This press release is from the collections at the Robert J. Dole Archive and Special Collections, University of Kansas. Please contact us with any questions or comments: http://dolearchive.ku.edu/ask

BOB DOLE

244 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING CAPITOL 4-3121, EXT. 2715 COMMITTEE: AGRICULTURE DISTRICT OFFICE: 210 FEDERAL BUILDING

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

COUNTIES:		
BARBER	HODG EMAN	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

Saturday, June 27, 1964

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Congressman Bob Dole (R-Kansas) introduced a resolution Monday, June 29, proposing a constitutional amendment which would permit states with Bicameral Legislatures to apportion one house on factors other than population. This would offset the Supreme Court decision of June 15, that representation in both houses of state legislatures must be based on population.

Congressman Dole declared: "If this Supreme Court decision is permitted to stand, the State of Kansas will be completely dominated from this day forward by urban areas. Rural areas will be virtually powerless. Balanced representation is important to protect the interests of both rural and urban areas however, if both Houses of our State Legislature are to be constituted solely on the basis of population such balance will be impossible. A requirement that both houses be apportioned strictly on population alone would amount to a desertion of the rights of the minority and an abandonment of the unique needs of the individual citizen."

Dole stated: "It has appeared to a rapidly increasing number of thoughful citizens that the Supreme Court has begun in recent years to exceed its proper authority and usurp powers which long have been held to belong to the States, or to other branches of the Federal government. Without doubt, these most immediate decisions of the Court proceed the farthest along this wayward path and do the most harm to the long time concept of States' Rights."

"It is correct to say," Dole said, "as the Supreme Court does, that legislators represent people, not trees or acres, but people who reside in States are not mere numbers. They are people with dissimilar and sometimes conflicting needs, with conflicting hopes and aspirations, with ever changing problems that sometimes fail to yield to computer logic. Through the wisdom of the people themselves, as represented by the elected leaders of Sovereign States, they may well decide that there is a need for representation of particular interests in one body of a legislature in contrast to the representation of general interests in the other body."

Congressman Dole's resolution contains this provision: "Nothing in the Constitution of the United States shall prohibit a State having a Bicameral Legislature, from This press release is from the collections at the Robert J. Dole Archive and Special Collections, University of Kansas. Please contact us with any questions or comments. http://dolearchive.ku.edu/ast

apportioning the membership of one house of its legislature on factors other than population. "

Dole concluded, "The Supreme Court calls for apportionment on the theory of 'one man, one vote.' A slogan, of course, cannot be a proper substitute for logic and in all likelihood it will not, for long guard individual rights. Apportionment according to population must be tempered by other considerations of equal importance, including geography. With regretable frequency, in recent years the Court seems to be assuming the role of elected officials and taking up the mace of the law makers. By such unwarranted action the Supreme Court invites increasing public distrust and rebuke. Abraham Lincoln once said:

'The candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal' ".

-30-