

URBAN REPRESENTATION AND THE OKLAHOMA  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:  
THE IMPACT OF REAPPORTIONMENT  
ON LEGISLATIVE POLICYMAKING

By

JEFFERY WILLIAM SPELMAN

//

Bachelor of Arts

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1967

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS  
May, 1971

OKLAHOMA  
STATE UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY  
DEC 31 1971

URBAN REPRESENTATION AND THE OKLAHOMA  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:  
THE IMPACT OF REAPPORTIONMENT  
ON LEGISLATIVE POLICYMAKING

Thesis Approved:

*Bertil L. Hanson*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Philip A. H. Rich*

*D. Durbin*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

803742

## PREFACE

This thesis concerns the impact which reapportionment had upon the performance of the Oklahoma House of Representatives. In the research, the House was carefully examined before and after reapportionment in regard to specific structural aspects (leadership, committee system, and coalitions) and certain policymaking decisions. Since the most obvious effect of reapportionment was a marked increase in the number of legislative seats allocated to the state's urban areas, the issue of urban representation was a primary focal point in the research.

The thesis concludes that reapportionment did not modify the performance of the House and that an understanding of the legislative policymaking process involves much more than a simplistic comparison of urban-rural voting strength.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to several people whose assistance was instrumental in the completion of this thesis:

Dr. Bertil Hanson, who carefully read the preliminary drafts of the thesis and provided thoughtful, diplomatic suggestions on the direction and scope of the work; Dr. Clifford A. L. Rich, who helped provide the financial assistance necessary for the completion of my graduate degree and took an interest in my study at Oklahoma State University; Dr.

Guy R. Donnell, who helped prepare my background in Oklahoma state government and politics necessary for writing this thesis; Dr. Raymond Habiby, for his personal interest and help in developing scholarly patterns of thought; and Dr. Harold V. Sare, for encouraging me as an undergraduate to undertake graduate work in political science.

In addition, I would like to thank Ruth Smith and Amelia Wettengel for their highly professional and efficient assistance in the final preparation of this thesis.

Finally, I express my gratitude to the person whose encouragement was essential in the preparation of this thesis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM . . . . .	4
III. HOW THE RURALS RULED: THE HOUSE BEFORE REAPPORTIONMENT . . . . .	23
Pre-reapportionment policymaking . . . . .	31
IV. REAPPORTIONMENT IN OKLAHOMA'S HOUSE . . . . .	42
V. THE HOUSE THAT REAPPORTIONMENT BUILT . . . . .	48
Post-reapportionment policymaking . . . . .	54
VI. CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	78
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	84
APPENDIX . . . . .	86

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Rural v. Urban Committee Chairmanships in Pre-reapportionment House, 1963 . . . . .	87
II. Rural-Urban Membership of Most Important House Committees, 1963 . . . . .	88
III. Rural-Urban Comparison: Tax Dollars Collected v. Tax Dollars Returned . . . . .	89
IV. The Impact of Reapportionment on the Oklahoma House of Representatives: Rural v. Urban Constituencies Before and After the Reapportionment 1963-1969 . . . . .	90
V. Reapportionment and the Oklahoma House of Representatives: A Before and After Comparison of Legislator's Background Qualifications . . . . .	91
VI. Reapportionment and Legislators' Qualifications: A Comparison of Urban Qualifications with House Sessions as a Whole Before and After Reapportionment, Twenty-Ninth and Thirty-Second Sessions . . . . .	92
VII. Composition of House Committees . . . . .	93
VIII. Roll Call Vote on H. B. 1271 . . . . .	94

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

When the Oklahoma Legislature was required to reapportion by a three-judge Federal District Court in 1964, the decision was greeted with enthusiasm by many Oklahomans. This was because the state's apportionment plan since statehood had underrepresented urban and suburban citizens through gerrymandering, disregard of constitutional requirements for reapportionment, or a combination of the two. Reapportionment, it was felt, could remove the obstacle of urban underrepresentation in the Legislature. Policymaking by the Legislature would then change and result in legislation more in sympathy with the state's urban areas.

Since that time, the effects of reapportionment upon the output of the Legislature have become an area ripe for investigation rather than speculation. The purpose of this study, then, is to examine the Oklahoma House of Representatives before and after reapportionment. In this investigation, the primary focus will be on the urban areas of the state, and the degree of effective representation these areas have or have not received before and after reapportionment. In assessing the quality of representation received by these areas, concentration will be given the body's output

in regard to issues important to urban areas as well as the structural aspects of the house affected by reapportionment--committees, leadership, chairmanships, and coalitions.

Answers to the following questions will be provided in as complete a manner as our research will permit:

Did reapportionment actually alleviate urban underrepresentation in Oklahoma?

What factors explain the success or failure of reapportionment in alleviating urban underrepresentation?

Were previous generalizations in professional literature concerning urban-rural conflict valid?

To answer these questions, this study will use as its major hypothesis: Reapportionment of the Oklahoma State Legislature was accompanied by a change in the nature of the Legislature's performance in regard to policymaking.

The basic source of information used in this thesis to verify or disprove the major hypothesis has been material gathered from interviews with members of the Oklahoma House of Representatives and lobbyists working with the Oklahoma Legislature. This data was also supplemented with material from the House Journal.

In the presentation of this material, the thesis is divided into four chapters. Chapter I is the introduction and Chapter II deals with the basic background material necessary to an understanding of the problem of urban underrepresentation in Oklahoma politics. Chapter III discusses the years of pro-rural dominance in the pre-reapportionment



sessions of the House. Chapter IV describes the immediate effects of reapportionment upon the composition of the House, and this is followed by a discussion of the characteristics of the post-reapportionment House. A final section, Chapter V, is devoted to the presentation of the findings, conclusions, and implications of the study.

## CHAPTER II

### BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

After the Warren Court's landmark reapportionment cases were decided, much popular attention and interest were generated regarding the problem of urban representation in state legislatures. For much of the general public, this attention was a new awareness, a reflection of predictions and speculations voiced by national or state magazines and newspapers. Terms like rural-urban split, the rural "old guard," or urban power shift acquired some currency among politically interested sections of the population.

However, the problem of urban underrepresentation was certainly not new, particularly in Oklahoma. To the contrary, urban underrepresentation had existed since statehood, condoned by the State Constitution, the Legislature, and the State Courts. In fact, several attempts to change or modify this underrepresentation through equitable apportionment plans had been defeated. Urban frustration, suddenly so apparent, was no new story in the state but more nearly the norm.

To place the problem of urban underrepresentation in proper perspective, discussion will begin with the Oklahoma constitutional convention. The convention's delegates showed a definite preference for the rural citizen. Speeches to the

assembly, particularly, extolled the beauty and essential goodness of the rural, frontier life. The delegates felt that most good qualities--self-reliance, industry, and deep religious conviction--were most often found in the hearts of those close to the land.<sup>1</sup>

This preference showed itself quite clearly in the document. They wrote an apportionment formula that contained certain biases against the more populous counties.

Mechanically, the formula was implemented by arriving at what the Constitution termed a "ratio of representation," a figure obtained by dividing the state's population by 100. Counties with one-half the ratio were allocated one representative; those in excess of this ratio were authorized two representatives. Counties with population in excess of one-and-three-fourths of the "ratio of representation" had to acquire "an entire ratio for each additional representative; PROVIDED THAT NO COUNTY SHALL EVER TAKE PART IN THE ELECTION OF MORE THAN SEVEN REPRESENTATIVES."<sup>2</sup>

The constitutional formula that the convention produced resembled the economic law of diminishing returns. Population increases above a certain level received no proportional increases in representation. From the standpoint of strength of representation in terms of numbers of legislators

---

<sup>1</sup>W. H. Murray, Journal of the Constitutional Convention of Oklahoma (Muskogee, 1935), p. 18.

<sup>2</sup>Constitution of the State of Oklahoma (St. Paul, 1968), Article 10, Section 10, pp. 12-13.

this definitely discriminated against those counties with larger populations.

But it was in regard to the representation of a possible city or a very heavily populated county that the pro-rural bias was most crippling in regard to equitable representation. By establishing a limit of seven representatives per county, the formula practically eliminated the possibility of future urban control of the Legislature. Further, the "limit of seven" provision also guaranteed that no matter how much a city of the future grew, smaller counties would be protected.

In addition to the advantages mentioned above, rural control was also enhanced by the use of so-called "floats." This was an arrangement whereby counties whose population exceeded the "ratio of representation" by a certain fraction could elect additional representatives during the decennial period. The floterial system operated in a manner suggested by this example:

If County X has a population of 27,000, such population exceeds the representation ratio by 4,666 (this is under the 1950 ratio). This remainder, as provided for in the Constitution, is multiplied by five, since there are five sessions in the decennial period. This result is 23,330, or slightly in excess of, in this instance, one representation ratio. Therefore, during one of the five sessions, County X will elect two representatives.<sup>3</sup>

In practice, the fraction could be so large as to permit election of up to four representatives, with the decision as to the distribution of the floats in the five legislative

---

<sup>3</sup>H. V. Thornton, The Apportionment Problem in Oklahoma (Norman, Oklahoma, 1959), p. 8.

sessions left up to the Legislature itself. Since the addition of floats did not apply to those counties with seven representatives, it generally provided a bonus for rural or semirural areas.

But the advantage given the rural areas can be exaggerated. Article V, Section 10 did provide that when a smaller county which had previously elected a representative had less than one per cent of the state population, the county's representation would be reduced by combining the county with its adjoining neighbor to become one representative district.

One more thing should be added to this discussion that is of a relevance to urban underrepresentation. Despite the obvious advantages given to rural areas by the Constitution, history shows that the Constitution was seldom followed. In fact, according to a study on apportionment, adherence to the constitutional provisions for the House apportionment plan only occurred from 1911 to 1921.<sup>4</sup> The result has been that urban areas were given even less representation than the admittedly pro-rural Constitution would have given them. An example is comparison of the enforcement of the "ceiling of seven" provision with the provision on the reduction of representation. In the first instance, the "ceiling of seven" was followed as closely as if it were a "Holy Writ" because from statehood until reapportionment by court order in 1964 there was not one instance of a county electing more than seven representatives. On the other hand, the number of

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

times a small county had its representation reduced was extremely rare; after 1921, in fact, no reductions took place at all. In short, it can be said that, not only did the constitutional provisions on apportionment favor the rural areas, but the implementation of the Constitution further underrepresented, not only Tulsa and Oklahoma Counties, but other populous counties as well.

The influence of populism did not end with the convention. Oklahoma has remained a state with memories of the prairie past; much of even its most urban population grew up in rural areas. Continued respect for agrarian and ultimately populist ideals is probably one of the reasons why lawmakers were allowed to ignore the Constitution. It also can be cited as a factor in the failure of other attempts at changing underrepresentation through initiative or referendum in 1958 and 1962. Separated from the farm by less than a generation, the population was slow in developing cleavages of a rural-urban nature and thus contributed to urban underrepresentation despite population trends to the contrary.

Populism and the original Constitution do not completely explain underrepresentation of the urban areas. New apportionment laws were enacted several times and each time urban underrepresentation could have been at least partially alleviated. As it is, however, these enactments and the resulting legal action were illustrations of the unresponsiveness of the State Legislature to urban interests.

The first of these enactments was the apportionment law

of 1931. In this case, despite the fact that figures from the 1930 United States Census showed that eight counties were below one-half of the representation ratio and therefore legally required to be merged with an adjoining county, the 1931 law completely overlooked this constitutional provision.<sup>5</sup> All counties were assigned at least one representative regardless of their population. On the other hand, Tulsa and Oklahoma Counties were each allowed only the constitutional limit of seven. The implications of this law for urban representation are quite obviously pro-rural.

The next apportionment enactment ten years later was essentially a re-enactment of the 1931 law. Despite population gains during the decade by the two largest counties which were substantial compared with the growth of the rest of the state, the 1941 law did not reflect this population trend (Oklahoma County gained 5,789 and Tulsa County 2,371),<sup>6</sup> and as a result its passage served only to aggravate the inequities of the 1931 plan.

But the 1941 enactment was received less passively in some quarters, and the apportionment problem added another dimension. For the first time the apportionment plan was challenged and the struggle was carried into the judicial branch of state government. A well-known Tulsa newspaper

---

<sup>5</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1931 (St. Paul, 1931), p. 98.

<sup>6</sup>U. S. Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book 1966 (Washington, 1966), p. 781.

editor, Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, questioned the constitutionality of the apportionment act. The case, Jones v. Freeman (193 Okla. 554), was brought before the Oklahoma Supreme Court in 1943.

The Court in its decision held that it could take jurisdiction in such cases by virtue of the Oklahoma Constitution (Art. V., Sec. 10(j) ), but that the Court itself could not apportion the Legislature or even compel the Legislature to enact an apportionment plan. On the question of the validity of the 1941 act in regard to the State Constitution, the Court's decision called attention to the fact that the act failed to comply with the State Constitution and expressed its opinion that the existing plan was inequitable. Nevertheless, in the all-important matter of relief, the Court failed to take decisive action.

It concluded that the invalidation of the 1941 act would result in injustices greater than those prevailing since there would be no apportionment plan to replace it.<sup>7</sup>

The Oklahoma Supreme Court refused to enter the battle and on the state level legal efforts to remedy urban underrepresentation were blocked.

The Oklahoma Legislature made one more rather feeble attempt to reapportion before the 1960s. In 1951 another law was enacted as the results of the 1950 census were made available. In some respects, this law was an improvement for some of the more populous counties. Garfield (Enid,) Cleve-

---

<sup>7</sup>Thornton, Legislative Apportionment in Oklahoma (Norman Oklahoma, 1961), p. 45.



land (Norman), Comanche (Lawton), and Washington (Bartlesville) Counties, all of which had been slighted in the past, received more representation. The plan still fell far short, however, of any ideal of the "equal representation" principle the United States Supreme Court was later to dictate since the law only corrected a few disparities and created new ones. For the primary urban areas, Tulsa and Oklahoma City, the new legislation was no improvement since the limit of seven was retained. The "long and winding trail" to reapportionment, as the Daily Oklahoman's Jim Young had been fond of calling the problem, reached another dead end.<sup>8</sup>

Presumably from the pattern of the past it would seem that the 1951 law would have settled the question of apportionment until the next census in 1960. However, it should be noted here that the state political system had been undergoing many changes during the years of malapportionment and many of these changes became politically relevant in the decade of the 1950s. First, the state's population profile changed from rural to predominantly urban. This transformed urban underrepresentation from a minority problem into a problem directly affecting most of the state and served to accent the inequities of the apportionment plan in use at the time. Secondly, concurrent with population changes, support for reapportionment materialized to such an extent that political efforts were made to change the apportionment

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

plan through the Legislature and legal action, as well as Oklahoma's tools of direct democracy--initiative petition and legislative referendum. Because these attempts place the problem of urban underrepresentation in perspective, it will be necessary to discuss some of the efforts made to achieve reapportionment.

Without being too arbitrary in selecting a point in time, it might be well to start with the election of J. Howard Edmondson in November, 1958. Parenthetically, Edmondson was the youngest Governor Oklahoma had ever elected. He had risen very rapidly to statewide political power through his local reputation as a reformer, his handsome appearance, and some luck in the Democratic primary. Possibly because of his youth or lack of the usual apprenticeship in state politics, his spirit for reform was perhaps too brash for Oklahoma politics. Nevertheless, he was the first Governor to back reapportionment and use the power of the office to attempt to alleviate urban underrepresentation.

Shortly after his election, Edmondson announced that he would submit to the 1959 Legislature a constitutional amendment that would bring about reapportionment.<sup>9</sup> Edmondson's plan, essentially following the State Constitution but with provisions for a board to handle the matter of reapportionment, did clear the House committee in April of 1959, but the Oklahoma State Senate's committee presented its own

---

<sup>9</sup>The Daily Oklahoman, November 10, 1958, p. 16.

version of the bill. The latter piece of legislation also proposed a reapportionment of the House, but left the Senate apportionment plan completely untouched. Needless to say, the House killed this version of a reapportionment plan in June 1959, and the session ended with neither chamber taking effective action.<sup>10</sup>

Frustrated in these channels, Edmondson's next approach was the use of the initiative petition. Another of the legacies of the populist era, the initiative permits Oklahomans to amend the State Constitution or pass legislation directly. To do so, petition backers must receive the signatures of voters equal to a specific percentage of the votes cast in the state's last general election; if the petition is found to be valid, it shall be submitted to a vote of the people at the next general election or a special election if called by either the Governor or the Legislature. The Constitution also adds the stipulation that constitutional amendments must receive a majority of all the votes cast in the general election, but only a majority on the question if the vote is taken at a special election. These provisions, as is probably self-evident, make this method of amendment difficult. Since citizens generally vote for personalities and ignore proposed state questions, it is possible for a state question to receive the majority of those votes cast on the question, but to fail because of the "silent vote."

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., June 12, 1959, p. 38 and June 24, 1959, p. 1.

In addition to the legal difficulties inherent in conducting a petition drive, Edmondson and backers of the initiative also had to face a hornet's nest of opposition. The Oklahoma Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, the County Officers Association of Oklahoma, and numerous Republican party leaders were all opposed to the petition; even the reform-minded League of Women Voters disagreed with certain portions of the plan and was late in supporting the petition drive.<sup>11</sup> Even brief acquaintanceship with Oklahoma politics will testify to the political strength of some of the petition's opponents. Political success is rare in the state without the support of such important groups--Farm Bureau, Farmers Union or the "courthouse crowd" of locally elected officials of county government. In this respect, the petition faced an uphill fight.

Nevertheless, supporters of the petition launched a telephone campaign in March of 1960 to canvass voters for signatures in the Oklahoma City and Tulsa areas. In April, the Women's Committee for Representative Government was formed to help the drive.<sup>12</sup> Consisting mainly of women from the state's largest cities, the organization raised funds, canvassed voters and wrote news releases and pamphlets. Another source of support, the Daily Oklahoman, one of the state's major newspapers, added whatever influence it had by

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., March 18, 1960, p. 37.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., March 19, 1960, p. 13.

faithfully cranking out 11 editorials during the year of 1960 supporting the concept of equal representation via a change in the apportionment of the Legislature.<sup>13</sup>

In September 1960 the Governor's petition was voted on as State Question 397, an amendment to the Constitution. Briefly, the amendment would have created a Legislative Apportionment Commission made up of the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, and the State Treasurer; this group would have been responsible for reapportionment following each decennial census. As for allocation of seats, the "ceiling of seven" was replaced with a plan that permitted seats beyond seven but it made a small concession to rural areas by requiring increased increments of population for extra representatives when the seventh and tenth seats were reached.

Despite the obvious concession to the rural areas of requiring more population per seat beyond the level of seven, the measure faced the aroused opposition of the rural areas and, even more critically, the expected strong support of the large city and semi-urban areas simply did not materialize. Garfield, Kay, and Muskogee Counties, for instance, despite their urban character, rejected the state question. Even in the largest counties, which had the most to gain, the vote gave reapportionment only a slight edge.

In conclusion, it can be stated that sharing the ballot

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., September 14, 1960, p. 18., September 15, 1960, p. 20, September 18, 1960, p. A-1, September 19, 1960, p. 18, and September 20, 1960, p. 14.

with reforms which were unpopular was highly damaging to the fortunes of the plan. As the final blow, the failure of the question to elicit urban support made the outcome inevitable.

The struggle was far from over. The opening days of the 1961 Legislature saw a renewal of the conflict over the conditions of malapportionment. Women of the Committee for Representative Government picketed the State Capitol on the session's opening days.<sup>14</sup> On another front, suit was filed in the Oklahoma State Supreme Court to block the spending of all state funds on the grounds that the appropriations of the Legislature were unconstitutional since the body was malapportioned.<sup>15</sup> The case was dismissed by the Court as a political move, but it illustrated the issue of reapportionment was certainly not dead.

Partially as a result of some of the increased pressure that was being brought to bear on the Legislature, the next focus of the reapportionment battle was the referendum of September 21, 1961, the result of H. J. R. 527. Voted on as State Question 407, the referendum was the first such proposal to come out of the Legislature in the state's history. Nevertheless, in regard to urban representation the referendum was still not satisfactory since the plan retained the top limit of seven in the House apportionment scheme.

---

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., January 26, 1961, p. 13, February 6, 1961, p. 6, and January 4, 1961, p. 5.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., April 3, 1960, p. E 7.

This referendum came out of a session of the House of Representatives that was an excellent example of the complexity of the legislative process. Proponents of reapportionment began with a direct effort; Representative Howze and Representative Wilhelm introduced H. B. 778 and 780, respectively, both providing for the reapportionment of the House. Differing only in detail, the two plans would have forced the House to follow the state constitutional provision precisely in regard to the "limit of seven," the flatorial system, and the reduction of representation. As written, either of the two bills would have improved the numerical representation of every urban area in the state with the exception of those counties under the "limit of seven." This situation, however, was not to be; H. B. 778 died in the Reapportionment Committee and H. B. 780 was reported back favorably from this committee but was killed by a "do not pass" recommendation by the Committee of the Whole.

Second efforts centered on H. J. R. 527, a referendum proposal. Resistance to this proposal was lower perhaps than to a direct approach since the people had previously rejected State Question 397. On the other hand, H. J. R. 527 did remove the "limit of seven" provision that had limited the representation of Tulsa and Oklahoma Counties for a number of years. To meet the threat of unlimited representation for Tulsa and Oklahoma Counties, rural representatives helped push H. B. 1033 through the House. This was a direct reapportionment, but from the rural perspective it was pref-

erable to H. J. R. 527 since it retained the limit of seven legislators per county and endorsed the practice of the 1931, 1941, and 1951 acts by making it easier to qualify for the second and third seats. The final result of the almost confusing twists and turns performed by the Legislature was that both H. B. 1033 and H. J. R. 527 were passed. Despite the seeming contradiction, the effort was tactically sound for rural representation. H. B. 1033 went into effect immediately and H. J. R. 527 was slated to be voted on as State Question 408. Since the next election was in November, H. B. 1033 was the basis for the 1962 primary and general elections until the state question could be voted on. In this manner even if the people passed the referendum, reapportionment was delayed for at least one more session of the Legislature. As events proved, however, the tactic was almost unnecessary since the referendum failed and H. B. 1033 became the unchallenged apportionment plan for the state.<sup>16</sup>

At the same time that the Legislature was struggling with the problem, legal proceedings in federal courts were also occurring. Ultimately, these legal steps were of greater importance than the work of the House. The proceedings stemmed from a suit filed by George Moss, an unemployed Oklahoma City citizen, to have an injunction issued to stop the scheduled May primary elections on the grounds that, given legislative malapportionment, the elections were a denial of

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., May 12, 1961, p. 15, May 31, 1961, p. 15, June 20, 1961, p. 9 and July 30, 1961, p. A-4.



equal protection of the laws. In April 1961, Judge Rizley held the suit in abeyance until the United States Supreme Court ruled on Baker v. Carr.<sup>17</sup> When the Federal District Court heard the Moss case in July 1962, it acted under the new rule of Baker. This changed the legal standing of such proceedings immensely. First, after Baker malapportionment was justiciable and, secondly, the courts could grant legal relief from malapportionment. In hearing the Moss case, the three-judge Court rather cautiously indicated that it would not grant immediate or temporary relief and would reapportion the Legislature only as a last resort, preferring to let either the 1963 session of the Oklahoma Legislature or State Question 408 complete the job.<sup>18</sup>

But the Court did establish certain guidelines. In regard to population, the Court did not necessarily state that exactly equal population standards for districts must be followed, but that any differences would have to be justified by relevant countervailing factors . . . . But none of these factors, whether considered separately or collectively, can overcome the basic principle underlying the right of an individual to cast an effective vote.<sup>19</sup>

Of extreme importance to our consideration of urban representation is the fact that the seven-member ceiling was held invidiously discriminatory and should be disregarded in

---

<sup>17</sup>Robert McKay, Reapportionment: The Laws and Politics of Reapportionment (New York, 1965, p. 405.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 406.

<sup>19</sup>Moss v. Burkhardt 220 F. Supp. 149.

future apportionment plans. The Court retained jurisdiction until March thus leaving the legislative session free to act but subject to judicial scrutiny.

With the defeat of State Question 408 in November because of an adverse "silent vote," the 1963 session was forced to face the problem. Its failure to enact a reapportionment plan that was acceptable to the Court showed the struggle that any state legislature faces in attempting to reapportion itself.

The legislative struggle as distinct from the court battle began on January 9 with the work of the House Committee on Reapportionment, an eleven-man committee with Representative Howze as chairman. Howze, a long-time reapportionment backer, made some attempt to follow a plan called "Model C," a reapportionment plan prepared by George Mauer and Dr. Joseph Pray of the University of Oklahoma. Called "Model C" in court hearings, the plan was presumably acceptable to the Federal Court under the guidelines of Baker v. Carr, and eliminated the limit of seven representatives for Tulsa and Oklahoma Counties. The plan received a committee "do-pass" recommendation and it was presented to the House.<sup>20</sup>

Due to the highly controversial nature of reapportionment, the usual strong leadership of J. D. McCarty was absent. This was because McCarty took no positive role in the deliberations. The Speaker, instead, took the position that the

---

<sup>20</sup>Joseph Pray and George Mauer, New Perspectives on Legislative Reapportionment (Norman, 1962), pp. 39-40.

problem should be faced but the time spent should be limited. Excessive debate, he felt, would open splits in the House, cause ill feelings, and reduce the effectiveness of the House as a legislative body in the rest of the session.

The character of the final debate in the House, however, on February 8, 1963, suggested that McCarty had been unsuccessful in reducing intense feelings. Consideration of the measure was emotional and involved as sixteen proposed amendments were disposed of in a fierce floor fight. Passage with amendments was secured only after four and one-half hours of debate.<sup>21</sup>

Nevertheless, the Howze bill was not a solution. First, as amended it did not meet the Court's guidelines and therefore was open to legal challenge. Secondly, it did not correspond to the Senate plan and the eventual conference committee was unsuccessful in achieving a compromise. Finally, the plan it provided was conditional pending the outcome of S. J. R. 4, State Question 416, a reapportionment referendum. In reality, the Legislature, despite its efforts, failed to effectively solve the reapportionment problem.

The struggle returned to the Courts; in July 1963, the Legislature's apportionment plan was held unconstitutional under the Moss guidelines and the Federal District Court substituted its own plan for the 1964 elections. Then on May 26, 1964, voters approved the constitutional amendment

---

<sup>21</sup>The Daily Oklahoman, March 13, 1963, p. 1.

that the 1963 session had proposed as State Question 416 or S. J. R. 4. Taking the referendum into account, the Court examined the measure's constitutionality, and then used it as the basis for yet another Court plan for the final reapportionment for the 1964 elections.

This created a problem since primary elections had already been held in May 1964, several months previous. The Court's solution was to require Governor Bellmon to call special primary elections in the new districts of the Court's plan, and the 1964 general elections proceeded under the Court's new plan.<sup>22</sup>

The Court-imposed plan basically provided for a Senate of 48 members elected from 33 legislative districts and a House of 99 members elected from 37 districts. Multi-county districts and multimember districts in populous counties were required to be divided into sub-districts.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Henrietta and Nelson Poynter, Representation and Apportionment, (Washington, 1966), p. 80.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

## CHAPTER III

### HOW THE RURALS RULED:

#### THE HOUSE BEFORE REAPPORTIONMENT

This chapter will describe some of the general characteristics of the pre-reapportionment sessions of the House of Representatives and show how these characteristics relate to urban underrepresentation in policymaking. Specific examples of legislation will illustrate how the urban areas were underrepresented in the important matters of state government--shares of state appropriations, taxation burdens, tax exemptions, etc.

Any discussion of a legislative body must begin with the group's leadership. For the Oklahoma House of Representatives when reapportionment occurred, leadership was centered around the office of the Speaker. From this office, the direction, pace, and content of much of the Legislature's actions were guided. For this reason, the nature of the office and the personalities who held the position will be important factors in our discussion of the pre-reapportionment Legislature.

The analysis of leadership provided by the Speaker over several sessions is a difficult task for numerous reasons. Not only is the time span involved rather long, but also no source material exists on the leadership techniques of past

Speakers. As a result, generalizations about the pre-reapportionment Speakership must be made cautiously.

Generally, however, in the twenty years before reapportionment, the real influence of the Speakership grew considerably, even though the formal powers of the office remained the same. First, the concept of the Speakership in these earlier sessions evolved into a more powerful role. One former Speaker summed up his concept of the job as

Leading the House to produce the best legislation for the people of the State of Oklahoma by being fair and being a good presiding officer.<sup>1</sup>

Despite the moral value of impartiality, the trait did not always provide strong leadership. Gradually in a manner that cannot be precisely indicated the role of the Speaker gained more prestige. One representative felt this occurred with the Speakership of Jim Nance in the Twenty-fourth Session and another felt that the change began to occur under B. E. Bill Harkey in the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Sessions. The second major reason for the change was the contrasting decline of the office of Majority Floor Leader. Actual leadership in the House once came from this position. Linked with the Governor's office, with its prestige and patronage rights, the Majority Floor Leader was in a position to play a powerful role in the House. But as leadership from the Governor's office became weaker (particularly

---

<sup>1</sup>Interview with Judge C. R. Board, January 1968.

in the cases of Edmondson, Bellmon, and Bartlett who each faced much opposition in the Legislature) coordination was no longer so important, and the leadership that the House provided itself became paramount. In short, in the context of the House of Representatives for three or four sessions before reapportionment, the Speaker's office was synonymous with leadership in the House; the humble beginnings of the office had been forgotten.

In regard to the problem of urban representation, recruitment data shows that the office of Speaker was not totally rurally dominated. Oklahoma City Representatives--Harkey and McCarty--held the chair a total of four times in the period 1947-1963, and a Tulsa Representative held part of a term as Speaker in 1945. The rest of the period, however, the gavel was firmly in rural hands with Representatives from Boise City, Marietta, Purcell, Wewoka, and Tahlequah in the Speaker's office.

In regard to political and personal attitudes held by the Speaker towards urban problems, the leadership provided by the Speaker's office was dictated by the political environment of the period. That is, the Speaker was generally not so much anti-urban as he was pro-rural. Political realities more or less forced this attitude on anyone who was Speaker. Speakers can simply not give orders and expect them to be carried out in military-like fashion since the rural members in pure numbers dominated the pre-reapportionment sessions. (Twenty-ninth Session, Rural 65; Semi urban

27; Urban 14; Tulsa 7; Oklahoma City 7.)<sup>2</sup> Facing such numbers a man who wished to be Speaker, even if he was from an urban or large city district, had to operate under the condition of not threatening rural interests. J. D. McCarty's behavior illustrates this generalization.

Mr. McCarty, an almost legendary figure in Oklahoma politics, came to power in what were then rather unusual circumstances. His original success in winning the Speakership was partly attributable to the vacuum of leadership that existed at the time. Edmondson, the Governor, faced a legislature containing many political enemies. As a result, he was unable to name a man to his liking as Speaker. Because of this, McCarty, despite his urban background, was able through his appeal to the basically rural area of southeastern Oklahoma and his control of a small group of urban representatives to gather enough votes to win the Speakership. McCarty, then, was an urban representative elected by a combination of circumstances and the support of rural representatives. This fact had an impact on the nature of his leadership and the problem of urban representation.

Once in office, McCarty was able to exercise effective leadership for a variety of reasons. First, his leadership was based upon a highly respected expertise in state government and an extremely effective political personality. His method of gathering votes, as one description went, was to

---

<sup>2</sup>House Journal, House of Representatives, State of Oklahoma, Twenty-ninth Session, pp. 3-9.



explain why he felt a certain bill was worth a vote and then to request support. No orders were given in a direct manner and the emphasis was on a polite, low-key approach. This attitude was reputed to extend even to freshmen lawmakers, and on at least one occasion McCarty carefully counseled a freshman to vote against a measure because he felt it would hurt the lawmaker in his home district, even though the leadership needed the vote. Secondly, he used the Speakership's prerogatives very astutely. By manipulating the three important levers of committee appointments, chairmanship appointments, and committee referrals, McCarty was, as one contemporary put it, "the power structure; he played upon the House committees like an organist....because a committee chairmanship is such an expensive 'trade-out'."<sup>3</sup> Further, McCarty used the Rules Committee skillfully. In the Oklahoma House of Representatives, the Rules Committee is potentially a very important source of power for the Speaker. Ostensibly, a means of expediting the business of the House by setting rules of procedure for each session, controlling amendments, the amount of debate, and setting an agenda for House consideration, the committee became a powerful tool of leadership. Under McCarty this was particularly true. First, the control of the agenda, debate, and amendment was in actual practice a veto power. As one representative put it succinctly, "Control of Rules is control of the agenda; few powers on this green

---

<sup>3</sup>Interview with Representative Douglas Wixson, March, 1968.

earth could get a bill out if the Speaker didn't want it released."<sup>4</sup> McCarty's control of the Rules gave him "two wastebaskets (for bills he didn't want debated)--committee chairman and the Rules Committee."<sup>5</sup>

The Rules Committee also was a source of leadership by virtue of its composition. Like all legislative sessions, those before reapportionment involved seemingly thousands of details with numerous decisions about legislation made every day. In the face of this complicated state of affairs, McCarty used the Rules Committee as his "eyes and ears" since it basically was made up of committee chairmen and those men the Speaker considered leaders. This was an excellent source of information necessary for leadership, particularly near the end of the session when the committee frequently met daily. McCarty's personal charm and firmness were apparently tailor-made for such gatherings of the major decision-makers, and in this fashion the composition of the Rules Committee heightened McCarty's strength of leadership.

Finally, McCarty's power was enhanced by his careful control of House Conference Committees. His insistence on attendance, unity of the House in conference meetings, and his bargaining skill were highly important. (Some observers have said that the reason House attendance at all legislative meetings was better than Senate attendance reflected McCarty's

---

<sup>4</sup>Interview with Representative Red Andrews, March 1968.

<sup>5</sup>Interview with Representative Douglas Wixson, March 1968.

insistence on attendance.) This source of power is particularly crucial when it is realized that conference committee reports are not subject to amendment and they are often the truly vital battleground for the most important appropriations bills.

But McCarty's powers, strong as they might have been, were based upon the political realities of the pre-reapportionment sessions of the House. His initial advantage, it was felt, stemmed from the coalition he built from the 17 "welfare" or "little Dixie" counties and the Oklahoma City vote. These representatives, supposedly from the counties of McCurtain, LeFlore, Choctaw, Pushmataha, Latimer, Haskell, Sequoyah, Cherokee, Adair, Atoka, Bryan, Coal, Pittsburg, McIntosh, Johnston, Hughes, and Wagoner, provided him with fairly consistent support.<sup>6</sup> Whether or not such a group ever existed seems to be open to considerable debate; however, the statement that McCarty was not a totally free agent, that he was supported by essentially non urban legislators, and that this had implications for his leadership and urban representation seems quite valid. Rural support thus limited the assistance that the leadership could provide for urban interests if an issue broke down rural-urban lines or involved the allocation of the state's resources.

Also closely tied to a discussion of leadership in the preapportionment Legislature was the seniority system. As

---

<sup>6</sup>Interview with Representative William Poulos, March, 1968.

pointed out in the discussion of the Speaker's office, committee appointments and chairmanships appointments were prerogatives of the Speaker, but he rarely ignored seniority. In the last session before apportionment, for instance, the average length of service for committee chairmen was 8.7 years compared with 4.7 years for the total membership of the House.<sup>7</sup>

It is interesting to note certain patterns regarding committee appointments in the last session before reapportionment. Not only is there evidence to indicate a pro-rural slant in the number of representatives from rural areas who were appointed committee chairmen, but the appointments to the chairmanship of the most important committees in the House and those that dealt with matters of concern to the urban areas of the state were also largely of rural members. In the Twenty-ninth (1963) Session of the Legislature, a distinctive pattern emerged in regard to the rural-urban composition of the membership of the most important committees in the House. This is represented in Tables I and II reproduced in the Appendix.

Examination of Tables I and II shows several points. Namely, it indicates that this pre-reapportionment session not only was dominated numerically by rural and small town representatives, but that important structural aspects of the

---

<sup>7</sup>Who is Who in the Twenty-ninth Session of the Oklahoma Legislature, (Oklahoma City, 1963) and Who is Who in the Thirty-second Session of the Oklahoma Legislature, (Oklahoma City, 1967).

House were also pro-rural. Furthermore, since all committee appointments--chairmanships and memberships--were designated by the Speaker, it reinforces the idea that rural influence extended to the House leadership. Also, given the power that committee chairmen had then (and still have) over legislation before their committees, the structural make-up of the pre-reapportionment house indicates that rural dominance was quite considerable at all levels.

#### Policymaking

The question that could be fairly asked at this point is what were the policies of the pre-reapportionment legislature; were they actually pro-rural?

This is a difficult question given the tremendous number of policy decisions made in any legislative session. Furthermore, most policies enacted are not subject to any conflict, much less a rural or urban advantage. Many policies, instead, are matters that would pass almost any legislative body--licensing policies, resolutions of praise for Oklahomans who win national honors, queen contests, basketball championships, or routine changes in state laws or regulations. As Patterson found in his study on a pre-reapportionment session of the Oklahoma House of Representatives, only 127 roll call votes could be termed conflicting. (By Patterson's terms a conflicting roll call involved at least 10 per cent dissenting vote.)<sup>8</sup> Since our interest is in the

<sup>8</sup>Samuel C. Patterson, "Dimensions of Voting Behavior in a One-Party State Legislature," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 26, 1962, p. 186.

general policymaking of the pre-reapportionment sessions, we will not attempt to examine all roll calls or all areas of policy, especially since many of those policies are non-controversial. Instead, we are primarily interested in those critical, high-interest areas of state government--taxation, education, allocation of funds, etc. These areas, as suggested by interviews with representatives, will provide an answer to questions concerning pre-reapportionment policymaking.

The first of these areas is the issue of the state's tax structure, including the formulas under which taxes are collected, distributed, and exemptions provided for. Policies in this area are excellent examples that show the results of urban underrepresentation.

The specific example of the state's sales tax passed before reapportionment showed this quite clearly. First passed for its present use in the Eighteenth Session of the Legislature, the tax was the result of the Sales Tax Act of 1941, and it provided earmarked funds for the financing of the Oklahoma Social Security Program. Similar to other taxes in Oklahoma, all revenues from the tax were to be used for a specific purpose, in this case, the state welfare program.

As a result of this earmarking formula, the urban areas did not receive as much tax money as the rural areas. This was because the sales tax collections were consistently higher for urban areas; yet with earmarking the distribution

moved the funds to other parts of the state. Urban areas, in other words, supported welfare programs in other parts of the state as well as their own programs. Examination of the Oklahoma Tax Commission Reports for the years 1959-1960 showed that the urban areas, although the largest contributors received less money back per dollar collected than did less populous regions of the state.

It can be seen that the sales tax did not favor urban areas. The chart does not indicate any moral judgment on the rural counties (there could be many arguments for helping the smaller counties out); it does indicate that the effects of urban underrepresentation were apparent in the original formula for the distribution of the state sales tax which was written before reapportionment. [See Table III.]

A second point concerning urban underrepresentation relates to the exemptions granted to the sales tax. In the case of Oklahoma, the exemptions given can be used to support the viewpoint that the pre-reapportionment Legislature placed a high value on rural groups. The original act was balanced with exemptions for both rural and urban. Farm products, newspapers circulated by carriers, bus fares, manufacturing equipment, and goods and merchandise used for manufacturing or processing were all included in the list of exemptions. However, additional exemptions prescribed by the Twenty-sixth Legislature by S. B. 367 in 1959 were all farm related products--livestock feeds, agricultural foodstuffs, and even farm machinery trade-in allowances. From the standpoint of

urban areas, it seemed that the Legislature's exemptions were written into law with mainly the state's farmers and ranchers in mind.

Finally, adding insult to inequity, the sales tax was prohibited by S. B. 282, Twentieth Session, from usage by urban areas as a source of revenue. This bill permitted all those cities over 300,000 population to raise taxes for their own purposes but denied the use of an additional sales tax levy. Of course, with the population clause, Tulsa and Oklahoma City were obviously the target of the bill.

Also on the issue of taxation a discussion of ad valorem taxes is useful. By constitutional provision real property is to be assessed for taxation by a county assessor who estimates a "fair cash value at a fair, voluntary sale." The owner is then taxed on the basis of this estimate at the rate established by the voters of the county and school district; provided, he is not assessed at more than 35 per cent of the property's fair cash value.

As the system actually operates, there are differences in the amount of taxes paid in different areas of the state. This is because land and property sales are less common in rural areas and reassessment for re-sale is infrequent. As a result the assessments, which are the basis of the tax levy, have been considerably lower in the rural areas as a general rule. Since few rural politicians actively seek periodic reassessment, which would create resentment, rural area property owners pay less tax. In fact, some rural areas of the state



have not had a thorough reassessment since the 1930s in contrast to reasonably frequent reassessment in the urban areas of the state. The disparities of payment of this type of tax, thus, have become rather large. One legislator with whom this interviewer talked spoke of a housing development in south Tulsa County that was discovered to overlap the Creek County line. The ad valorem tax on the Tulsa side was \$28.50 and on the Creek County side it was \$2.00.<sup>9</sup>

The ad valorem tax system also adversely affects the interests of the urban citizen through the composition of the County Excise Board. This board has broad, discretionary powers over the apportionment of millages, tax roll corrections, and other matters vital to local governmental operations. However, no provision is made for municipalities to receive representation on the board. Its membership consists of one member appointed by the State Tax Commission, one by the District Judge, and one by the Board of County Commissioners. According to a study on the matter, urban areas have not received favorable treatment from this board.<sup>10</sup> Despite this, no legislative enactment or referendum measure changing ad valorem tax methods or establishing some form of representation for municipalities was passed during this period.

Another revealing problem in regard to tax collections

---

<sup>9</sup>Interview with Representative Charles Ford, March 1968.

<sup>10</sup>Study of the State Constitution, Part II, (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1967), pp. 67-68.

is the allocation of funds from the state's various gasoline taxes. As a major source of revenue on the state level, it is clear that rural control devised the formula for allocation of the tax and that rural control has maintained this policy. For our purposes it will be interesting to examine the formula briefly.

The original gasoline tax of 4¢ on the gallon was to be allocated as follows:

1. 3 per cent of collections to the Oklahoma Tax Commission . . . .
2. 5 per cent . . . to the treasurers of the various incorporated towns and cities of the state in the percentage which the population, as shown by the last Federal census, bears to the total population of all incorporated cities and towns in this state. Such funds shall be expended for the construction, repair, and maintenance of the streets and alleys of the incorporated cities and towns of this state . . . .
3. 22 per cent to the various counties as follows:
  - 40 per cent of the above sum shall be distributed to the various counties in that proportion which the county road mileage bears to the entire state. . . .
  - 60 per cent . . . shall be distributed to the various counties in that proportion which the population and area of each county bear to the total population and area of the entire state.<sup>11</sup>

Additional levies were allocated in an even more pro-rural manner. The next gasoline excise tax of 1.5 cents was to be allocated to the State Highway Special Fund, an account in the State Treasurer's office for use in matching federal money for farm-to-market roads and bridges. By legislative

---

<sup>11</sup>Oklahoma State Statutes, 1961, Title 68, Section 660a.

intent, the counties were to use the funds for the

construction of permanent bridges and culverts, located on school bus routes and mail routes and for the surfacing and re-surfacing of rural roads, consisting of school bus routes and mail routes.<sup>12</sup>

Regarding exemptions, rural groups were again favored.

The original gasoline excise tax provided exemptions for fuel used on farms or in the practice of agriculture. Later sessions added exemptions to the levy for district-owned school buses which was especially helpful for rural schools with extensive busing systems, Future Farmers of America and 4-H Club buses and trucks were also made exempt from the tax.

An additional example of pro-rural policymaking is provided by the method of allocating the excise tax revenue in the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of 1959. The following formula was used:

- (a) Two-thirds of 97 per cent of such tax . . . shall be paid to the State Treasurer and placed to the credit of the General Revenue Fund.
- (b) One-third of 97 per cent . . . is hereby allocated to the counties of this state and shall be paid to the county treasurers on the basis of area and population (giving equal weight to both) . . . all of said funds shall be appropriated by the county commissioners . . . to all incorporated cities and towns on the basis of population within each city and town in said county . . . For the purpose of appropriating and paying taxes collected under this Act . . . incorporated cities and towns, the corporate limits of which include territory within more than one county, shall be treated and considered as being a city or town in only the county within which 50 per cent of the population resides . . . .<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., Title 68, Section 660b.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., Title 37, Section 563.

One final example concerning the pro-rural nature of the tax structure created by the pre-reapportionment legislative sessions is the case of the licensing and registration of motor vehicles in the state. Both systems used, that for the licensing of farm trucks and that for automobile licensing, show similar trends to what this chapter is trying to establish.

Automobile and Farm Truck Licenses

- (a) 5 per cent to the Oklahoma Tax Commission
- (b) 95 per cent of fees . . . will be appropriated monthly to the county from which it was collected for use and support of the common schools of the county.<sup>14</sup>

In a less concrete manner, urban underrepresentation can be shown by legislation not passed in the pre-reapportionment sessions. As an example, many "acts of omission" that have slighted Oklahoma City and Tulsa have not been caused by anti-urban sentiment but by the emphasis the Legislature has placed on the county level of state government. Representatives are prone to think of themselves as a particular county's representative and that urban or statewide problems must be solved after local ones are resolved. Further, protecting the county level of government is attractive since it aids in strengthening the individual legislator's power base. More specifically, the failure to standardize ad valorem tax assessment methods, the redistribution of state revenues to seventy-seven county treasurers, the failure to reapportion the State Legislature, the protected position of county

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., Title 47, Section 22.2

commissioners in regard to central purchasing, and the decentralized nature of much of the common school program are all areas in which change would have helped to make the legislative system more responsive to urban problems. Instead, by maintaining the status quo, the Legislature contributed to urban underrepresentation by the dispersion of funds and political power.

This is not to say that the rural legislators played some variety of "Robin Hood" politics--draining the cities to fill the coffers of rural county treasuries. In fact, many legislators who served in pre-reapportionment sessions point with some pride to the fact that actual state money received by Oklahoma and Tulsa counties was a higher total than any rural county. These men note that, while they were looking after their home counties, they did see to it that urban areas were taken care of also.

Their point is correct. Certainly no conscious plot was hatched to short change urban areas. Even though the per capita share of state revenues by Oklahoma and Tulsa Counties might give one pause as to how paternalistic the rural representatives were, it could be maintained that the rurals were making some attempts to help the urban areas with their problems. The examples of urban underrepresentation that have been shown could probably more realistically be considered as the sum of all the thousands of pro-rural decisions throughout the Oklahoma political system.

Further in regard to the concept of the rural-urban

conflict in legislative systems, older legislators are often upset by complaints of urban underrepresentation. In addition to the funds rural legislators voted for the state's two largest cities, they point out the ease of passage of bills and resolutions concerned with only urban matters. This legislation, usually made to apply to Oklahoma City and Tulsa exclusively by a population requirement of 225,000 or 300,000, moved very easily through the House. Several legislature enactments such as the Urban Re-development Law of 1959, a levy by cities for zoo revenue, and the special city sales tax helped cities with problems that would not be shared by the rest of the state. For these reasons many legislators who served in the pre-reapportionment sessions felt the urban-rural split was an illusion. One Representative said:

In the old system, we looked out for the city fellows' interest and they understood about our home counties. If they wanted something passed they used the population clause and didn't try to cram things down our throats. Now some of these damn new fellows see an urban-rural fight behind every bush.<sup>15</sup>

Patterson, in an article on the 1959 session, also agrees that there does not seem to be any kind of constantly present rural-urban conflict. In fact, his attempts at scaling voting coalitions suggested the existence of a "metropolitan-rural" voting bloc in at least the matter of some forms of taxation.

The taxation scale suggested a fairly straightforward coalition in the House based upon the support by metro members of tax legislation designed primarily to benefit

---

<sup>15</sup>Interview with Representative V. H. Odom.

rural areas (e. g. distributing gasoline tax increases on the basis of county road mileage, providing an additional gasoline tax increase for the improvement of rural roads, and permitting an additional tax levy for support of cooperative county libraries), in return for rural support of tax legislation favoring metropolitan areas (e. g. permitting a city located in a county having 325,000 inhabitants) to levy taxes for revenue purposes under certain conditions . . . .<sup>16</sup>

Such a coalition would not have seemed possible if rural-urban conflict were the basis of the legislative struggle. Nevertheless, paternalism seemed to reach its outward limits when the allocation of revenues was in question. This of course would have happened in any political system and it does not condemn the rural representatives who served in the pre-reapportionment sessions. In accord with their concept of their job as representatives (i. e. helping their home county), they performed their duties well. Further, their efforts to help Oklahoma City and Tulsa with urban problems were somewhat statesmanlike in that no quid pro quo system dictated that the rural representatives owed the urban areas much of anything politically.

---

<sup>16</sup>Patterson, p. 199.

## CHAPTER IV

### REAPPORTIONMENT IN OKLAHOMA'S HOUSE

This portion of the thesis will examine some of the changes made by reapportionment in the Oklahoma House of Representatives by comparing the individual backgrounds of the House membership before and after reapportionment. In this comparison, such characteristics of the legislator as his constituency, profession, education, or tenure will be used to establish rough "patterns of recruitment" among those elected to the House. Since this chapter is a prelude to a discussion of post-reapportionment legislative output or performance, particular attention will be paid to the effects of reapportionment upon urban areas.

After a long, involved political battle, described earlier in this paper, the Oklahoma Legislature was reapportioned for the 1964 elections, thus making the Thirtieth Session (1965) the first under the new plan. Initial examination of the post-reapportionment House showed that, in connection with urban representation, the results were startling. In the revised apportionment plan, Oklahoma County received nineteen representatives, Tulsa County received fifteen representatives, and Comanche County (Lawton) received four representatives. Thus, through reapportionment, the state's three



largest urban places gained a total of twenty-two new legislative seats. Furthermore, the new apportionment plan had other features that affected urban representation. First, none of the new House districts varied in population by more than 15 per cent and the plan raised the minimum percentage of voters required to elect a majority of the House ( a common measure of malapportionment) from 29.9 per cent to 48.7 per cent. Second, the plan aided the cause of urban representation by reducing the total membership of the House from 120 to 99; this meant that the new plan gave Oklahoma County and Tulsa County 34 out of 99 seats compared with 14 out of 120 under the old districting scheme. In brief, the Court plan accomplished what the Oklahoma House had half-heartedly attempted to do since 1921.

For a more precise look at the urban gains after the first post-reapportionment election, we have divided the state into the following categories:<sup>1</sup>

- (1) Larger Urban Places: Tulsa and Oklahoma City.
- (2) Urban Places: All those cities in excess of 25,000 (Bartlesville, Enid, Lawton, Midwest City, and Norman).
- (3) Semi-urban: All those counties that have a city of 2,500 and at least 55 per cent of the county's population in a city of 2,500 and up.
- (4) Rural: This includes the remainder of the cities and counties in the state.

Application of this scheme to the Twenty-ninth, Thirtieth

---

<sup>1</sup>Taken from usage by Samuel C. Patterson, "Dimensions of Voting Behavior in a One-Party State Legislature," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 26, 1962, p. 186.

Thirty-first, and Thirty-second sessions of the House of Representatives revealed the following results in Table IV below.

This classification scheme shows that after rather remarkable gains for the larger urban areas along with heavy losses by the rural areas, the pattern has remained reasonably stable. This is to be expected since no districting changes have occurred since the initial reapportionment. Generally, the changes that have occurred are explained by shifts with districts, i. e. a representative from Sapulpa replacing a member from Tulsa does not change the county total, but it does record a category change. Basically, it can be said that the numerical superiority of rural districts has been broken and has remained so since reapportionment.

Another obvious but important question concerning the effects of reapportionment upon the House is the problem of continuity among the membership, or the existence of the "old guard." Political survival of reapportionment, of course, does not imply any common bond nor any kind of a power elite, but the character of the Legislature can be affected by these men. Despite generalizations to the effect that reapportionment would accomplish a "house cleaning," a high degree of continuity has existed in the membership of the House. In the Thirty-second Session, for instance, there were thirty-one representatives who have served continuously since before reapportionment. Of the thirty-one, there are fifteen rural members, eight from semi-urban areas, one each from the small

urban places of Bartlesville, Lawton, and Enid, and four from Tulsa and one from Oklahoma City. There were many of the older faces, then, not replaced due to reapportionment.

Further, while this "old guard" group consisted of many rural members, there does not seem to be much evidence that these lawmakers are poorly equipped for their jobs relative to other legislators. Educationally, they fulfill fairly high standards, and, compared with the Thirty-second House session's background (See Table IV), the figures would not support a very strong statement concerning higher or lower standards for the "old guard" than a post-reapportionment session. Additionally, there is also not much difference in regard to professional qualifications between the "old guard" and the Thirty-second Session as a whole.

As to final conclusions from this comparison, it can be maintained from the evidence presented that, numerically, urban representation has been made stronger by reapportionment. It also seems that the educational level of the Thirty-second Session of the House is slightly higher than before reapportionment, but not enough to maintain that reapportionment either caused the change or that reapportionment improved the qualifications of all legislators. Finally, reapportionment did not destroy the continuity of the membership in the House.

What of generalizations concerning the recruitment of individual lawmakers from the new urban districts?

One effect that reapportionment was expected to produce

was a general rise in the qualifications of legislators. This was to occur presumably because urban districts would elect representatives better suited through education or professional experience to fill positions in the Legislature. High quality legislators, it was reasoned, could shape the legislative process in a manner helpful to urban areas, make rapid advancements to leadership positions, and upgrade all of state politics. To test the validity of the proposition that reapportionment resulted in the recruitment to the House of more qualified urban members, a comparison was made between the professional and educational backgrounds of the post-reapportionment urban members with the membership of earlier sessions and the membership of the current house as a whole. The tables found in the appendices reflect the results of that comparison.

By the somewhat imprecise measure of education and profession, it does not seem that reapportionment made a large impact on the qualifications of post-reapportionment members. From the table, urban members' educational level was slightly higher, which partly reflects the larger number of attorneys from urban areas in the House. Other differences between categories were not so apparent. However, in addition to these qualifications, subjective analysis of new urban members also indicated some improvement in their quality. At least one representative interviewed felt that the first post-reapportionment freshman class of urban lawmakers was the finest ever seen in the Capitol and others

agreed that the class, if not the finest, was much better than average.

On this basis, despite weak objective differences, it seems that reapportionment was a factor in the improvement of the overall quality of the membership of post-reapportionment sessions through the addition of new urban representatives.<sup>2</sup> Further, urban representatives seem to be slightly better qualified than the membership of prereapportionment sessions. Looking at other parts of this study, however, it seems that this "quality" improvement has not yet made its impact and the importance of this improvement seems to lie in its potential for future legislative sessions.

---

<sup>2</sup>This is a problem in causality. Annual sessions and improved compensation could also be cited as factors. It is difficult to assign a priority or to say that reapportionment directly caused     x    .

## CHAPTER V

### THE HOUSE THAT REAPPORTIONMENT BUILT

This chapter will describe some of the characteristics of the post-reapportionment House of Representatives in much the same manner as the treatment in Chapter III of this thesis.

Regarding leadership, the first session after reapportionment did not produce any sharp contrasts with the past in regard to its leadership. Despite the marked impact reapportionment had upon the composition of the House membership, the top leadership roles were still filled with the same people--J. D. McCarty, Rex Privett, and Leland Wolf.

Since Speaker McCarty's style of leadership was described previously, analysis will not be repeated for the first reapportionment session. Nevertheless, there is one aspect of McCarty's attitude toward urban problems which is instructive. It should be noted that Speaker McCarty took a neutral position in the 1963 debates on reapportionment, and he made efforts to tone down the emotions which reapportionment generated. At the height of the controversy, he was quoted as saying "Things like this [debate on reapportionment] can tear the House down." and he continued to say that such debate could open bitterness which could prevent the House of

Representatives from performing its task of lawmaking.<sup>1</sup> Speaker McCarty in other words wished to play down the cleavage of rural and urban. Instead, he seemed to place a higher priority on the harmony and cooperation necessary for the House as a whole to legislate effectively. It is noticeable that he supported a sales tax measure of importance to urban areas for revenue raising purposes as well as reappointing predominantly rural and semirural Representatives to the most important standing committees. In conclusion, despite his even-handed treatment of urban and rural, he did reinforce the status quo (his leadership position) and thereby rural control was continued throughout the first session of the post-reapportionment House of Representatives.

The second post-reapportionment session witnessed some change in the House leadership. McCarty ran into some political problems in his own district. Republican party workers saturated his constituency with campaign material and spent a rumored \$200,000 on his opponent's campaign. In combination with charges of tax fraud and corruption brought to light late in the race, the Republican efforts were successful, McCarty was defeated, and the Speaker's chair was left empty.

The heir apparent was Rex Privett of Pawnee County, a ten year veteran. He had served with McCarty as Speaker pro Tempore, but the passage of the gavel is not automatic and, despite support from the former Speaker, Privett had several

---

<sup>1</sup>The Daily Oklahoman, February 16, 1964, p. 1.

challengers. In general, the struggle for the chair is one of the most informal areas in Oklahoma politics. In fact, it is usually so disconnected from the formal legislative process that in the older days it was said the actual selection of the Speaker and the Majority Floor Leader took place in the lobby and coffee shop of the old Huckins Hotel in downtown Oklahoma City. This tradition continues with campaigning for the position occurring at pre-session Legislative Council Executive Committee meetings, at barbecues held for the Democratic party, and at other gatherings where numerous House members are present. As a result, verbal accounts become the major source material. The following is one version:

Privett was well-liked and respected and he had J. D.'s support which was still important. Still, you cannot pass these things (the Speakership) like you would a farm to your son. Privett contacted people before the session and gathered votes from the urban areas and the rural areas west of Oklahoma City and north to Kansas; "pledge cards" were circulated to his behalf. When he had this group, others began to join him . . . . Of course the people from certain areas don't always vote together on the Speaker, but they do a lot of talking among themselves and often vote together . . . . For the first time in Privett's victory, the "welfare" counties did not have a veto power over the selection of the Speaker. However, Privett had to lead the House so he had to deal with a lot of people and this included a lot of the "welfare" boys and he had to appoint them to some of the major committees and give the ones with seniority chairmanships.<sup>2</sup>

Although this Representative's conclusion that the "welfare" counties, sometimes referred to as "Little Dixie," exercised a veto power over the choice of the Speaker, it was not frequently verified by other representatives. Many denied that

---

<sup>2</sup>Interview with Representative William Poulos, March, 1969.



the "welfare" counties, which include Wagoner, Cherokee, Adair, Sequoyah, Muskogee, McIntosh, Okmulgee, Haskell, LeFlore, McCurtain, Latimer, Choctaw, Pushmataha, Pittsburg, Atoka, Coal, and Hughes, ever voted as a bloc. Nevertheless, his description, despite disagreement, is useful, since it indicates the manner of selection of the Speaker.

What was the nature of Privett's leadership in regard to the problems of urban areas?

The strongest statement that can be made is that Privett, by style, by personality, by constituency, by occupation, and by personal knowledge is more rural than urban. This reflects itself in his leadership, particularly in the all important decisions regarding the division of the state's dollars, but it does not imply a lack of awareness of urban problems since money is always in short supply, choices have to be made between state agencies and legislators' pet projects, between state parks and state lodges, and, of course, between rural and urban.

One major element of leadership is the House committee structure, and further analysis of the House leadership will begin with this subject. Examination of these appointments makes the rather obvious point that no important improvement for urban representation has occurred.

Further, Privett's choices for the membership of the important Rules Committee should be stressed. As can be seen from Table IV, the inroads made by urban and large city legislators have been minimal. With only three exceptions,

the entire committee is composed of men from small town Oklahoma with service in the House dating to before reapportionment.

The lack of improvement becomes clearer when the number of chairmanships held by rural, semi-urban, urban, and large city representatives is examined. Rural control is further seen in the composition of several of what are considered by many representatives to be the most important committees in the House. [See Table VII.]

The most striking characteristic of the post-reapportionment House in regard to our problem is the potential power an urban coalition could hold. If all the Representatives from urban districts would vote together with any kind of regularity, they would hold a virtual veto power over the process, with 45 urban districts out of a total of 99 seats in the House. Obviously, such voting strength, acting as a coalition, would be an extremely powerful force in the deliberations of the House and the implications for urban representation are tremendous.

Nevertheless, dreams of an effective urban coalition have been unfulfilled. This research can provide no evidence that all 45 urban legislators ever voted together in a manner which would suggest the existence of a broad urban coalition. Instead, House voting records show a splintered pattern and it can strongly be concluded that no urban coalition exists.

What explains the non-existence of an urban coalition? One of several factors is party affiliation. This is per-

ceived by legislators as a more important consideration in many instances than the urban or rural nature of their district; party label, then, cuts across rural-urban lines and weakens any potential urban coalition. For example, in the Thirty-second Session, Republicans from Woodward to Tulsa gathered on the losing side in Governor Dewey F. Bartlett's conflict with State Treasurer Leo Winters on the issue of deposition of state funds and formed a solid bloc of opposition to H. R. 1029.<sup>3</sup>

Another source of division is seniority. Cliques and friendships develop in any legislative group and often urban and large city representatives with comparatively longer service seem to have more in common with rural representatives than with new legislators from urban areas. Since dimensions of personality have a definite impact on the political process, this friendship is often more important and effective than loyalty to other legislators from similar constituencies. For instance, most of the older members in the House do not share the frustration that new urban and large city Representatives sometimes voice concerning urban problems. Calling attention to rural-urban conflict, many old members feel, is "being disagreeable and doesn't help the House to get its work done."<sup>4</sup>

Finally, the point can be made that Representatives do not generally feel that belonging to a similar census category

---

<sup>3</sup>House Journal, First Regular Session, 1969, p. 98.

<sup>4</sup>Interview with Representative Red Andrews, March 1969.

is a basis for political unity, particularly those urban Representatives not from Oklahoma City or Tulsa. Representatives from the urban areas of Bartlesville, Lawton, Muskogee, Enid, and Norman do not think of themselves as sharing a community of interest with those legislators from the state's two largest cities, and, instead, often see some degree of competition. Additionally, few legislators from the urban areas identify themselves as wholly urban. Many grew up in farming areas and it is not uncommon for legislators to refer to their rural background with some pride even though they have not lived there for a number of years.

In conclusion, the House of Representatives after reapportionment has many of the same characteristics of the pre-reapportionment House. Leadership positions are still supported by rural and semi-rural representatives and the committee structure also retains the same flavor of previous sessions of the House in regard to its composition. Furthermore, although it has been pointed out that reapportionment has had an impact on the composition of the House, this change has not been meaningful in modifying the output of the legislative process.

#### Post-reapportionment Policymaking

The question can now be fairly asked: What have been the policymaking decisions following reapportionment that have affected the urban interests?

To answer this question, examples from some of the most

important areas of state government will be dealt with in a similar manner as in Chapter III.

One issue upon which many Representatives agree is the progress made by urban interests in regard to Oklahoma's sales tax. Formerly, the use of a sales tax levy as a local revenue measure was specifically prohibited, and cities and towns had to find other sources of revenue for the day-to-day operations of local government; this was particularly hard on the urban areas due to the greater expense of running larger units of government. The only exception to this prohibition was provision for a special sales tax which could be levied to meet emergency expenses caused by a disaster such as a flood, storm, or riot.

After reapportionment, the Legislature passed S. B. 66 in 1965 which permits the use of an additional sales tax levy by an incorporated city or town whose citizens vote to accept the tax. This tax is then collected by the State Tax Commission, but is put to local use in accord with the decisions of the governing body of the city or town.

The urban advantages are obvious. As one Representative put it, "All things considered, it [S. B. 66] was the first real revenue-raising measure passed for the cities in ten years."<sup>5</sup> Since urban areas formerly had to depend on the Legislature for funds or permission to raise funds, the sales tax was welcomed as positive proof of the helpful effects of reapportionment.

---

<sup>5</sup>Interview with Representative Donald Beauchamp, March 1969.

Nevertheless, while the measure's usefulness to urban areas is apparent, the conclusion that this gain was the result of reapportionment is open to debate on at least two points. First, the passage of the bill was not opposed by the leadership and long-time members of the legislature were co-sponsors. Its passage was painless.

Secondly, the bill does not require any allocation by the Legislature and it permits the decision to levy to be made on the local level rather than in the State Capitol. This of course would encourage rural and semi-urban members to support the bill without fear of costing their districts any state appropriations. Perhaps a more valid test of the effects of reapportionment will come at a time when the House passes legislation that could not have been passed in a pre-reapportionment session.

To completely dampen the urban pride at the passage of the sales tax, it must also be pointed out that new pro-rural exemptions to the state sales tax were added during the same session. S. B. 110, a bill that excludes livestock medicines from the sales tax passed the House 81-4 with the four dissenters from Oklahoma City and Tulsa. It is only with difficulty that one can maintain that urban strength passed S. B. 66 in the face of the pro-rural S. B. 110.<sup>6</sup>

Oklahoma's ad valorem tax system, as previously noted, has been one of the areas of policymaking where urban areas

---

<sup>6</sup>House Journal, First Regular Session, 1965, p. 694.

have been discriminated against. Has there been a policy change affecting this situation?

The evidence does not indicate much progress. No comprehensive attack on ad valorem tax methods or even limited reform has been successful since reapportionment. One reason for this failure lies in the fact that present ad valorem tax methods are constitutional, thus requiring not only passage by the Legislature but an affirmative vote of the people. Despite the difficulty of changing ad valorem tax methods, the tax has not been totally immune to attempts at change. In the Thirty-second Session a very pro-rural constitutional referendum was passed by the House. Although later killed by the Senate, this measure, H. J. R. 1001 by Representative Briscoe, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, was referred to his own committee rather than the possibly more usual assignment to the Committee on Constitutional Revisions and Regulatory Services. The resolution was given a "do pass" recommendation and rapid passage by the House.<sup>7</sup>

In content, the resolution would have submitted to a vote of the people a question on changing assessment methods in the Constitution. The change involved the establishment of a tax relief for owners of agricultural lands outside urban areas. The tax relief was deemed necessary since ad valorem taxes are assessed on the basis of the price a "fair, voluntary sale" of the land would bring. Land prices on the edges

---

<sup>7</sup>House Journal, First Regular Session, 1969, p. 833.

of urban areas, however, are usually higher than the agricultural worth of the land because of urban expansion. As the relentless housing developments, shopping centers, golf and country clubs, and other improvements encroach on the countryside, the farmer's tax is driven up by the speculative value of his land rather than its agricultural worth. To correct this, the referendum would have allowed the tax to be based upon the agricultural worth of the land rather than its artificial value as an investment. This measure is an example of the lack of change in the content of policymaking after reapportionment; it focuses on the problems of a few rural persons and ignores the inequities existing in the overall application of the tax.

The House passed this measure on March 4, 1969. The roll call vote on the resolution provided a rare glimpse of the urban Representatives acting as a "coalition." In defeat, urban representatives crossed party lines (D-13; R-14), and buried Oklahoma City-Tulsa rivalry enough to post a sizable vote. However, outside of Tulsa and Oklahoma City the other so-called urban representatives did not join the opposition to the resolution. (Aye votes; Oklahoma City, 11; Tulsa, 10; Midwest City, 2; Bartlesville, 1; Semi-urban, 2; rural, 0.)<sup>8</sup> Rural and semi-urban power was still quite impressive despite reapportionment.

Another extremely important issue in Oklahoma politics is

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 383.



the state system of common schools and higher education. Policy on these matters is sometimes related to rural-urban splits in the House.

One example of this is the conflict that occasionally arises over the accreditation of public schools in the state. For most of statehood, the small town or the rural school has been the backbone of the state's educational system. Not only have these schools performed their tasks to the satisfaction of most of their patrons, but they hold an extremely important position in their respective communities. For many Oklahomans, in fact, the public school is much more than just a school; it is a major cultural, social, and business interest in their areas. Long winter nights of basketball, school dances, and other programs fill the sometimes bleak social life of the rural areas; a threat to the school is a threat to the community. As a result, the issue of accreditation is a very important issue to rural areas, and rural Representatives interested in political survival must place high priority on the maintenance of local schools.

However, in recent years the effectiveness of the small rural school has been frequently challenged. These schools, it is charged, often have lower standards, particularly when judged in terms of present society, since they do not give adequate preparation in "new" mathematics, the sciences, or other special education projects. These charges, coupled with problems such schools have in staffing, maintenance, and providing other services associated with a quality edu-

cation, have hurt the small school's prestige. Many educators have seen consolidation as a remedy, especially since the population of rural areas has been decreasing in recent years.

As a result of these two strains of thought, legislative solutions were sought to the problem. The conflict surrounding H. B. 1026 and H. B. 1012 illustrate the still potent position of the rural interests in the state. The two bills mentioned were attempts to clarify the relationship between the Department of Education, a bureaucracy, and the State Board of Education, a political body. Clarification was needed because the Department had made policy decisions cutting off state aid and refusing to accredit certain small rural schools with daily average attendance below a specified level. The decision was based upon the educational and economic factors involved in keeping a small school open and application of the rule would have forced the consolidation of many rural schools throughout the state.

In response, rural and small town Oklahomans organized an attack on the administrative decision. Through H. B. 1026, they hoped to remove the Department of Education's authority to base accreditation on a daily average attendance figure and give most of this power to the State Board of Education. H. B. 1012, directed to the same end, protects state aid to small schools from termination by administrative order. In this manner, rural schools would be protected from administrative orders to close or consolidate.

Politically, pressure for the passage of "protection" of rural schools was very intense. For their method of lobbying, the well-organized rural citizens chose a tactic rarely used in other states, but a time tested one in Oklahoma--the visit to the State Capitol. Traveling in buses, pickups, and private cars, the defenders of the small schools packed the capitol building to let lawmakers know their stand: close the small schools at your own political peril. The pressure of the packed galleries, crowded hallways, and aroused numbers of constituents resulted in amendments to H. B. 1026 and H. B. 1012 that froze the level of daily average attendance needed for accreditation at 75. This was satisfactory to most rural groups, and they went home generally pleased; rural wrath was by and large eased and this made most rural and semi-rural Representatives relaxed if not happy. The Department of Education's threat to rural schools had been quite reduced and the small schools were once again safe to muddle on.

In retrospect, it is possible that the trip was almost a celebration of a foregone conclusion rather than a lobbying effort. The issue of closing rural schools had united two groups of rural and semi-urban representatives, the western and southeastern portions of the state, and this was a rare but potent legislative force. The western areas with school districts of hundreds of square miles feared the transportation problems consolidation would create. In the southeastern part of the state, grade schools were defended as community centers and necessary to keep small children closer to home.

The result of this unity, although for different reasons, created a large margin of votes for victory.

In passage, the bill had thirteen sponsors: eight rural and five semi-urban. Not one rural Representative voted against the measure and, of the potential forty-five in the so-called urban coalition, only twenty-four voted against enactment despite the costs of keeping state funds tied up in hundreds of small schools instead of being used in urban schools. The rurals showed quite clearly that reapportionment did not rob them of considerable strength on matters that were vital to their interests.<sup>9</sup>

Also on the subject of education, success of the rural demonstration contrasted rather sharply with two other mass lobbying attempts. In the first session after reapportionment, the Student Lobby for Higher Education packed galleries and filled Capitol halls but with no response to their demands for more funds for Higher Education. A visit by teachers from Tulsa in the Thirty-second Session was likewise fruitless. Despite their numbers and vocal demands, the issues of a pay raise and a more effective retirement plan were side stepped with a watered-down retirement plan and a resolution to "find a workable" solution at the next session to the problem of teachers' salaries. The contrast, it seems, is relevant to the problem. Rural appeals, despite reapportionment, still meet with a more sympathetic hearing and responses

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 149.

that are appropriate to their needs; urban problems do not.

One area in education that showed a positive gain for urban interests in the Thirty-second Session was the issue of city junior colleges. H.B. 1156, which allows city governing bodies to make application to the state Board of Regents for Higher Education for permission to build local junior colleges as one example.) To qualify, the bill requires that a petition of 5 per cent of the legal voters in the area or "community" signing be presented with the application, and that the area served have at least 75,000 population and \$75 million assessed valuation. The passage of the measure was welcomed by many urban and large city citizens. At this writing, three applications for junior colleges have already been made and more will probably be forthcoming in the future.

Here again, as has been pointed out in this material with regularity, urban gains generally have rural consent. Even though several representatives considered this bill to be evidence of urban gains in policymaking, it should be noted that the measure is free. No allocation of state funds was involved and no particular strain is placed on the existing sources of funds. This fact makes the 93-0 vote look like less of a victory.<sup>10</sup> In many respects, the enactment looks like the "permissive" or "class" legislation passed so frequently in the pre-reapportionment sessions of the House.

There is another indicator of urban underrepresentation

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 150.

that contributes to our data--legislative inaction. Just as policymaking occurs through enactment of bills, resolutions, or allocations, it is also shaped by what the Legislature does not do. By presentation of certain examples of failures to act, urban underrepresentation will be further documented.

Immediate examples are found in the state's taxation structure. In addition to the basically pro-rural ad valorem and sales tax systems that have already been discussed, the gasoline tax allocations, the liquor tax allocations, and the automobile license tax allocations have all retained exactly the same formulas for distribution of revenues that were written into law by pre-reapportionment sessions of the Legislature. Further, no proposals that have been offered have been threatened those monuments to rural control with the slightest change. In fact, for the most part, they have remained unchallenged. As One Representative noted, "Trying to change that now would be so farfetched it would be a waste of time."<sup>11</sup> Past rural control, in other words, has enhanced present rural control by discouraging attempted change, at least in regard to these taxation systems.

Another example of legislative inaction is the perennial failure to place Oklahoma's county commissioners under comprehensive central purchasing laws. This proposal has been defeated several times before and after reapportionment. The Twenty-second Session kept it alive only because members of

---

<sup>11</sup>Interview with Representative William Poulos, March 1969.

the Senate held S. B. 252 over for study by the Legislative Council for consideration during the last half of the session.

Although support for broader central purchasing laws has never been universal among urban Representatives, it has been an issue that has rural-urban overtones. From the urban and large city standpoint, the county commissioner's freedom to purchase equipment seems to be sand in a rat hole. Not only do urbans often suspect corruption, but they resent the money that always seems to be available for county projects but not urban problems. When attempts to expand the Central Purchasing Act have been ambushed in the Legislature, it often helps to convince urbans of the extent of rural power. In the Thirty-second Session, for instance, Garrison of the Senate was quoted as saying that S. B. 252 would not pass due to opposition in the House drummed up by county commissioners all over the state.<sup>12</sup>

Rural legislators, supported by a few urban and large city Representatives, resort to the argument that "central purchasing is fine in theory but doesn't actually work." Boiled down to its core, their support for the present system is based upon the premise that local control is more effective than central control, and, until changes are made, this continues to be the policy of the Legislature.

The failure of H. J. R. 1014, a referendum measure on

---

<sup>12</sup>Informal conversations with Senator Denzil Garrison and David Atkinson, President of the County Commissioners Association.

liquor-by-the-drink, was another example of legislative inaction that is relevant to our problem. With some qualifications, H. J. R. 1014 was called an urban measure. This was primarily because the resolution was introduced by Representative Ford of Tulsa and it had the backing of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce as well as other urban citizens.<sup>13</sup> Further, most of the arguments in support of the measure were directed toward urban ears. For example, passage of the resolution, its sponsor felt, would help Tulsa become a major convention center, open new clubs, and provide new tax revenues. All this, he felt, would be important attractions in luring new industries to the state. It is apparent that most of these advantages would accrue to the state's urban or large cities rather than to the rest of the state.

However, the short life span of the resolution in the House reinforces our generalizations concerning rural overrepresentation. The measure received a double committee assignment and was given to both the Revenue and Taxation Committee and the Constitutional Revisions Committee. At this point, as one proponent put it, the bill may as well have been put in a wastebasket since nothing ever gets out of a double assignment. V. H. Odom, chairman of the first committee and a rural member of the "old guard," felt that his district would vote against the referendum and that it might be personally politically harmful. On this reasoning, he

---

<sup>13</sup>Interview with Representative Charles Ford, March 1969.



pigeon-holed the bill the day that he got it and the matter was ended.<sup>14</sup>

This action provided an excellent example of the importance of the committee chairman. Even if the large city Representatives and the urban Representatives had been highly unified, the resolution's fate would have remained unchanged, and, as a result, urban interests were again frustrated in the House.

Another area of inaction that indicates reapportionment has caused no sweeping change in policymaking is the protection position of county funds. Two examples of the high mortality rate of measures which would re-allocate county funds occurred in the Thirty-second Session. S. B. 195, which would have provided secretaries for special judges in counties with up to 100,000 population [this would have affected Garfield (Enid), Comanche (Lawton), Cleveland (Norman), and Muskogee (Muskogee) Counties], was defeated for this reason. Several legislators said that the bill would have established a precedent for state control over county funds, since the salaries of the secretaries involved would have come from county court funds.

Another example of the importance of county funds is the previously mentioned defeat of H. J. R. 1014. Even if this measure had come to the floor, some legislators stated,

---

<sup>14</sup>Interview with Representative V. H. Odom, April 1969. This point was also verified by Representative Brian Conaghan.

its defeat would have been a foregoing conclusion because of its effect on county funds. It was reasoned that passage of a liquor-by-the-drink law would cut into package store revenues and the funds counties receive under the present prorural allocation formula of such revenues would be reduced; thus, the measure would be harmful to rural areas. However, loss of package store revenues in the cities would be offset by increased revenues from clubs, bars, and restaurants.

As a final illustration of the fate of many urban proposals, examination of the bills pending in the House Municipal Government Committee on the last day of the first session is revealing. Although these bills are technically alive for consideration in the second half of the session, the probability of their eventual passage is remote.

Measures Pending in the House Municipal  
Government Committee<sup>15</sup>

H. B. 1247 Clemons (Midwest City) and Boren (Seminole)

An act creating a Commission to conduct training and certification for Municipal Clerks, Treasurers, and other such financial officers; provision were also made for the reimbursement of expenses incurred during such training.

H. B. 1376 Nance (Oklahoma City) and McGraw (Tulsa Senator). An act authorizing cities and towns to submit the question of the assessment of a room occupancy tax to city voters for their approval.

---

<sup>15</sup>Files of the Legislative Council unbound material on the Committees of the House.

H. B. 1399 Atkins (Oklahoma City)

An act amending present law regarding tenant eligibility in public housing projects and setting a statutory limitation on the amount of rent charged.

H. B. 1443 Hopkins (Tulsa)

An act amending present statutes relating to the municipal police pension and retirement system and providing for the inclusion of new benefits in the plan.

H. B. 1455 B. Hill (Tulsa)

An act relating to zoning and requiring that the public hearings used to develop such plans be held at a time and place which would accommodate those persons most affected by the master zoning plan. (This was to prevent hearings held a good distance from the black community in Tulsa by the City of Tulsa.)

H. B. 1478 Hatchett (Oklahoma City)

An act relating to the creation of a Housing Authority in cities and counties and requiring any project undertaken by such Authority must have the approval of the voters in the areas served.

S. B. 44 Howard (Tulsa Senator)

An act providing for a procedure for appeals from a zoning decision by a City Board of Adjustment to the District Court.

S. B. 133 Martin (Ardmore Senator)

An act granting city councils authority to annex adjacent territory and providing for tax exemptions for property.

owners in the territory annexed.

S. B. 309 Martin (Ardmore Senator)

The same measure as S. B. 133 with the section on tax exemptions removed.

It is obvious that the dormant condition of these measures does not prove a general hostility towards urban legislative proposals, but it does show that many urban bills do not reach the floor, much less gain passage. According to an unpublished Legislative Council study by Gloria Wood and Donna Skinner, 40.91 per cent of all bills referred to the House Municipal Government Committee remained there at session's end.<sup>16</sup> Further, with the lone exception of the Rules Committee, the House Municipal Government Committee was assigned fewer bills in the Thirty-second Legislature than any other House Committee with its total of 22.<sup>17</sup> Urban measures then, are fewer in number and die more often than many of their counterparts.

On the other hand, conclusions which portray rural and semi-urban Representatives as patently unfair are questionable. Urban measures, as we shall see, are not defeated or pigeon-holed indiscriminately, particularly if the proposed legislation does not compete with sources of funds and projec

---

<sup>16</sup>Files of the Legislative Council unbound material on the Committees of the House.

<sup>17</sup>Donna Skinner and Gloria Wood, Committee Work Loads (Oklahoma City, 1969). This material was compiled at the request of the Legislative Council Committee on Legislative Procedure. It is unpublished and unbound.

which would significantly alter resource allocation. The fact cannot be ignored that numerous legislative measures--appropriations, bills, resolutions--which have a beneficial impact on the urban areas of the state have been enacted. Further, it would be far too cynical to imagine that many of these enactments were not a sincere effort to respond to urban problems. Certainly one major point which this research seems to indicate, despite our focus on the rural-urban cleavage, is that such differences are not an over-riding factor in the explanation of state legislative policymaking.

As an illustration of this point, several examples can be cited. The first instance is the passage of H. J. R. 1029; this resolution will permit urban voters in Oklahoma City and Tulsa to vote on the assessment of a special ad valorem tax levy for the support of municipal zoo funds. Its companion measure, H. B. 1297, providing for the creation and maintenance of a municipal zoo fund in the State Treasurer's office (provided the resolution passed) was also passed easily. Despite the fact that the resolution was returned by the Senate to languish on General Order, the passage of the two measures shows evidence of some rural sympathy for urban problems. Also noticeable is the passage of H. B. 1438, which is primarily directed toward the urban problem of law enforcement. This bill allows the District Attorney in any county with a population of more than 43,000 to hire special investigators for assistance in criminal cases. With the population clause, the law applies to the counties containing Lawton,

Tulsa, and Oklahoma City. Further evidence is supplied by the enactment of H. B. 1376, which permits portions of cities to be designated social service centers and thereby eligible to receive federal matching funds. H. B. 1387, authorizing the Legislative Council to direct an interim study on the feasibility of a Tulsa-Oklahoma City rapid transit system for commuters, is a final example of a general willingness of the legislative membership to face and act on some urban problems.

These bills indicate that the House has not ignored urban requests entirely even if they have not been showered with attention. This is especially true in response to situations where a small grant of money or "permissive legislation" enactments are the issue. In these cases passage is generally accomplished in more or less the same fashion as other legislation, regardless of its sponsor's district and factors other than urban-rural divisions become more important.

Finally, a few points should be made to define what this thesis has referred to as the rural-urban split. Several examples of policymaking indicate that a pro-rural bias exists in the allocation of the state's resources, but the extent of rural influence over other areas of policymaking is not established. The question is, does rural-urban conflict involve other issues not concerned with resource allocation? In order to answer this question, the subjects of public morals, the racial issue, and labor legislation will be used to measure urban-rural attitudes.

One issue that was not related to resource allocation in

the first half of the Thirty-second Session was the conflict over sex education in the public schools which centered around H. B. 1484. Although this bill also involved a question of local control of schools it is one of the best attitude measures available in the session.

The bill itself was drafted during the session after attacks had been made on the teaching or proposed teaching of sex education in various public schools in the state. One of the major sources of such opposition was a group of parents who called themselves Sanity on Sex (SOS). Locally formed, the group's main tactic was mailing material to lawmakers used in sex education courses and calling attention to offensive items such as illustrations, books, and pamphlets used in teaching sex education. Material endorsed by the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) was especially offensive to the SOS group. The former is a nation-wide concern, a non-profit health organization which had sent materials to school administrators and teachers encouraging them to adopt sex education courses in public schools; some schools had already done so. The brunt of SOS objections was the frank nature of the SIECUS material. Of particular concern was the handling of topics such as sexual abnormality, homosexuality, sensitivity training and venereal disease.

As drafted, the bill relieved much of the anxiety of those in SOS. Written in the House Education Committee, the measure banned the teaching of sex education as a separate,

distinct course in grades 1-12. In grades 6-12 sex education which, as defined in the bill, included all forms of procreation, could be dealt with as a topic within the framework of other courses such as biology, physical education, or home economics. Deviant or abnormal practices were not to be discussed at any level.

The bill passed the House, but a small urban opposition was distinguishable, with the backbone of opposition coming from Oklahoma City and Tulsa. (Oklahoma City, 7; Tulsa, 10; Urban, 3; Semi-urban, 2; Rural, 1.)<sup>18</sup> Twenty of the 45 urban Representatives are not enough to state that the urban Representative is more liberal than his rural counterpart; but it is interesting to note that 16 of the 20 urban votes against the bill were cast by Representatives newly elected since reapportionment. Further, of the 16, ten also voted against H. B. 1026, the small schools bill, and against H. J. R. 1001, the ad valorem tax exemption. Some urban Representatives who have come into the Legislature since reapportionment are somewhat more liberal on the issue of sex education. The roll call vote looks very much like our previous examples of the rural-urban split.

In regard to racial matters, it is difficult to assert that there is any correlation between a liberal voting record and the degree of urban population in a legislative district as the following example indicates. Before reapportionment,

---

<sup>18</sup>House Journal, First Regular Session, 1969, p. 510.



the major legislation dealing with racial matters was the 1963 bill which established a Human Rights Commission and banned discriminatory employment practices by state agencies. This measure, S. B. 273, was introduced by Fred Harris of Lawton and he was quickly joined by thirteen Senate coauthors, including Dewey Bartlett, later elected Governor. Passage in this chamber was rapid and the bill was sent to the House.

On the other side of the Capitol, the legislative measure was assigned to the Governmental Reform Committee where amendment reduced the bill's appropriation and watered down its statement of purpose. After the Senate rejected the amendments offered by the House, an Appropriations Conference Committee reduced the Commission's appropriation by a total of \$6,000 for the two fiscal years.

On final passage, the roll call vote was favorable, with only nine votes cast against the measure; however, there was a high degree of absenteeism on the vote, with nineteen Representatives not recorded.

After reapportionment, the only bill dealing with racial matters has been H. B. 1271, a fair housing law.<sup>19</sup> This act was introduced by the three black members of the House, Archibald Hill, Hannah Atkins, and Ben Hill. As written, the bill was a reasonably strong fair housing act; the Human Rights Commission was given power to investigate complaints of unfair housing practices, to hold hearings, and transmit findings and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature. Per-

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 192.

sons who felt that they had been discriminated against could appeal to the Commission with the right of judicial review by the District Court.

The bill was assigned to the urban dominated Municipal Government Committee, chaired by Representative Red Andrews of Oklahoma City, a long-time member of the House. The committee prepared a substitute bill which was milder than the original as it provided exceptions for private organizations and for any single-family house rented by the owner. It also somewhat watered down the Commission's power to hear cases and included a number of public relations duties in its role.

The roll call vote is revealing for several reasons. First, it illustrates the well-established fact that the committee chairman has a great deal of leverage over the work of his committee. On the final vote, seven of the thirteen members of the Municipal Government Committee voted against the bill, which had received a "do-pass" recommendation from their committee; it is obvious bills do not come to the floor by a majority vote. The second point is that absenteeism was again apparent. Seventeen legislators did not vote on the bill. Splintered voting patterns were also apparent among the urban legislators.

There are a number of parallels between the handling of racial legislation both before and after reapportionment. In both instances, the committee assigned to study the bill weakened its effect. Harris's bill had its appropriation cut and the post-reapportionment bill had exemption clauses

added. Secondly, passage of the compromise measures in both cases was characterized by a low level of conflict on the vote with a high absenteeism.

It can be concluded that racial issues are not a source of urban-rural conflict.

Another issue of importance which indicates attitudes was the passage of the Consumer Credit Code. This bill, which was a major source of controversy in the first half of the session, will be used to examine legislative attitudes towards labor.

Although organized labor is not a powerful political force in Oklahoma, attitude toward labor does help define the distinction or lack of distinction between rural and urban representatives. The position of labor in Oklahoma has been rather unusual. According to Mr. Henry Likes, Oklahoma State AFL-CIO President, despite the National AFL-CIO support of reapportionment, the state organization fought reapportionment because it felt that the rural legislators had been very friendly to labor and the unions did not wish to see a change in their good relations with the Legislature.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>Interview with Henry Likes, State President of the AFL-CIO, August 1969.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSIONS

∨ In concluding this thesis, it seems appropriate to analyze the findings of this research in terms of the study's major hypothesis and the questions which guided the research.

∨ Accordingly, the major hypothesis of this research was as follows: Reapportionment of the Oklahoma Legislature was accompanied by a change in the nature of the Legislature's performance or output.

∨ Regarding this hypothesis, it was found that despite substantial gains in numerical representation for the primary urban areas of the state, few changes were found in regard to the nature of policy decisions made by the post-reapportionment House of Representatives. Instead, it was found that similar to the pre-reapportionment House of Representatives, rural power was still vigorous enough to dictate major policy decisions. This conclusion is, however, tempered by the fact that some policy decisions favorable to urban interests were made by the House. The city sales tax measure, the junior college bill, and the open housing bill are all examples which can be used to support the contention that urban problems do receive some attention from the House. Nevertheless, as noted in the discussion of each of these examples, the

measures resemble the "permissive legislation" so common to pre-reapportionment sessions; it could not be maintained, therefore, that a distinct change in the nature of the performance of the House has occurred.

As a result, it seems that the major hypothesis of this study should be changed to read as follows: reapportionment of the Oklahoma Legislature was not accompanied by major changes in the nature of the Legislature's output of policy decisions.

Having disposed of the major hypothesis, attention is turned to the research questions:

(1) What factors explain the failure of reapportionment to alter the performance of the Oklahoma Legislature?

As an explanation of the lack of change in the area of policymaking, it was demonstrated that the House leadership, the House committee system, and the failure of urban representatives to form coalitions are all contributing factors in reducing the impact of reapportionment. The House leadership, despite some personnel changes, is still elected and supported by largely rural and semi-rural Representatives; the attitude of those in leadership positions, committee appointments, chairmanship appointments, and the role played by the leadership reflects this fact. The committee system is still rurally dominated. Membership as well as chairmanships of the major committees show a high degree of similarity in composition to pre-reapportionment sessions. The only exception to the rural nature of the committee system is the

Municipal Government Committee. Its make-up is urban and, in the First Session of the Thirty-second Legislature, this committee initiated some policies which contrasted with the output of the pre-reapportionment sessions, but failed to generate sufficient support for passage, despite the larger urban numbers present in the post-reapportionment House. As pointed out, the urban coalition did not come to life because of the divisive effects of party membership, age, and competition within the so-called "bloc."

It is interesting to note that these conclusions are similar to the findings of David Derge in his study of the Missouri and Illinois State Legislatures following their reapportionment.<sup>1</sup> For instance, Derge found in his research that despite the large number of legislators from St. Louis in the Missouri Legislature and from Chicago in the Illinois Legislature, urban dominance did not occur in either body, and Derge observed examples of urban factionalism quite similar to those discussed in this paper.

(2) What does this study imply in regard to rural-urban cleavages?

Before an answer to this question is attempted, mention must be made of some of the conclusions drawn in the professional literature on the subject. In a study on the Florida Legislature, Havard and Beth concluded " . . . it is our

---

<sup>1</sup>David Derge, "Urban-Rural Conflict: The Case in Illinois in Legislative Behavior, ed. John C. Wahlke and Heinz Eulau (Glencoe, Illinois, 1959), p. 218.

opinion that the rural-urban cleavage is at once one of the most basic and far-reaching aspects of present day politics in the state."<sup>2</sup> Contrarily, another study on state legislative politics has questioned the importance of the rural-urban split, stating that it is "uncharacteristic of legislative conflict in American state politics."<sup>3</sup>

Our findings seem to indicate a middle ground. On such issues as H. J. R. 1001 (ad valorem tax exemptions), H. B. 1026 (small schools), and H. B. 1484 (sex education), there was some evidence of the existence of rural-urban lines in voting behavior. On the other hand, nothing in the session, with the possible exception of the two public moral issues--sex education and liquor-by-the-drink--suggests that conflict in the Legislature stems from attitudes or ideologies particular to either rural or urban legislators. Instead, rural-urban conflict is generally most evident in connection with taxation and appropriations.

This conclusion conforms with that of Patterson in his study of the 1959 Oklahoma House of Representatives.

Apparently one-party state legislatures appear to respond to different sets of issues in essentially unrelated ways . . . It seems likely that rural-urban differences are important, but more so on some kinds of issues than others and more so in some parts of the country than others.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>William C. Havard and Loren P. Beth, The Politics of Mis-Representation, (Baton Rouge, 1962), p. 11.

<sup>3</sup>Robert S. Friedman, "The Urban-Rural Conflict Revisited," Western Political Quarterly, Vol. 14 (1964), p. 481.

<sup>4</sup>Samuel Patterson, "Dimensions of Voting Behavior in a One-Party State Legislature," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 26, 1962, p. 186.

Patterson also found a rural-urban split of some degree on issues of public morals which was also suggested by this study.

As for implications, this thesis shows rather clearly that earlier predictions concerning the effects of reapportionment were oversimplifications.<sup>5</sup> Based in large part on institutionally oriented generalizations, such predictions foresaw a new era in state politics resulting from reapportionment. This study leads to a more realistic conclusion that the constitutional and legal aspects of a political system are not the exclusive determinants of political behavior.

As for predictions, it seems that the quality of urban representation will improve. Reapportionment after 1970 should result in additional seats for urban areas if the plan accurately reflects present population trends; this of course will strengthen urban representation and increase the likelihood that changes of a more important nature will occur in the Legislature's output. Of even greater importance to the overall fortunes of urban representation is the fact that

---

<sup>5</sup>Robert G. Dixon, Jr., Democratic Representation: Reapportionment in Law and Politics (New York, 1968), p. 574. Dixon states, "Many commentators predicted that reapportionment would lead to a great resurgence of state government, a heightened concern for urban problems at state capitals, and less need for direct federal-local relations to solve urban problems. These thoughts have been common in social science and popular literature for decades, and were highlighted in the 1955 report of the Kestnbaum Commission on intergovernmental relations. They are repeated in a report on apportionment issued by the United States Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations." Dixon also cites Gordon Baker, Rural Versus Urban Political Power (New York, 1955).



individual urban legislators, through additional experience and more important committee assignments, will probably be in a position to take a greater role in the leadership of the House. Finally, if the predictions of some House members are correct that the era of House Speakers, supported in part or wholly by rural or semi-urban legislators will soon be relegated to the past, change in the output of Legislature will become a certainty.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- David, Paul T. and Eisenberg, Ralph. Devaluation of Urban and Suburban Votes. Charlottesville: Bureau of Public Administration, University of Virginia, 1962.
- Derge, David R. "Metropolitan and Outstate Alignments in Illinois and Missouri Legislative Delegations." American Political Science Review, LII (December 1959), pp. 1051-61.
- Derge, David R. "Urban-Rural Conflict: The Case in Illinois and Missouri" in John C. Wahlke and Heinz Eulau (eds.) Legislative Behavior. Glencoe: Free Press, 1959, pp. 218-25.
- Dixon, Robert G. Democratic Representation: Reapportionment in Law and Politics. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Flinn, Thomas A. "Outline of Ohio Politics." Western Political Quarterly, XIII (September 1960), pp. 702-721.
- Friedman, Robert S. "The Urban-Rural Conflict Revisited." Western Political Quarterly, XIV (June 1961), pp. 481-95.
- Frost, Robert T. "On Derge's Metro and Outstate Legislative Delegations: A Critique." American Political Science Review, LIII (September 1959), pp. 792-95.
- Jewell, Malcolm. Legislative Representation in the Contemporary South. Durham: Duke Press, 1967.
- Jewell, Malcolm. "State Legislatures in Southern Politics." Journal of Politics, XXVI (March 1964), pp. 177-96.
- Meller, Norman. "Legislative Behavior Research." Western Political Quarterly, XIII (1960), pp. 131-53.
- Meller, Norman. "Legislative Behavior Research Revisited." Western Political Quarterly, XVIII (1965), pp. 775-83.
- Patterson, Samuel C. "Dimensions of Voting Behavior in a One-Party State Legislature." Public Opinion Quarterly, XXVI (1962), pp. 185-200.

- Patterson, Samuel C. "The Role of the Lobbyist: The Case of Oklahoma." Journal of Politics, XXV (1963), pp. 72-92.
- Pray, Joseph and Mauer, George. New Perspectives on Legislative Reapportionment. Norman: Bureau of Governmental Research, University of Oklahoma, 1962.
- Schubert, Glendon and Press, Charles. "Measuring Malapportionment." American Political Science Review, LVIII (June 1964), pp. 302-27.
- Thornton, H. V. The Apportionment Problem in Oklahoma. Norman: Bureau of Government Research, University of Oklahoma, 1957.
- White, John P. and Thomas, Norman C. "Urban and Rural Representation and Legislative Apportionment" Western Political Quarterly, XVII (December 1964), pp. 724-40.

APPENDIX

TABLE I

RURAL V. URBAN COMMITTEE CHAIRMANSHIPS IN  
PRE-REAPPORTIONMENT HOUSE, 1963

Constituency	Number of Chairman	Name of Committee
Tulsa	1	Banks and Banking
Oklahoma City	4	Rules, Rubiness and Industry, Public Safety, Enrolled and Engrossed Bills.
Urban Places	2	Revenue and Taxation, General Investments
Semi-Urban	12	Higher Education, Judiciary, Oil and Gas, Reapportionment, Social Welfare, Roads, Public Health, Utilities, Labor Relations, Constitutional Amendments, Public Services, Labor Relations
Rural	21	Appropriations and Budget, Ways and Means, Municipal Government, Education (common schools), Game and Fish, County, State, Federal Government, Water Resources, Legal and Fiscal, Elections and Privileges, Insurance, Veteran Affairs, Professions and Occupations, Parks and Recreation, Governmental Reform, Employment, House-Senate Affairs, Penal and Eleemosynary Institutions, Jurisprudence, Water Resources, House Administration

Source: House Journal, Twenty-ninth Session, pp. 23-29.

TABLE II

RURAL-URBAN MEMBERSHIP OF MOST IMPORTANT  
HOUSE COMMITTEES, 1963

Committee	Tulsa	Okla. City	Urban	Semi- Urban	Rural
Revenue and Taxation	4	3	3	3	10
Appropriations and Budget	2	3	4	13	15
Ways and Means	1	0	2	4	7
Rules	0	1	3	3	10
Municipal Government	1	3	2	3	5
Business and Industry	2	1	3	3	12
Industrial Develop- ment	3	1	3	2	16

Source: House Journal, Twenty-ninth Session, pp. 23-28.

TABLE III

RURAL-URBAN COMPARISON: TAX DOLLARS COLLECTED  
V. TAX DOLLARS RETURNED

Name of County	Population	Amount returned per \$ collection
Tulsa	364,000	\$ .72
Oklahoma	439,000	.75
Comanche (Lawton)	90,800	1.01
Garfield (Enid)	52,900	.88
Muskogee	61,800	.89
.		
.		
Choctaw	15,600	11.68
McCurtain	25,800	12.26
Sequoyah	18,000	14.18

Source: (Population) County and City Data Book, 1966

Source: (Tax Figures) Oklahoma Tax Commission Reports  
1959-1960

TABLE IV

THE IMPACT OF REAPPORTIONMENT OF THE OKLAHOMA HOUSE  
OF REPRESENTATIVES: RURAL V. URBAN CONSTITUENCIES  
BEFORE AND AFTER THE REAPPORTIONMENT  
1963-1969

Session	Rural	Semi-urban	Urban	Okla. City	Tulsa
<u>29th</u>	65	27	14	7	7
(Reapportionment)					
<u>30th</u>	37	16	12	18	16
<u>31st</u>	34	20	12	17	16
<u>32nd</u>	33	20	12	18	16

Source: Oklahoma Legislature, Twenty-ninth through Thirty-second sessions, Journal of the House of Representatives. Numbers in table indicate the number of legislators from that particular type of constituency or district.

TABLE V

REAPPORTIONMENT AND THE OKLAHOMA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:  
A BEFORE AND AFTER COMPARISON OF LEGISLATORS'  
BACKGROUND QUALIFICATIONS\*

## PART I

Twenty-ninth Session	"Old Guard"	Thirty-second Session
Graduate degree	24%	34%
College degree	22%	20%
College Work	20%	21%
High School	29%	20%
Unclassified	3%	4%

## PART II

Twenty-ninth Session	"Old Guard"	Thirty-second Session
Attorneys	17%	25%
Agriculture	21%	20%
Business	17%	19%
Insurance, Public Relations	12%	18%
Oil	10%	8%
Education	8%	3%
Miscellaneous	15%	7%

Source: Both tables compiled from Who is Who in the Twentieth Session of the Oklahoma Legislature and Who is Who in the Thirty-second Session of the Oklahoma Legislature.

\*Due to rounding-off, some columns will not total 100%  
\*\*On this figure it was not totally clear if the response indicated high school or not.



TABLE VI

REAPPORTIONMENT AND LEGISLATORS' QUALIFICATIONS: A COMPARISON  
OF URBAN QUALIFICATIONS WITH HOUSE SESSIONS AS A WHOLE BEFORE  
AND AFTER REAPPORTIONMENT, TWENTY-NINTH AND  
THIRTY-SECOND SESSIONS

## PART I

Twenty-ninth Session	Thirty-second Session	Urban Members*
Graduate degree 24%	34%	37%
College degree 22%	20%	18%
College work* 20%	20%	23%
High school 29%	16%	13%
Unclassified* 3%	10%	9%

## PART II

Twenty-ninth Session	Thirty-second Session	Urban Members*
Attorneys 17%	25%	27%
Agriculture 21%	20%	-
Business 17%	19%	29%
Insurance, Public Relations 12%	18%	16%
Oil 10%	8%	5%
Education 8%	3%	10%
Miscellaneous 15%	7%	22%

Source: Both tables compiled from Who is Who in the Twentieth Session of the Oklahoma Legislature and Who is Who in the Thirty-second Session of the Oklahoma Legislature.

\*Urban members refers to urban legislators elected since reapportionment. College work means attendance at college, but no degree awarded. Unclassified means source not clear if high school was completed.

TABLE VII

## COMPOSITION OF HOUSE COMMITTEES

## PART I

Constituency	Chairmanships	Committees Include
Tulsa	1	Judiciary
Oklahoma City	1	Municipal Govern- ment
Urban	0	
Semi-urban	4	Education, Agri- culture, Roads, and Highway Constitutional Re- visions
Rural	9	Rules, Public Affa Business Relations Public Health, Finance, Revenue & Taxation, Appropri- tions & Budget

## PART II

## Selected Committees and Composition of Membership

Name	Tulsa	Oklahoma City	Urban	Other	Urban as Per Cent of Total
Education	2	3	5	17	37%
Roads & Highways	3	1	2	10	38%
Revenue & Taxation	5	5	2	12	50%
Appropriations & Budget	1	3	4	17	32%
Rules	2	0	2	22	15%

Source: House Journal, First Regular Session, 1969, pp.  
27-29.

TABLE VIII

## ROLL CALL VOTE ON H. B. 1271\*

	For	Against	Absent
Oklahoma City	9	6	3
Tulsa	8	5	2
Urban	9	3	0
Others	36	6	12

Source: House Journal, First Session, 1969, p. 356.

VITA

Jeffery William Spelman

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

**Thesis:** URBAN REPRESENTATION AND THE OKLAHOMA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: THE IMPACT OF REAPPORTIONMENT ON LEGISLATIVE POLICYMAKING

**Major Field:** Political Science

**Biographical:**

**Personal Data:** Born in Pueblo, Colorado, October 15, 1945, the son of Mr. and Mrs. George J. Spelman.

**Education:** Graduated from Boise City High School, Boise City, Oklahoma, May, 1963; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from Oklahoma State University in 1967, with a major in political science; completed requirements for the Master of Arts degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1971.

**Professional Experience:** Graduate assistant, Political Science Department, Oklahoma State University, 1967-1968; presently Research Associate, State Legislative Council, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.