How to Fix the Fair Representation Act (HR 4632) so That it is Fair, Clear, Neutral, and Enforceable

By Rick Neifeld, Neifeld IP Law, PLLC

The Fair Representation Act (H.R.4632), here:

https://beyer.house.gov/uploadedfiles/the_fair_representation_act_of_2025.pdf

is too complicated, and appears to be drawn for partisan political reasons. It is not a valid contender for enacting voting reform and avoiding gerrymandering of congressional districts. I have a Ph.D. in physics and a JD in law, and I have trouble following it. An and even I, a middle of the roader, are upset with its provisions. This bill will so complicated that it will lose support from the voters because they do not understand it. This bill, if passed in current form, would be unhelpful.

I suggest you amend this Bill as follows:

1. Drop the complications introduced in the multi-member district provisions. Instead, specifying that the number of candidates having the highest numbers of votes that is equal to the number of seats up for election, are elected.

2. Revise the criteria for redistricting in proposed "SEC. 303. CRITERIA FOR REDISTRICTING" as follows.

First and foremost, avoiding gerrymandering requires avoiding drawing district lines that result in a number of districts having a majority of voters likely to vote for one political party be much larger that the fraction of those voters. That does not require "multi-seat' districts and does not requiring definiing "communities of interest" as appears now in the criteria that must be followed to redistrict.

To avoid gerrymandering, add the requirement that the standard deviation of distance of registered voters in each district must be within ten percent of one another. That avoids all of the other problems, and is easily feasible given voter residence information. This should be the sole requirement for the following reasons.

I address why the other provisions are bad and should be removed or at least modified, below.

Remove the "order of priority" in the listing of criteria for redistricting. That is nonsense, vague, unenforceable, racially charged, and divisive. This provision provides no standard for "priority." Priority means first, it does not mean "weight" accorded to a criteria.

Remove criteria 4. ("To the extent practicable, districts shall reflect the diversity of political opinion in the State such that no district in the State...".) This criteria is vague, racially charged, divisive, and unenforceable. What does "reflect the diversity of political opinion" mean? That term is is undefinable.

Remove criteria 5. ("5) To the greatest extent practicable the State shall minimize the number of

districts electing 4 Representatives.") This criteria is as vague and unenforceable. In context, "the greatest extent practicable " and "minimize" are vague. If you want to minimize 5 member districts, require there be no 5 member districts. If there are exceptions, expressly state them. Such as, for example, if a state has 6 seats, then it can have one district for 5 seats. This criteria seems to be contrary to the constitutional principle that each district have a representative that represents only that districts interests.

Remove criteria 6. ("(6) To the greatest extent practicable the State shall maximize the number of districts electing 5 Representatives"). This criteria is as vague, unenforceable, and it does not serve a valid purpose. If you to maximize 6 member districts, require every election to comprise 6 districts. If there are exceptions, then expressly state them. Such as, for example, if a state has 7 seats, then it can have one district for 6 seats, and one district with 1 seat. This criteria seems to be contrary to the constitutional principle that each district have a representative that represents only that districts interests.

Remove criteria 7, as impractical, divisive, vague, and unnecessary. ("Districts shall be drawn to represent communities of interest and neighborhoods to the extent practicable after compliance with the requirements of paragraphs (1) through (6).") It is not a purpose of the Constitution to require that districts "be drawn to represent communities of interest and neighborhoods." Representing communities of interest is not what our constitution stands for. It stands for equality of voting power. Not equality of communities. This language is racially charged and divisive, and fails the purpose of neutralizing divisive and gerrymandering forces. This requirement is impractical since it requires evidence defining "communities of interest and neighborhoods" in enforcement, and those terms are unclear even with definitions, and evidence thereof what constutites admissible evidence thereof is unclear.

Avoiding gerrymandering requires avoiding drawing district lines that result in a number of districts having a majority of voters likely to vote for one political party be much larger that the fraction of those voters. That does not depend upon knowing, or attempting to know the definition, and number of voters in communities of interest. This provision that districts need to be defined by "represent communities of interest" does not directly address goal of avoiding gerrymandering and is otherwise nonsensical, vague and divisive.

Path and filename:
Y:\Pubs\articles\How to Fix the Fair Representation Act (HR 4632).wpd