

**The original documents are located in Box D18, folder “Republican Mayors Conference, St. Louis, MO, May 31, 1965” of the Ford Congressional Papers: Press Secretary and Speech File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.**

### **Copyright Notice**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. The Council donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

From the desk of

*William B. Prendergast*

*June 9*

*This is a suggestion.*

*The proposal on Congressional  
redistricting may seem startling.*

*I'd like to discuss it with you.*

*It would make news.*

*WBP*



May 26, 1965

DRAFT OF SPEECH - HONORABLE GERALD R. FORD  
AT REPUBLICAN MAYORS CONFERENCE IN ST. LOUIS  
May 31, 1965

There are two distinct purposes behind the trip that other House Republican leaders and I have made to be with you here in St. Louis.

One reason is our need and desire for an exchange of views with you on urban area problems. Since we in the Congress are legislating for a nation that is overwhelmingly urban, we need the first-hand information that you can provide on the difficult problems which you have to deal with as Mayors of our large cities. We are turning to you for expert guidance so that we may do our job better as Members of the Congress.

In his address to the Conference this morning, my colleague, Clark MacGregor, offered some observations on handling urban area problems as seen from the vantage point of the Congress. He made some suggestions for improvements in the practices of the national government in its efforts to assist you in meeting these problems. I heartily concur in the observations and the suggestions that Mr. MacGregor has made.

In your session this afternoon my colleagues listened with profit to what is on your minds. Out of this meeting has come the kind of information which will enable us to play a more helpful role in dealing with urban problems in the future.

The second reason for this gathering is, frankly, political. This afternoon and this evening we Republicans of the House of Representatives have been meeting with Republican Mayors. At such meetings the strengthening of the Republican Party - that is to say, making the Republican Party a more effective agency for the service of the general welfare - is a major objective.

The results of the 1964 election have left the future of the two Parties in the United States in grave <sup>doubt</sup> ~~depth~~. I believe that one Party monopoly is bad - not only for the <sup>74</sup> Minority Party, but bad for all citizens. Effective competition by two strong Parties in politics, like competition in business, means more efficient government, greater heed to the needs and desires of the citizens, and progress in overcoming problems. Two Party competition at the national level can exist only if two strong Parties exist throughout the nation at the local level. You and I have a common interest that transcends our interest in getting re-elected in working to reinvigorate the Republican Party and to expand its ranks.

The area of chronic <sup>Republican</sup> weakness has been our cities. In 1960 the Republican candidate for the Presidency was defeated in the nation because he was overwhelmed in a few big cities. In 1964 the Republican Presidential ticket was overwhelmed almost everywhere -- but again its greatest weakness was in the big cities.

The pattern of the decline of the Republican Party shown in the election returns of our major cities in the last three Presidential elections is distressing. But if this Republican Party is ever to make a come-back it must face the bitter fact of its desperate situation in the cities, and it must act to change things.

Let me cite three figures for you which illustrate my point. In 36 cities (the largest cities in the 1950 census), President Eisenhower got 7 million votes in 1956. Mr. Nixon got 5½ million in 1960 and Barry Goldwater got 4,200,000 votes in 1964. In these cities collectively, Eisenhower received 51% of the vote in 1956; Goldwater got 31% in the most recent Presidential election.



Yet there is another side of the picture which is somewhat more encouraging. In 1964 Republican candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives and for State and local offices, generally ran well ahead of the Presidential ticket. This was true particularly in the cities. In the House of Representatives Republicans were elected from Districts located wholly or in part in such cities as New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Omaha, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix, Birmingham, <sup>Pittsburgh, Seattle,</sup> and others.

Your presence here is further evidence that the cities of the nation are not inhospitable territory for all Republicans. The fact that you have been elected as the chief executive of your city gives you an important part to play in the process of rebuilding our Party. Anyone who knows how to win in a city deserves a place of special honor in ~~Republican~~ <sup>The</sup> ranks *of Republican leaders.*

I need not tell this audience what needs to be done. A plan of action, which incidentally was never adequately implemented, was offered by Ray Bliss in 1961, known popularly as the "Big City Report." I think it is time to take this Report off the shelves, dust it off, and begin following its advice. And I shall urge Mr. Bliss, now that he is in a better position to translate his advice into action, to begin to do so. Any effort of this kind will need the full support of Republican Mayors if it is to be successful.

Representative government in the United States is undergoing a change of great significance because of the Supreme Court's enunciation of the one man, one vote <sup>principle.</sup> ~~plan~~ The change is one which I welcome for the national House of Representatives. A principle is involved here so important as to override all others ~~under~~ considerations. The national House of Representatives should be composed of members representing districts relatively equal in population.



State legislative bodies in all parts of the nation have too long engaged in the practice of drawing Congressional district boundaries as though the fortunes of a political Party ~~are~~ <sup>are of</sup> for an individual office holder ~~or~~ <sup>—</sup> or would-be office holder ~~is~~ <sup>—</sup> ~~are power of~~ <sup>were the dominant</sup> consideration. The process of determining such boundaries must be done henceforth with the recognition that the interests of citizens must be overriding. The gerrymander is an infringement on the citizens' right to vote. Unfair Congressional districting deprives some citizens of their right to choose their representatives just as effectively as do the poll tax, unreasonable literacy and residence requirements, ballot stealing, or any of the other devices that ~~are condemned as violations of~~ <sup>violate</sup> the most basic civil right.

It seems to me almost necessary that ~~the~~ <sup>state legislative bodies</sup> process of Congressional districting be ~~transferred~~ <sup>transferred</sup> from State legislative bodies ~~and delegated~~ to impartial tribunals if justice is to be achieved. Redistricting by State legislatures almost inevitably involves the placing of Party advantage or individual advantage before the interest of the citizens in equitable representation.

As I have said, I believe that this is a matter on which principle must govern. I do not believe, however, that Republicans have anything to fear from the changes which the application of the one man, one vote principle will bring in the House of Representatives. Republicans have been getting the short end of the stick under Congressional districting arrangements in the recent past. How badly the Republican Party has fared is apparent when ~~you consider the~~ <sup>is compared</sup> share of the vote which Republican candidates have received <sup>is compared</sup> with the share of the House seats which Republicans have won.

To take the two most recent examples, in 1962 Republican candidates for the House of Representatives received 48 per cent of the vote cast for the House



but won only 40 percent of the seats. In 1964 Republican House candidates received 43 percent of the vote, but the Republicans occupied only <sup>32</sup>~~23~~ percent of the seats of the House of Representatives.

The reason for this disparity is very clear. <sup>The</sup> ~~Existing~~ Congressional districts, <sup>of 1962 and 1964 were</sup> ~~have been~~ established principally by State legislative bodies under Democratic control and they <sup>were</sup> ~~have been~~ so drawn as to provide maximum benefit for the Democrat<sup>e</sup> Party.



Proposed speech #1

(you have original)

May 26, 1965

DRAFT OF SPEECH - HONORABLE GERALD R. FORD  
AT REPUBLICAN MAYORS CONFERENCE IN ST. LOUIS

May 31, 1965

There are two distinct purposes behind the trip that other House Republican leaders and I have made to be with you here in St. Louis.

One reason is our need and desire for an exchange of views with you on urban area problems. Since we in the Congress are legislating for a nation that is overwhelmingly urban, we need the first-hand information that you can provide on the difficult problems which you have to deal with as Mayors of our large cities. We are turning to you for expert guidance so that we may do our job better as Members of the Congress.

In his address to the Conference this morning, my colleague, Clark MacGregor, offered some observations on handling urban area problems as seen from the vantage point of the Congress. He made some suggestions for improvements in the practices of the national government in its efforts to assist you in meeting these problems. I heartily concur in the observations and the suggestions that Mr. MacGregor has made.

In your session this afternoon my colleagues listened with profit to what is on your minds. Out of this meeting has come the kind of information which will enable us to play a more helpful role in dealing with urban problems in the future.

The second reason for this gathering is, frankly, political. This afternoon and this evening we Republicans of the House of Representatives have been meeting with Republican Mayors. At such meetings the strengthening of the Republican Party - that is to say, making the Republican Party a more effective agency for the service of the general welfare - is a major objective.





The results of the 1964 election have left the future of the two Parties in the United States in grave <sup>doubt</sup> ~~depth~~. I believe that one Party monopoly is bad - not only for the <sup>Minority</sup> ~~Minority~~ Party, but bad for all citizens. Effective competition by two strong Parties in politics, like competition in business, means more efficient government, greater heed to the needs and desires of the citizens, and progress in overcoming problems. Two Party competition at the national level can exist only if two strong parties exist throughout the nation at the local level. You and I have a common interest that transcends our interest in getting re-elected in working to reinvigorate the Republican Party and to expand its ranks.

The area of chronic <sup>Republican</sup> ~~weakness~~ has been our cities. In 1960 the Republican candidate for the Presidency was defeated in the nation because he was overwhelmed in a few big cities. In 1964 the Republican Presidential ticket was overwhelmed almost everywhere -- but again its greatest weakness was in the big cities.

The pattern of the decline of the Republican Party shown in the election returns of our major cities in the last three Presidential elections is distressing but if this Republican Party is ever to make a come-back it must face the bitter fact of its desperate situation in the cities and it must act to change things.

Let me cite three figures for you which illustrate my point. In 36 cities (the largest cities in the 1950 census), President Eisenhower got 7 million votes in 1956. Mr. Nixon got 5½ million in 1960 and Barry Goldwater got 4,200,000 votes in 1964. In these cities collectively, Eisenhower received 51% of the vote in 1956; Goldwater got 31% in the most recent Presidential election.



Yet there is another side of the picture which is somewhat more encouraging. In 1964 Republican candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives and for State and local offices, generally ran well ahead of the Presidential ticket. This was true particularly in the cities. In the House of Representatives Republicans were elected from Districts located wholly or in part in such cities as New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Omaha, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix, Birmingham, <sup>Pittsburgh, Seattle,</sup> and others.

Your presence here is further evidence that the cities of the nation are not inhospitable territory for all Republicans. The fact that you have been elected as the chief executive of your city gives you an important part to play in the process of rebuilding our Party. Anyone who knows how to win in a city deserves a place of special honor in ~~Republican~~<sup>the</sup> ranks of Republicans.

I need not tell this audience what needs to be done. A plan of action, which incidentally was never adequately implemented, was offered by Ray Bliss in 1961, known popularly as the "Big City Report." I think it is time to take this Report off the shelves, dust it off, and begin following its advice. And I shall urge Mr. Bliss, now that he is in a better position to translate his advice into action, to begin to do so. Any effort of this kind will need the full support of Republican Mayors if it is to be successful.

Representative government in the United States is undergoing a change of great significance because of the Supreme Court's enunciation of the one man, one vote <sup>principle</sup> ~~plan~~. The change is one which I welcome for the national House of Representatives. A principle is involved here so important as to override all others under consideration. The national House of Representatives should be composed of members representing districts relatively equal in population.



State legislative bodies in all parts of the nation have too long engaged in the practice of drawing Congressional district boundaries as though the fortunes of a political Party ~~are for~~ <sup>or of</sup> an individual office holder <sup>or</sup> or would-be office holder <sup>were the dominant</sup> ~~are for~~ consideration. The process of determining such boundaries must be done henceforth with the recognition that the interests of citizens must be overriding. <sup>Such</sup> The gerrymander is an infringement on the citizens' right to vote. Unfair Congressional districting deprives some citizens of their right to choose their representatives just as affectively as do the poll tax, unreasonable literacy and residence requirements, ballot stealing, or any of the other devices that ~~are~~ <sup>violate</sup> ~~condemned as violations of~~ the most basic civil rights.

<sup>Based on the need</sup> ~~It~~ seems to me almost <sup>a caveat be made</sup> necessary that the process of Congressional districting <sup>transferred</sup> be taken from State legislative bodies and delegated to impartial tribunals if <sup>equity</sup> justice is to be achieved. <sup>Too often the problems of equitable Congressional redistricting gets involved in</sup> Redistricting by State legislatures almost inevitably <sup>legislative manipulation</sup> involves the placing of Party advantage or individual advantage before the interest of the citizens in equitable representation. <sup>The net result - delay, a lack of logic & equity.</sup>

As I have said, I believe that this is a matter on which principle must govern. I do not believe, however, that Republicans have anything to fear from the changes which the application of the one man, one vote principle will bring in the House of Representatives. Republicans have been getting the short end of the stick under Congressional districting arrangements in the recent past. How badly the Republican Party has fared is apparent when you consider the <sup>the</sup> share of the vote which Republican candidates have received <sup>is compared</sup> with the share of the House seats which Republicans have won.

To take the two most recent examples, in 1962 Republican candidates for the House of Representatives received 48 per cent of the vote cast for the House



but won only 40 percent of the seats. In 1964 Republican House candidates received 43 percent of the vote, but the Republicans occupied only <sup>32</sup> percent of the seats of the House of Representatives.

The reason for this disparity is very clear. <sup>The</sup> Existing Congressional districts, ~~have been~~ <sup>of 1962 and 1964 were</sup> established principally by State legislative bodies under Democratic control and they ~~have been~~ <sup>were</sup> so drawn as to provide maximum benefit for the Democrat Party.



Alternative to Proposed Speech #1

Mayor's Conference

St. Louis

May 31

There are several reasons behind the trip that other House Republican leaders and I have made to be with you here in St. Louis.

One reason is our need and desire for an exchange of views with you on urban area problems. Since we in the Congress are legislating for a Nation that is overwhelmingly urban, we need first-hand information that you can provide on the difficult problems which you have to deal with as mayors of our larger cities. We are turning to you for expert guidance so that we may do our job better as Congressmen.

My colleague Clark MacGregor this morning in an address to the Conference offered some observations on handling urban area problems as seen from the vantage point of Congress. He made some suggestions for improvements in the practices of national government in its efforts to assist you in meeting these problems. I heartily concur in the observations and the suggestions that Clark has made.

In your session this afternoon my colleagues listened with profit to what is on your minds. Out of this meeting came the kind of information which will enable us to play a more helpful role in dealing with urban problems in the future.



Another reason for this gathering is--frankly--political. This afternoon and this evening we Republicans of the House have been meeting with Republican mayors. The major objective of these get-togethers is to strengthen the Republican Party as a more effective agency for the service of the general welfare.

The area of chronic Republican weakness has been our cities. The pattern of our Party's decline in the past three Presidential elections is distressing. ~~Let the Republican Party~~ In making a comeback, the Republican Party must reverse the situation in the cities by earning the respect of the electorate.

Your presence here is evidence that the cities are not inhospitable territory for all Republicans. <sup>And,</sup> <sup>(long pause)</sup> You have won election...I might add, that anyone who knows how to win deserves a place of special honor in the ranks of the Republican Party.

Extending my remarks beyond the scene of this meeting to Washington, I remind you of the speedy growth of federal power that is building king-sized government.

Centralism will be ~~used~~ <sup>checked</sup> only when national leaders refuse to encourage



the "easy way" of federal assistance, and state and local leaders assume the responsibility and privilege of local action and control. The answer is not a call to easy living, but rather an opportunity for strength through struggle.

You--with all local officials throughout the country---have the answer. When in concert, local leaders proclaim loudly and clearly "we will do the job" the first step toward checking federal centralism will be taken.

Those who disagree with this theory, who ~~insist~~ insist on either running to Washington for federal financial aid or who push for legislation that allocates handouts to cities and states, must be aware <sup>of</sup> ~~that~~ the end ~~result~~ result..... federal money means federal control.

Leaders of local governments who earnestly want to maintain responsible direction of guidance of their cities should keep in mind the danger of losing those ~~responsibilities~~ responsibilities. For you see it is quite obvious that the more extensive the federal aid the more likely and the more serious the federal dictation.

Another reason for speaking with you this evening is to discuss two major goals which must be achieved if the American Democracy is to continue to exist and to be strengthened throughout subsequent generations.



Two major goals must be achieved if the American Democracy is to continue to exist and to be strengthened throughout subsequent generations.

First, we must maintain a balance in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government as established by our Constitution.

The parallel task is to preserve the two-party system---the genius of our Democracy.

Enlarging upon the first goal, that of keeping the three branches of government in balance, I believe that if any one of them becomes too strong or too weak, the foundations of our government will crack and our freedom will be threatened.

There are disturbing signs of slow erosion in the power of the Legislative branch, a build-up of awesome strength in the executive arm, and a change from the intended direction in the Federal Judiciary.

Congress, the legislative branch, has been criticized as being too slow to react in an age of speed. Critics have described the House and Senate as being too cumbersome and too old-fashioned.

Those critics perhaps are unaware that in Congress a system of checks and balances is provided by the Constitution.

When speed is essential, Congress has proved many times that it can react with dispatch to meet a crisis in war or in peacetime, in days of economic depression or in times of glowing prosperity.

It has been said that Congress frequently makes haste slowly. However, the act of deliberate slowness is a safeguard against racing to the brink of decision. It prevents a dangerous plunge. Congress should reach its major decisions only after adequate research, thought, and exhaustive discussion.

When the balance of power in Congress is steeply tilted by an overwhelming majority in one political party, the system of checks and balances is endangered. This becomes even more serious when the executive branch is dominated by the same party.

Although the President is the chief executive and head of state for all of us, he does represent especially the views of the people who voted for him. Members of Congress, and particularly those in the House of Representatives, are closer to the Nation's citizens because they are chosen by smaller segments of the Nation.

Members of the House are elected every two years, a fact which in itself places Representatives closer to the people. Every two years a Representative must go to his constituents for a mandate to continue in office. His record is placed on the line and he must be endorsed by a majority of the voters in his district.



As in the Senate, the House is represented by nearly every major profession, national origin, and religion. Congress is a cross-section of the American people. This is your strength. It should not be lessened by an over-balance of power in the executive and judicial branches of government.

The responsibilities of Congress are clearly defined in the Constitution, and include the making of all laws which are necessary and proper for carrying out the duties and powers of government.

Under the Constitution, every statute requiring concurrence of Congress must be presented to the President before taking effect. If the chief executive rejects a proposed act, he can be over-ruled by a two-third majority vote of the Senate and the House.

It is quickly obvious that a crushing over-balance of political power in both houses of Congress and in the executive branch weakens the safeguards of the Constitution.

Reflecting on the duties and obligations of the third branch of government, it can be said that the Federal Judiciary's function is to interpret the Constitution and the laws.

There is evidence that the Judicial Branch is arbitrarily elbowing its way to new positions of authority, disregarding the wise suggestions of judicial restraint made by the late Justice Frankfurter and others.

When the Supreme Court ordered states to reapportion on the "one-man, one vote" concept, Justice Frankfurter in a dissenting opinion was critical of an assumption by the Court of "destructively novel judicial power."

"In this situation, as in others of like nature, appeal for relief does not belong here," Justice Frankfurter said. "Appeal must be made to an informed, civically militant electorate. In a democratic society like ours, relief must come through an aroused public conscience that sears the conscience of the people's representatives."

Justice Frankfurter emphasized that the Supreme "Court's authority--possessed neither of the purse nor the sword--ultimately rests on sustained public confidence in its moral sanction."

I have stressed the need to preserve the two-party system as among the major areas of concern in maintaining our structure of government.

Without any indulgence in partisanship, I am sure we can agree that a strong two-party system is bedrock assurance that our Democracy will survive, prosper, grow, and help others in the world to accept their role in the society of free nations.

A crushing over-balance of strength in either party for too long a time makes a mockery of our traditions in government, weakens and softens the voice of the people, and places control in the hands of a comparatively small majority.

These it seems to me are currently the major goals in the area of government: a sensitive balance in the legislative, executive and judicial branches, and a strong two-party system.

I urge that you help accomplish these goals not only in the national interest but for the ~~benefit~~ of each city, town, village and community in America.

If we fail, we fail the citizens of the United States.

Winning means contributing in great measure to the strength, the welfare, the health, the growth, the prosperity, the well-being of every citizen in the Republic and in the society of free world nations.

# # #



Mr. MacGregor is taking a quantity of these to St. Louis.

FOR RELEASE - TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1965

REMARKS OF HONORABLE GERALD R. FORD  
AT DINNER WITH REPUBLICAN MAYORS  
CHASE-PARK PLAZA HOTEL, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI  
MAY 31, 1965

There are two distinct purposes behind the trip that other House Republican leaders and I have made to be with you here in St. Louis.

One reason is our need and desire for an exchange of views with you on urban area problems. Since we in the Congress are legislating for a nation that is overwhelmingly urban, we need the first-hand information that you can provide on the difficult problems which you have to deal with as Mayors of our large cities. We are turning to you for expert guidance so that we may do our job better as Members of the Congress.

In his address to the Conference this morning, my colleague, Clark MacGregor, offered some observations on handling urban area problems as seen from the vantage point of the Congress. He made some suggestions for improvements in the practices of the national government in its efforts to assist you in meeting these problems. I heartily concur in the observations and the suggestions that Mr. MacGregor has made.

In your session this afternoon my colleagues listened with profit to your expressions of what is on your minds. Out of this meeting has come the kind of information which will enable us to play a more helpful role in dealing with urban problems in the future.

The second reason for this gathering is frankly political. This afternoon and this evening we Republicans of the House of Representatives have been meeting with Republican Mayors. At such meetings the strengthening of the Republican Party - that is to say, making the Republican Party a more effective agency for the service of the general welfare - is a major objective.

The results of the 1964 election have left the future of the two Parties in the United States in grave doubt. I believe that one-party monopoly is bad - not only for the minority party, but bad for all citizens. Effective competition by two strong parties in politics, like competition in business, means more efficiency, greater heed to the needs and desires of the citizens, and progress in overcoming problems. Two-party competition at the national level can exist only if two strong parties exist throughout the nation at the local level. You and I have a common interest that transcends our interest in getting re-elected in working to reinvigorate the Republican Party and to expand its ranks.

I know that some in this audience come from communities with a strong tradition of non-partisanship in local affairs. Where this tradition does not bar

Including my own of G.R. Michigan



extra-curricular partisan activity, I hope you will join in activities looking toward Republican victories in state and national contests.

The area of chronic Republican weakness has been our cities. In 1960 the Republican candidate for the Presidency was defeated in the nation because he was overwhelmed in a few big cities. In 1964 the Republican Presidential ticket was overwhelmed almost everywhere -- but again its greatest weakness was in the big cities.

Handwritten note: Sunday Evening Community

The pattern of the decline of the Republican Party shown in the election returns of our major cities in the last three Presidential elections is distressing. But if this Republican Party is ever to make a come-back it must face the bitter fact of its desperate situation in the cities and it must act to change things.

Let me cite three figures for you which illustrate my point. In 36 cities (the largest cities in the 1950 census), President Eisenhower got 7 million votes in 1956. Mr. Nixon got 5 1/2 million in 1960 and Barry Goldwater got 4,200,000 votes in 1964. In these cities collectively, Eisenhower received 51 percent of the vote in 1956; Goldwater got 31 percent in the most recent Presidential election.

Yet there is another side of the picture which is somewhat more encouraging.

In 1964 Republican candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives and for State and local offices, generally ran well ahead of the Presidential ticket. This was true particularly in the cities. In the House of Representatives Republicans were elected from Districts located wholly or partly in such cities as New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Omaha, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix, Birmingham, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and others.

Your presence here is further evidence that the cities of the nation are not inhospitable territory for all Republicans. The fact that you have been elected as the chief executive of your city gives you an important part to play in the process of rebuilding our Party. Anyone who knows how to win in a city deserves a place of special honor in the ranks of Republican leaders.

I need not tell this audience what needs to be done. A plan of action, was offered by Ray Bliss in 1961, known popularly as the "Big City Report." I think it is time to take this Report off the shelves, dust it off, and begin following its advice. And I shall urge Mr. Bliss, now that he is in a better position to translate his advice into action, to begin to do so. Any effort of this kind will need the full support of Republican Mayors if it is to be successful.

Representative government in the United States is undergoing a change of great significance because of the Supreme Court's enunciation of the one man - one vote principle. The national House of Representatives should be composed of members representing districts relatively equal in population. That is what the

Constitution intended from the beginning.

In all parts of the nation it has too long been the practice to draw Congressional district boundaries as though the fortunes of a political party or of an individual office holder - or would-be office holder - were the dominant consideration.

It seems to me that a case can be made for transferring the process of Congressional districting from State legislative bodies to impartial tribunals if equity is to be achieved. Too often the problem of equitable Congressional districting gets involved in the complexities of State legislative reapportionment. Furthermore, redistricting by State legislatures too often involves the placing of party advantage or individual advantage before the interest of the citizens in equitable representation. The net result -- delay and a lack of logic and equity.

I do not believe that Republicans have anything to fear from the changes which the establishment of districts of equal population will bring in the House of Representatives. Republicans have been getting the short end of the stick under Congressional districting arrangements in the recent past. How badly the Republican Party has fared is apparent when one compares the share of the vote which Republican candidates have received with the share of the House seats which Republicans have won.

To take the two most recent examples -- in 1962 Republican candidates for the House of Representatives received 48 percent of the vote cast for the House but won only 40 percent of the seats. In 1964 Republican House candidates received 43 percent of the vote, but the Republicans occupy only 32 percent of the seats of the House of Representatives.

If the percentage of Republican-held seats in the last Congress had matched the Republican percentage of the vote, there would have been 208 Republicans in the House of Representatives - 30 more than were actually elected. On this basis, in the present Congress there would be 187 Republicans in the House - 47 more than are actually here.

One big reason for this disparity is very clear. The Congressional districts of 1962 and 1964 were established principally by State legislative bodies under Democratic control and they were so drawn as to provide maximum benefit for the Democratic Party.

(over)



The present Congress will pass legislation requiring that Congressional districts in each state be compact and contiguous and setting the outer limits of permissible population disparity among Congressional districts. This legislation will not prohibit gerrymandering. It stops only the grossest forms of the gerrymander.

The process of determining Congressional boundaries must be done henceforth with the recognition that the interests of citizens must be overriding. The gerrymander is an infringement on the citizens' right to vote. Unfair Congressional districting deprives some citizens of their right to choose their representatives just as effectively as does the poll tax, unreasonable literacy and residence requirements, ballot stealing, or any of the other devices that violate the most basic civil right.

I do not believe that Republicans have anything to fear from the changes which the establishment of districts of equal population will bring in the House of Representatives. Republicans have been getting the short end of the stick under Congressional districting arrangements in the recent past. How badly the Republican Party has fared is apparent when one compares the share of the vote which Republican candidates have received with the share of the House seats which Republicans have won.

To take the two most recent examples -- in 1962 Republican candidates for the House of Representatives received 48 percent of the vote cast for the House but won only 40 percent of the seats. In 1964 Republican House candidates received 43 percent of the vote, but the Republicans occupy only 32 percent of the seats of the House of Representatives.

If the percentage of Republican-held seats in the last Congress had matched the Republican percentage of the vote, there would have been 208 Republicans in the House of Representatives - 30 more than were actually elected. On this basis, in the present Congress there would be 107 Republicans in the House - 47 more than are actually here.

One big reason for this disparity is very clear. The Congressional districts of 1962 and 1964 were established principally by State legislative bodies under Democratic control and they were so drawn as to provide maximum benefit for the Democratic Party.

(over)

*file copy*

REMARKS OF HONORABLE GERALD R. FORD  
AT DINNER WITH REPUBLICAN MAYORS  
CHASE-PARK PLAZA HOTEL, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI  
MAY 31, 1965

There are two distinct purposes behind the trip that other House Republican leaders and I have made to be with you here in St. Louis.

One reason is our need and desire for an exchange of views with you on urban area problems. Since we in the Congress are legislating for a nation that is overwhelmingly urban, we need the first-hand information that you can provide on the difficult problems which you have to deal with as Mayors of our large cities. We are turning to you for expert guidance so that we may do our job better as Members of the Congress.

In his address to the Conference this morning, my colleague, Clark MacGregor, offered some observations on handling urban area problems as seen from the vantage point of the Congress. He made some suggestions for improvements in the practices of the national government in its efforts to assist you in meeting these problems. I heartily concur in the observations and the suggestions that Mr. MacGregor has made.

In your session this afternoon my colleagues listened with profit to your expressions of what is on your minds. Out of this meeting has come the kind of information which will enable us to play a more helpful role in dealing with urban problems in the future.

The second reason for this gathering is frankly political. This afternoon and this evening we Republicans of the House of Representatives have been meeting with Republican Mayors. At such meetings the strengthening of the Republican Party - that is to say, making the Republican Party a more effective agency for the service of the general welfare - is a major objective.

The results of the 1964 election have left the future of the two Parties in the United States in grave doubt. I believe that one-party monopoly is bad - not only for the minority party, but bad for all citizens. Effective competition by two strong parties in politics, like competition in business, means more efficiency, greater heed to the needs and desires of the citizens, and progress in overcoming problems. Two-party competition at the national level can exist only if two strong parties exist throughout the nation at the local level. You and I have a common interest that transcends our interest in getting re-elected in working to reinvigorate the Republican Party and to expand its ranks.

I know that some in this audience come from communities with a strong tradition of non-partisanship in local affairs. Where this tradition does not bar



extra-curricular partisan activity, I hope you will join in activities looking toward Republican victories in state and national contests.

The area of chronic Republican weakness has been our cities. In 1960 the Republican candidate for the Presidency was defeated in the nation because he was overwhelmed in a few big cities. In 1964 the Republican Presidential ticket was overwhelmed almost everywhere -- but again its greatest weakness was in the big cities.

The pattern of the decline of the Republican Party shown in the election returns of our major cities in the last three Presidential elections is distressing. But if this Republican Party is ever to make a come-back it must face the bitter fact of its desperate situation in the cities and it must act to change things.

Let me cite three figures for you which illustrate my point. In 36 cities (the largest cities in the 1950 census), President Eisenhower got 7 million votes in 1956. Mr. Nixon got 5½ million in 1960 and Barry Goldwater got 4,200,000 votes in 1964. In these cities collectively, Eisenhower received 51 percent of the vote in 1956; Goldwater got 31 percent in the most recent Presidential election.

Yet there is another side of the picture which is somewhat more encouraging. In 1964 Republican candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives and for State and local offices, generally ran well ahead of the Presidential ticket. This was true particularly in the cities. In the House of Representatives Republicans were elected from Districts located wholly or partly in such cities as New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Omaha, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix, Birmingham, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and others.

Your presence here is further evidence that the cities of the nation are not inhospitable territory for all Republicans. The fact that you have been elected as the chief executive of your city gives you an important part to play in the process of rebuilding our Party. Anyone who knows how to win in a city deserves a place of special honor in the ranks of Republican leaders.

I need not tell this audience what needs to be done. A plan of action, was offered by Ray Bliss in 1961, known popularly as the "Big City Report." I think it is time to take this Report off the shelves, dust it off, and begin following its advice. And I shall urge Mr. Bliss, now that he is in a better position to translate his advice into action, to begin to do so. Any effort of this kind will need the full support of Republican Mayors if it is to be successful.

Representative government in the United States is undergoing a change of great significance because of the Supreme Court's enunciation of the one man - one vote principle. The national House of Representatives should be composed of members representing districts relatively equal in population. That is what the

ERALD R.



Constitution intended from the beginning.

In all parts of the nation it has too long been the practice to draw Congressional district boundaries as though the fortunes of a political party or of an individual office holder - or would-be office holder - were the dominant consideration.

It seems to me that a case can be made for transferring the process of Congressional districting from State legislative bodies to impartial tribunals if equity is to be achieved. Too often the problem of equitable Congressional districting gets involved in the complexities of State legislative reapportionment. Furthermore, redistricting by State legislatures too often involves the placing of party advantage or individual advantage before the interest of the citizens in equitable representation. The net result -- delay and a lack of logic and equity.

I do not believe that Republicans have anything to fear from the changes which the establishment of districts of equal population will bring in the House of Representatives. Republicans have been getting the short end of the stick under Congressional districting arrangements in the recent past. How badly the Republican Party has fared is apparent when one compares the share of the vote which Republican candidates have received with the share of the House seats which Republicans have won.

To take the two most recent examples -- in 1962 Republican candidates for the House of Representatives received 48 percent of the vote cast for the House but won only 40 percent of the seats. In 1964 Republican House candidates received 43 percent of the vote, but the Republicans occupy only 32 percent of the seats of the House of Representatives.

If the percentage of Republican-held seats in the last Congress had matched the Republican percentage of the vote, there would have been 208 Republicans in the House of Representatives - 30 more than were actually elected. On this basis, in the present Congress there would be 137 Republicans in the House - 47 more than are actually here.

One big reason for this disparity is very clear. The Congressional districts of 1952 and 1964 were established principally by State legislative bodies under Democratic control and they were so drawn as to provide maximum benefit for the Democratic Party.