5 in the record.

6                       MR. SLOCOMBE:   I will second the motion.

7                       CHAIRMAN MEEK:   Moved and seconded that  
8 the reading of the minutes be waived and that they be  
9 inserted in the record.   All those in favor say aye.  
10 Those opposed no.

11                      The ayes have it.   Motion is carried.

12                      I believe we are all here that were here this morning.  
13 At this time we will proceed with the Johnson County  
14 proposition and I believe I will call on Mr. Amrein.

15                      MR. AMREIN:    Mr. Chairman, I never before  
16 knew what it was like to be up on the horns of a dilemma,  
17 but I will have to say to you at this time, at this parti-  
18 cular day, there is not one map that can be presented to  
19 you for the reapportionment of Johnson County.   I think  
20 probably most of you know that all of my district is in  
21 Overland Park and I represent probably three-fourths of  
22 that particular city.   My feelings are very mixed on this.  
23 I would like to make that clear, because I thought there  
24 was a ground of compromise that could be true.   I find  
25 that not to be true.   I find that, for what it is worth,



1 my support for the committee of the two maps would be  
2 what is referred to as the Winters map in your brochure.

3 The people in my area, whom I represent and whom I  
4 have talked to about it, like this map better than the map  
5 that I and the other three members of the delegation worked  
6 on last week. I met with them over the weekend. I  
7 thought there were some changes in one or the other could  
8 be made to arrive at a solution. I find that not to be  
9 true once again. I will put it simply, without belabor-  
10 ing the point, and certainly I will be open to any ques-  
11 tions that you might have. I find that my position should  
12 be and must be support of the map and brochures before you.

13 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Anyone have any questions  
14 they would like to ask Mr. Amrein?

15 MR. GOLDEN: Could you repeat that last  
16 statement?

17 MR. AMREIN: My endorsement of support  
18 should be and must be and will be of the map in the  
19 brochures for ten.

20 MR. SLOCOMBE: You support this one?

21 MR. AMREIN: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN MEEK: That is the second plan  
23 that was presented this morning?

24 MR. AMREIN: Yes.

25 MR. SLOCOMBE: That is the plan presented

1 by Mr. Winters.

2 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Any other questions?

3 MR. FINNEY: The last two maps in here?

4 MR. AMREIN: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Any other questions? If  
6 not, gentlemen, I think it is up to this committee--

7 MR. TURNER: I have a question. Is Mr.  
8 Zimmerman here? Did you have some work from anybody over  
9 the noon hour that would indicate that pershaps some of  
10 the information given this morning was erroneously given?

11 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I have rechecked with the  
12 people in my area who have taken an interest in these  
13 maps and they support the delegation map as on the wall.

14 MR. TURNER: Is there any change of  
15 position on your executive committee?

16 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I have heard none. These  
17 people have supported this type of plan and still do  
18 today.

19 CHAIRMAN MEEK: It apparently is up to  
20 this committee to make a decision which one of these maps  
21 we are going to accept. I think I know you fellows  
22 well enough to know that whichever one is accepted will  
23 be supported. Therefore, I think I will call for a vote  
24 on this by the members of the committee, and this voting  
25 is just a little bit sticky here. We have members on both

1 sides here, members of the House--I mean that are sponsor-  
2 ing these. Is there a preference on how we vote?

3 MR. TURNER: I make a motion. I move we  
4 accept the House endorsement of the majority of the mem-  
5 bers from Johnson County. That is the map on the wall.

6 CHAIRMAN MEEK: That is a motion that we  
7 accept it?

8 MR. TURNER: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Is there a second? Wait  
10 a minute. We would still have to vote. Now, is there  
11 a preference on how we shall vote?

12 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Mr. Chairman, the sug-  
13 gession has been made to me that we vote by secret ballot  
14 and I think that suggestion is very wise. This is, I  
15 think as far as I am concerned, I don't want to vote.  
16 I do think and it might be also wise to just vote on  
17 Plan A or Plan B, because if one of them wins or loses,  
18 if we know what we are voting on, I just think it might  
19 be wise.

20 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Let's designate them as  
21 one and two.

22 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Yes. I don't know whether  
23 that is agreeable with Jack or not.

24 CHAIRMAN MEEK: This is a motion--

25 MR. TURNER: Let's have the reporter mark

1 the map that is on the wall, I believe it would be three,  
2 wouldn't it?

3 (Thereupon the delegation map was marked  
4 as Exhibit 3 and the executive committee brochure was  
5 marked Exhibit 4.)

6 CHAIRMAN MEEK: You second Van Cleave's  
7 motion? Do you want to discuss the motion of how we  
8 shall vote, John?

9 MR. GOLDEN: I wanted to discuss your  
10 motion.

11 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Let's determine how we  
12 shall vote.

13 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Mine was a suggestion only,  
14 but in order to resolve the question, the easiest way to  
15 resolve it would be to vote on Exhibit 3 or Exhibit 4.  
16 If you are for this plan there, you are voting for Exhibit  
17 3, and you can just--if we vote by secret, we just put a  
18 three or four.

19 CHAIRMAN MEEK: By ballots.

20 MR. VAN CLEAVE: By ballots.

21 MR. SLOCOMBE: Mr. Chairman, I make a  
22 substitute motion that we vote by ballot on Exhibit 3 or  
23 4 by written ballot.

24 CHAIRMAN MEEK: That includes everything,  
25 I guess.

1 MR. GRABER: I will second that.

2 CHAIRMAN MEEK: It has been moved and  
3 seconded that we vote on Exhibit 3 and Exhibit 4 by  
4 written ballot. Is there any discussion on this?

5 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Not on the motion.

6 CHAIRMAN MEEK: All those in favor--Mr.  
7 Howard?

8 MR. HOWARD: I do have some question.  
9 No. 1, as Don stated, of course, in a short time I don't  
10 think we have really had any time to work out any kind of  
11 agreement. I am not saying there aren't some changes to  
12 be made from the map I happen to support and I think from  
13 the county people that I talked to there isn't anything  
14 they can't change on the map that they sent up. I would  
15 ask if the mover would, or at least--I guess I don't need  
16 it as long as it is clear--that of course whichever map  
17 is accepted, if there are some changes that would be  
18 mutually acceptable to everybody that those could be made.  
19 I don't know whether we need this in the motion as long as  
20 that is acceptable.

21 MR. VAN CLEAVE: I think this committee  
22 certainly would entertain anything that you could get to-  
23 gether--

24 MR. HOWARD: The problem on trying to get  
25 together on any figures is you just can't take one precinct

1 here and change it with another precinct.

2 What is the purpose of voting?

3 CHAIRMAN MEEK: We will have a starting  
4 place and we will work off of one. Are you ready to  
5 vote? Let's get this clear, that is Exhibit 3 on the  
6 wall, which was presented by Mr. Howard, and Exhibit 4  
7 was presented by Mr. Winters.

8 MR. TURNER: Did you want to discuss this  
9 some more, John?

10 MR. GOLDEN: Yes, I want to discuss the  
11 map.

12 MR. FINNEY: Can't we vote on this motion?

13 MR. GOLDEN: The motion is whether we  
14 have a secret ballot or not?

15 MR. TURNER: You don't vote on a secret  
16 ballot.

17 MR. GOLDEN: I have a question to ask Mr.  
18 Amrein. I understand, Mr. Amrein, now, that you are for  
19 Exhibit 4.

20 MR. AMREIN: Correct.

21 MR. GOLDEN: And Mr. Zimmerman is for  
22 Exhibit 3?

23 MR. AMREIN: Correct.

24 MR. GOLDEN: All right.

25 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Let's vote.

1 (Thereupon vote was taken by secret bal-  
2 lot.)

3 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mrs. Newell and Mr. Cubit,  
4 will you collect these ballots.

5 The vote is six for Exhibit 3 and ten for Exhibit 4,  
6 so the Chair declares Exhibit 4 as the plan that is ac-  
7 cepted by this committee.

8 \* \* \*

9  
10 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Next order of business  
11 before the committee--if it is agreeable with the committee--  
12 we didn't call this meeting for this purpose--will be to  
13 listen to Mr. Euler and Mr. Nowlin present a plan that they  
14 have developed in regard to the northeast corner. Do you  
15 have extra maps of that or anything?

16 MR. EULER: We have a map which we gave  
17 to the committee. Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Chairman?

18 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Ready, Mr. Euler.

19 MR. EULER: Show appearing with me on the  
20 proposition which relates to five counties in the north-  
21 east corner of the state--these counties being Doniphan,  
22 Brown, Nemaha, Jackson and Atchison--are the representa-  
23 tives from Atchison County, Mr. Stutz; from Jackson  
24 County, Mr. Nowlin; and Mr. Yunghans who was here. I  
25 see that he is gone. Mr. Geiger is not here. We are

1 not in position to speak for him.

2 Mr. Nowlin and myself have done a considerable amount  
3 of work on this particular area of the state which was  
4 set apart and assigned to the representatives in that  
5 area. At the outset, I think I can state that four or  
6 five elected representatives from that area do not agree  
7 with the plan which has been proposed by this committee  
8 or some part of it and which is now on the board over  
9 here.

10 CHAIRMAN MEEK: I will take responsibility  
11 for that.

12 MR. EULER: And we devised an alternate  
13 plan. First, as to why we don't feel this is the best  
14 plan for that area. Primarily, it would be because I  
15 think some consideration should be given to political  
16 subdivisions, if it can be, and under the plan as it is  
17 on the board, of these five counties, four of them are  
18 divided and lose their identity, whereas under our plan  
19 of the five counties involved three out of the five con-  
20 tinue to maintain their identity. One as against three.

21 Now, we have a total population in that area of  
22 65,971. This excludes the western counties, and Nemaha  
23 County, the western townships in Nemaha County. This  
24 would be an average population of 16,492.

25 The map on the board shows populations ranging from



1 16,970 down to 16,048.

2           Going into this plan that is on the board again,  
3 I don't think it takes into proper consideration unity of  
4 interest of various areas here. It divides the County of  
5 Atchison, which I don't think should be necessary, and  
6 it doesn't have as regular lines as it might have.

7           Under the plan Mr. Nowlin and I have worked on and  
8 which I have shown to Mr. Stutz, and he endorses it, I  
9 showed it to Mr. Yunghans and he states simply it is  
10 better than the one that is now on the board. Of course,  
11 he isn't generally in favor of them, because as between  
12 the two he prefers our plan with the one on the board.  
13 Mr. Geiger has not viewed this. I haven't had an oppor-  
14 tunity to talk with him today. I don't know what his  
15 position is on it.

16           Under this plan it would put Doniphan County with two  
17 townships in Brown County plus the voting precinct of  
18 North Shannon in Atchison County plus the east precinct  
19 of the 3rd Ward in Atchison County, would make a total  
20 population of 17,079. This incidentally would put Mr.  
21 Geiger and I in the same representative district. I  
22 certainly don't commend to you as the reason for the  
23 opposite plan. I don't like it any better than possibly  
24 Mr. Geiger or anybody else on this committee or anybody  
25 else involved in this particular problem is concerned.

1 but nonetheless I think that an impartial objective view  
2 of this problem in the area would demand that this terri-  
3 tory be divided up as we provided here in this map.

4 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Do you think you are  
5 qualified to present an impartial view of this thing?

6 MR. EULER: That is up to the committee.  
7 In other words, if there are five representatives there--

8 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Why don't you use some  
9 other word?

10 MR. EULER: I am putting myself with  
11 another representative.

12 The next district would deviate from the plan on  
13 the board only that it would move--you can see this  
14 little dog leg down here and it would put it over with  
15 Doniphan County.

16 CHAIRMAN MEEK: You mean that one town-  
17 ship?

18 MR. EULER: Yes, it would remove the  
19 upper green, would be this solid block here.

20 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Just the same?

21 MR. EULER: Just the same, yes. Would  
22 have a population of 16,229.

23 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Jack, how long would it  
24 take you to run some maps off? I think it is impossible  
25 for these people to follow this. I am so familiar with

1 that that I can do it, but I don't see how any of the  
2 rest of these people can follow this at all. Or else  
3 get a big enough one.

4 MR. GRABER: How many districts are  
5 involved?

6 MR. EULER: It will be reducing from five  
7 to four.

8 MR. GEIGER: Mr. Chairman, I just now  
9 came in the door and I am totally unprepared, of course.  
10 I have only got 15 maps of my own. Naturally, I would  
11 have to oppose anything that would cut Brown County into  
12 three pieces. I could talk for another thirty minutes,  
13 I couldn't say any more than that, I believe.

14 MR. CUBIT: We might ask Mr. Geiger if  
15 he would like to get his map and pass it around.

16 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Jack sent a map over to  
17 Research to have it printed. Do you happen to have a  
18 copy of the one your prefer?

19 MR. GEIGER: The last one, I am not quite  
20 sure it is off the press yet. I didn't get a chance to  
21 ask Dr. Beasley. If you have anything else you could  
22 talk about here, maybe we could get this thing up. It  
23 did cut the counties up to nearly equal on population and  
24 it is a little bit different than anything I have seen  
25 yet, but no one else would love it, of course. It did

1 leave the same districts. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, I  
2 don't have anything to offer on this other than I have  
3 to oppose anything that cuts my county into three pieces,  
4 that is all.

5 CHAIRMAN MEEK: If there is no objection  
6 on the part of the committee, we will either sit here and  
7 discuss a few things just casually or else we can recess  
8 a few minutes and come back here in about 15 minutes  
9 when these maps should be ready. I think it is impossible,  
10 like I said, to discuss a map intelligently if you can't  
11 see it. Let's recess 15 minutes.

12 (Thereupon a recess was taken.)

13 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Let's call the meeting  
14 to order.

15 MR. EULER: Proposition No. 2 is the one  
16 which is up on the board at the present time, Map No. 2.

17 CHAIRMAN MEEK: That is the one you  
18 don't like?

19 MR. EULER: That is correct. I think  
20 basically I have said about all I have got to say. Map  
21 No. 1, there is a data sheet on this particular map.

22 CHAIRMAN MEEK: I don't want you to  
23 answer this if you don't want to. I still am not quite  
24 sure, other than it cut one more county, cut three  
25 counties instead of two, what you didn't like about this

1 No. 2 Plan that is on the board.

2 MR. EULER: I don't think you should have  
3 lines like you have got on the Map No. 2 on the board.  
4 I think if you can draw a straight line or something  
5 that is reasonably straight, you ought to draw it. Always  
6 subject to criticism and people will get the wrong idea  
7 about why you draw maps.

8 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Of course, we had this  
9 court decision the other day that said that a territory  
10 didn't even have to be contiguous, I believe is the way  
11 I read it, and this isn't gerrymandering but it is just  
12 defining population. But even gerrymandering was all  
13 right in a one-man one-vote.

14 MR. EULER: I don't think you can really  
15 interpret that decision to be just a let down on the  
16 bar of gerrymandering. I don't say this map is gerry-  
17 mandering.

18 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Thank you. Tom?

19 MR. VAN CLEAVE: It is kind of hard to  
20 follow this map, but as I understand your map, you keep  
21 how many counties intact?

22 MR. EULER: Three out of five.

23 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Three out of five. Now,  
24 on the map that is on the board, how many counties are  
25 intact?

1 MR. EULER: One out of five.

2 MR. MEEK: That is right. I was thinking  
3 there were two but it is just one.

4 MR. FINNEY: What are they, Doniphan,  
5 Jackson--

6 MR. EULER: Doniphan, Jackson and Atchison.

7 MR. STUTZ: Honorable Chairman, I have  
8 never bothered anyone about this. What I don't like about  
9 the map on the board, Atchison County has got about  
10 2,300 more than they have to have to be on the dot, and  
11 the map on the board, I don't know how many it takes away  
12 from Atchison County, but probably 5000 or 6000 and then  
13 you go out in Jackson County and bring in six townships  
14 and make our county almost 50 miles long where it doesn't  
15 have to be but 12. That is all I have got to say about  
16 it. It is not necessary whether you come just as close  
17 or closer to the figures by not taking one end. I don't  
18 know why you want to take away from the county.

19 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Thank you, Mr. Stutz.

20 Mr. Nowlin?

21 MR. NOWLIN: You are cutting the six  
22 townships from the east side of Jackson County and putting  
23 them over in Atchison. That is trade territory for  
24 Holton. They come that way to trade, even on the Plan 1  
25 with the two townships from Atchison that would be with

1 Jackson County, that is in our trade territory. Part of  
2 that land is even in unified districts in Jackson County,  
3 and most of it is our trade territory. I hate to see  
4 them cut land about four miles--well, it is less than  
5 that, about three miles from Holton and send it clear  
6 over to be in with the City of Atchison.

7 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Do you think they would  
8 stop trading over at Holton?

9 MR. NOWLIN: That is where they naturally  
10 come. I don't know whether they would go there or not.

11 MR. EULER: I think his point is that  
12 a representative from the Holton area would be more  
13 receptive probably to the needs and wants and demands of  
14 the people three miles outside the City of Holton than  
15 they would in the City of Athcison.

16 MR. FINNEY: Jack, I can't find but two  
17 counties that are intact, Doniphan and Jackson.

18 MR. EULER: Atchison has got their  
19 representative. That is the best you can do.

20 CHAIRMAN MEEK: But it is not intact.

21 MR. HOWARD: You have to take some off,  
22 though.

23 MR. EULER: You are just begging the  
24 question, though.

25 MR. VAN CLEAVE: My question was, how

1 many were intact. It probably was misunderstood. But  
2 that was the question.

3 MR. EULER: But the prevailing question  
4 here is whether or not Atchison County with 19,000 people  
5 is entitled to a representative.

6 MR. VAN CLEAVE: I understand that. May  
7 I ask a question of Mr. Stutz?

8 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Certainly.

9 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Mr. Stutz, do I understand  
10 that you favor Map No. 1, too? Is that correct?

11 MR. STUTZ: Is this No. 2 up here?

12 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Right.

13 MR. STUTZ: I favor No. 1.

14 MR. NOWLIN: I favor No. 1.

15 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Cubit has a question.

16 MR. CUBIT: Jack, might not you have taken  
17 some townships along the Nebraska border to go with  
18 Doniphan County and then you would have had a more  
19 contiguous district, using part of Nemaha and Brown?

20 MR. EULER: That possibility exists. As  
21 Mr. Geiger said, he has got 15 maps, I suppose I have  
22 drawn 10 or 20 of them.

23 CHAIRMAN MEEK: I would like to ask Doc  
24 Geiger now.

25 MR. GEIGER: Mr. Chairman, I only have



1 one copy. This one is really hot off the press here.  
2 Merely to answer someone's question, that leaves three  
3 counties intact. It leaves Atchison with a clear cut  
4 district. Other than that, why--

5 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Can you have some of those  
6 run off?

7 MR. GEIGER: Just as quick as I can get  
8 it done.

9 MR. VAN CLEAVE: That is a different plan  
10 than what we have here?

11 MR. GEIGER: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN MEEK: I am wondering about  
13 having a meeting in the morning at 9:00 o'clock. Would  
14 there be any objection? We want to whip this thing up  
15 in shape as fast as we can without any particular abuse.  
16 I would like to appoint a committee or two. One of them  
17 is to consider that area that we had this hearing on,  
18 Republic, Jewell, Mitchell, Osborne area out there where  
19 the hearing was, the Lervold-Penner area. With your  
20 permission, I would like to appoint Mr. Charlie Heath,  
21 Chairman, Mr. Rogg and Mr. John Golden as a subcommittee  
22 to bring us in--if they think they can bring an alternate  
23 plan in the morning, bring it. If they can't, tell us  
24 why.

25 MR. HEATH: That is Republic, Jewell,

1 Ottawa--

2 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mitchell and Smith.

3 MR. TURNER: Are you asking for recommen-  
4 dations from the subcommittee or do you just want the maps?

5 CHAIRMAN MEEK: If they can come up with  
6 a recommendation, either recommend or tell us why they  
7 can't recommend any change.

8 MR. GOLDEN: I would like to hear Mr.  
9 Jack Turner. I think he has a statement.

10 MR. TURNER: I was just thinking, that  
11 is kind of putting them in the oven. Maybe if they just  
12 collect the maps--I don't know how they feel about it.

13 CHAIRMAN MEEK: We promised these people  
14 we would try to work out something and we would give them  
15 some consideration.

16 MR. VAN CLEAVE: They are working on it,  
17 Jack. I saw them in the other room here. I don't know  
18 what they have come up with.

19 CHAIRMAN MEEK: That is in that room off  
20 the Claims and Accounts room?

21 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Don, do you want to talk  
23 about Butler County?

24 MR. CUBIT: We have settled that one.

25 MR. JOSEPH: We have settled that one.

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

MR. DEMPSEY: Mr. Chairman, you have the maps that Mr. Euler gave you that you can look on and see. As the population figures show for Jefferson County, I believe they have eleven thousand some hundred. They need approximately 11,212. So they need around 6,000 more in population in order to have a representative. Leavenworth has 40,500 and some, so we are going to have to give up approximately 5,000 population to some area. Mr. Bower and Mr. Vogel and I had previously discussed these three counties. Since Douglas County has to give up part of their population, they had an area in the northwest part of approximately 800 that Mr. Bower and Mr. Vogel had agreed should go to Jefferson County. So in order to be halfway consistent, we decided that the whole tier of townships on the western part of Leavenworth County, which comprises approximately 4,000-- between 500 and 800, I believe, I don't know just exactly for sure, I don't have my figures here, but something over 4,500, could be taken with a line straight from the north end of the county down to Eudora to the river and that that would be added to Jefferson County. That would put the City of Tonganoxie which this map over here does not put in it. It also would put in the rest of Leavenworth County, Sherman Township, which has approximately 900 population. It would give Mr. Bower in his district about

1 500 more people, which his district really needs in order  
2 to be in line with the rest of the area. Then the rest  
3 of Leavenworth County could be divided with part of the  
4 City of Leavenworth added to the rest of the rural area.  
5 It would leave a real straight line as boundaries are  
6 concerned. It would leave the similarity of interest and  
7 it wouldn't throw this township over in the other county  
8 which comes back up in a neck on the north part of Leaven-  
9 worth County. Now, who drew this map I don't know, but  
10 I will assure you I have not entered into any of this  
11 in regard to any political favoritism for anybody. I  
12 have never discussed any of this with my county chair-  
13 man in the Democrat Party and I don't intend to, but I  
14 do think that we should draw lines with honesty and with  
15 common sense and if we can keep straight lines and put  
16 the population where it belongs, I think that is what  
17 we should do. Now, I don't know what wards, what precincts  
18 they have taken out of the City of Leavenworth to draw  
19 this map. I am going to contact Dr. Beasley to see which  
20 one has been taken out of the city for this map here.

21 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Apparently the city is  
22 too big.

23 MR. DEMPSEY: It is, twenty-six thousand  
24 some hundred.

25 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Have you contacted John

1 Vogel?

2 MR. DEMPSEY: Yes, with their approval  
3 that I have explained to you now.

4 MR. VAN CLEAVE: This meets with their  
5 approval?

6 MR. DEMPSEY: This meets with their  
7 approval. It is a plan we had formulated with the three  
8 of us discussing it and we thought the map was probably  
9 drawn on that basis, and then we come up and see the  
10 City of Tonganoxie taken from the Township of Tonganoxie  
11 and put in the other area. What the reason was I don't  
12 know. But I am going to check with the precincts to  
13 see where we can divide the rest of the area in the most--

14 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Any of Tonganoxie in  
15 Stranger Township?

16 MR. DEMPSEY: It is all in Tonganoxie  
17 Township.

18 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Comes right against the  
19 line there looks like.

20 MR. DEMPSEY: It does. But it is all  
21 in Tonganoxie Township.

22 MR. SLOCOMBE: How many did you say in  
23 this tier of townships?

24 MR. DEMPSEY: 4,500 and something. I  
25 had the figures down at my desk but I don't have them

1 here.

2 MR. FINNEY: Was Lecompton Township sup-  
3 posed to go with Jefferson, too, out of Douglas?

4 MR. DEMPSEY: Yes.

5 MR. CUBIT: We have already taken two  
6 townships from Douglas--Lecompton and Kanwaka.

7 MR. DEMPSEY: Isn't that about 800 voters?

8 MR. CUBIT: Yes approximately that.

9 MR. DEMPSEY: I just don't think it  
10 shows good judgment on our part to take the City of  
11 Tonganoxie out of Tonganoxie Township and then to sub-  
12 stitute an area like Sherman Township which goes clear  
13 on over east and forms a boot for the area added to  
14 Jefferson County.

15 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Mr. Van Cleave.

16 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Ambrose, I ask you  
17 another question now. Here is what you are taking out of  
18 Leavenworth County and putting with Jefferson County; is  
19 that correct? Tonganoxie--

20 MR. DEMPSEY: From right here clear down  
21 to there (indicating).

22 MR. VAN CLEAVE: I see. That is how  
23 many?

24 MR. DEMPSEY: Around 4,500, I don't know  
25 just exactly how many.

1 MR. VAN CLEAVE: I mean how many additional  
2 are you putting in under your proposal to what is already  
3 in the territory?

4 MR. DEMPSEY: I think approximately 500.

5 MR. VAN CLEAVE: That does not take in  
6 Sherman County?

7 MR. DEMPSEY: That is right. It does not  
8 take in Sherman County.

9 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Additionally, you are  
10 proposing Tonganoxie?

11 MR. DEMPSEY: City of Tonganoxie.

12 MR. VAN CLEAVE: What about Reno Township?

13 MR. DEMPSEY: All four, the whole tier  
14 of counties on the western border.

15 MR. VAN CLEAVE: I am trying to find out  
16 just what change you are proposing.

17 (Thereupon general discussion was had off  
18 the record.)

19 (Exhibits 5, 6 and 7 were marked by the  
20 reporter for identification.)

21 MR. VAN CLEAVE: As I understand, Mr.  
22 Dempsey, and speaking from Exhibit 6, the change that you  
23 are proposing in Exhibit A is to put the City of Tonga-  
24 noxie into the district that has Jefferson County; is  
25 that right?

1 MR. DEMPSEY: That is right.

2 MR. VAN CLEAVE: And that is the only  
3 change?

4 MR. DEMPSEY: Remove from that, from the  
5 proposed map, Exhibit A, Sherman Township, which would go  
6 back to Leavenworth.

7 MR. VAN CLEAVE: And there would be a  
8 total change of population of--

9 MR. DEMPSEY: Approximately 700.

10 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Approximately 700?

11 MR. DEMPSEY: In the vicinity.

12 MR. BUNTEN: Mr. Chairman, I am getting  
13 a little confused here. You are talking about something  
14 that I don't have a map on.

15 MR. VAN CLEAVE: Do you have Map No. 1  
16 which has been marked Exhibit 6 by the reporter?

17 MR. BUNTEN: That doesn't concern his--  
18 (Thereupon general discussion was had off  
19 the record.)

20 CHAIRMAN MEEK: Is it all right if I  
21 appoint a subcommittee on this one and report back at  
22 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning? If it is agreeable, Mr.  
23 Slocombe, Mr. Finney, Mr. Dempsey. Gentlemen, I think  
24 we have about exhausted these several areas right now.

25 MR. HOWARD: That wasn't on the Leavenworth



1 area?

2 CHAIRMAN MEEK: That is on the Leavenworth  
3 area.

4 MR. CUBIT: Were we going to hear Doc  
5 Geiger on this?

6 CHAIRMAN MEEK: We have his map.

7 MR. GEIGER: Mr. Chairman, actually I  
8 don't have any report to make on that particular map. The  
9 lines are there and possibly there could be a change or  
10 two suggested, such as over here on the Nemaha-Marshall  
11 County line, the Township of Home could be put in with  
12 Jackson County and it would increase them up to about  
13 16,600 and take off that many off of the Marshall County  
14 map because I believe it was suggested something about  
15 there was a few people down here below that might be  
16 brought in up there, but there is two or three--for  
17 instance, over in the southwest corner of Brown County over  
18 there, the Township of Powhattan could be moved west and  
19 the two up in the northeast corner of Brown County,  
20 Padonia and Irving, which are about equal in population,  
21 could be moved east. There are some minor changes there  
22 but it would not change the overall picture. I don't  
23 know, I just kind of like the looks of it. I am kind of  
24 against it because it is cutting Brown County half in two  
25 but it the best one I have seen. I mean, it looks more

1           like a--

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

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

9   \* \* \*

10

11   FEBRUARY 23, 1966

12

13                           CHAIRMAN MEEK: I think we will call  
14 the meeting to order. We need a subcommittee to be work-  
15 ing on that area yesterday, Republic, Cloud and Washington  
16 and bring in a report just as soon as they can and report  
17 back to this committee. This is the time table this  
18 morning, as far as I know. We will meet now and recess  
19 at 10:00 o'clock and reconvene at maybe 10:30 and work  
20 until noon and we will see how far along we are at that  
21 time. But I would like to appoint on this subcommittee  
22 Mr. Boyd, Mr. Crow and Mr. Turner and in a few minutes or  
23 anytime they can go over in some other room and work out  
24 that district, if they will. We don't have anything of  
25 a general nature to come before here ready for adoption