

BOB DOLE
1ST DISTRICT, KANSAS
244 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
CAPITOL 4-3121, EXT. 2715
COMMITTEE:
AGRICULTURE
DISTRICT OFFICE:
210 FEDERAL BUILDING
MUTCHINSON, KANSAS 67501

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

COUNTIES:		
BARBER	HODGEMAN	RAWLINS
BARTON	JEWELL	RENO
CHEYENNE	KEARNY	REPUBLIC
CLARK	KINGMAN	RICE
CLOUD	KIOWA	ROOKS
COMANCHE	LANE	RUSH
DECATUR	LINCOLN	RUSSELL
EDWARDS	LOGAN	SALINE
ELLIS	MEADE	SCOTT
ELLSWORTH	MITCHELL	SEWARD
FINNEY	MORTON	SHERIDAN
FORD	NESS	SHERMAN
GOVE	NORTON	SMITH
GRAHAM	OSBORNE	STAFFORD
GRANT	OTTAWA	STANTON
GRAY	PAWNEE	STEVENS
GREELEY	PHILLIPS	THOMAS
HAMILTON	PRATT	TREGO
HARPER		WALLACE
HASKELL		WICHITA

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
August 30, 1965

Congressman Bob Dole (R-Kan) made the following statement on the House floor today concerning "home rule" and legislative reapportionment. The statement is as follows:

"There appears to be a double standard in the definition which some members apply to the term "home rule".

I refer to the inconsistency of many now urging extraordinary legislative procedure to enact so-called "home rule" for residents of the District of Columbia, while at the same time ignoring the fundamental right to self-government of the people of the 50 states.

Last week the White House sought to coerce the House regarding "home rule" for the District. Just yesterday on the TV program "FACE THE NATION" Martin Luther King inferred it might be District Rule or District Riots. Strangely, however, this Administration remains indifferent to the many pending proposals for a Constitutional amendment which would preserve for the people of the various states the right to determine the structure of their own legislatures.

This right, so historically basic to the process of representative government in this country, was destroyed by the United States Supreme Court's "one-man, one-vote" decree of June 15, 1964.

Much like the slogan "home rule", the slogan "one-man, one-vote" is misleading. Confronted by the action of the judicial branch and the inaction of the executive, it remains for the Congress, despite the reluctance of the powers that be on the House Judiciary Committee, to protect not slogans, but the substance of representative government. If the Members of this body are expected to respond to the clamor of those calling for self-government in the District of Columbia, then let these "home rule" advocates also recognize the right of our sovereign states to apportion their legislatures. Many of us strongly believe in local self-government, but how can we close our eyes to one problem and, at the same time, embrace another?

The President last week in an ill-advised statement declared that time is running out and "the clock is ticking" regarding demands for District "home rule". This sense of urgency regarding "home rule" would have more appeal if the President also took cognizance of the need for immediate action to preserve the right of legislative self-determination in the several states. Can it be said that the interest of "home rule" supporters apparently stops at the boundaries of the District of Columbia?

I respectfully urge the proponents of "home rule" and all others who are truly interested in the principles of representative government to rally to the support of a Constitutional amendment which would permit states upon approval by a majority of voters to apportion one house of a bicameral legislature on factors other than population.