



# **Puerto Rican Statehood: Effects on House Apportionment**

**Royce Crocker**  
Specialist in American National Government

March 16, 2011

**Congressional Research Service**

7-5700

[www.crs.gov](http://www.crs.gov)

R41113

## Summary

For years, the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have been involved in discussions relating to changing the political status of Puerto Rico from a commonwealth of the United States to either the 51<sup>st</sup> state or an independent nation, or maintaining the status quo as a commonwealth.

In the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress, H.R. 2499, introduced by Representative Pedro Pierluisi, would have established procedures to determine Puerto Rico's political status. It would have authorized a two-stage plebiscite in Puerto Rico to reconsider the status issue. H.R. 2499 was similar to H.R. 900 as introduced in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress. A possible outcome of this process is Puerto Rican statehood.

Proposals to change Puerto Rico's governmental relationship with the United States from a commonwealth to some other model raise many political, social, and economic issues. This report focuses exclusively on what impact adding a new state that is more populous than 22 of the existing 50 states would have on representation in the House of Representatives.

Statehood for Puerto Rico would likely cause Congress to explore whether the current limit of 435 seats in the House of Representatives should be changed. If Puerto Rico had been a state when the 2010 census was taken, it would have been entitled to five Representatives based on its 2010 census population of 3.7 million residents.

If the House were faced with the addition of five new Representatives, it could accommodate them either by expanding the size of the House or adhering to the current 435-seat statutory limit, which would reduce the number of Representatives in other states.

## **Contents**

Introduction and Background .....	1
Apportionment Options When Admitting New States .....	1
Congressional Precedent .....	1
Puerto Rican Statehood Apportionment Options .....	5
House Apportionment if Puerto Rico Became a State, Post-2010 .....	5
Potential Impact of Puerto Rican Statehood on the 2010 Apportionment .....	6
Increasing the Size of the House and the Tradition of a 435-Seat House.....	10

## **Tables**

Table 1. Representatives Under Each Apportionment.....	2
Table 2. Apportionment of Representatives to the U.S. House of Representatives Using 2010 Census Apportionment Population: The 50 States and Puerto Rico.....	7

## **Contacts**

Author Contact Information .....	11
----------------------------------	----

## Introduction and Background

In the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress, H.R. 2499, introduced by Representative Pedro Pierluisi, would have established procedures to determine Puerto Rico's political status. It would have authorized a two-stage plebiscite in Puerto Rico to reconsider the status issue. H.R. 2499 was similar to H.R. 900 as introduced in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress. A possible outcome of this process is Puerto Rican statehood.

If Puerto Rico's citizens vote in favor of statehood in the series of plebiscites as outlined in H.R. 2499, then Puerto Rico would, most likely, be entitled to five Representatives in the House of Representatives as well as two United States Senators. If the size of the House remains fixed at the legally mandated 435-seat limit, then five states would likely have one fewer Representative than they would have had if Puerto Rico had not become a state. Another option that the House could choose, given the entrance of another state, is to increase the size of the House.

## Apportionment Options When Admitting New States

### Congressional Precedent

General congressional practice when admitting new states to the union has been to increase the size of the House, either permanently or temporarily, to accommodate the new states. New states usually resulted in additions to the size of the House in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. The exceptions to this general rule occurred when states were formed from other states (Maine, Kentucky, and West Virginia). These states' Representatives came from the allocations of Representatives of the states from which the new ones had been formed.<sup>1</sup>

When Alaska and Hawaii were admitted in 1959 and 1960 the House size was temporarily increased to 437. This modern precedent differed from the state admission acts passed following the censuses in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, which provided that new states' representation would be added to the apportionment totals. **Table 1** lists the number of seats each state has received after each census, and the notes show the initial seat assignments to states admitted between censuses.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a general discussion of the history of admitting states to the union, see CRS Report 98-702 GOV, *Statehood Process of the Fifty States*, by Garrine P. Laney (out-of-print, available from the author upon request).

Table I. Representatives Under Each Apportionment  
1789-2010

ST	1789	1790	1800	1810	1820	1830	1840	1850	1860	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010
AL	NA	NA	NA	1	3	5	7	7	6	8	8	9	9	10	10	9	9	9	8	7	7	7	7	7
AK	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
AZ	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	2	2	3	4	5	6	8	9
AR	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7	7	7	7	6	4	4	4	4	4	4
CA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	3	4	6	7	8	11	11	20	23	30	38	43	45	52	53	53
CO	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	6	6	7	7
CT	5	7	7	7	6	6	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5
DE	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
FL	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	4	4	5	6	8	12	15	19	23	25	27
GA	3	2	4	6	7	9	8	8	7	9	10	11	11	12	12	10	10	10	10	10	10	11	13	14
HI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
ID	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
IL	NA	NA	NA	1	1	3	7	9	14	19	20	22	25	27	27	27	26	25	24	24	22	20	19	18
IN	NA	NA	NA	1	3	7	10	11	11	13	13	13	13	13	13	12	11	11	11	11	10	10	9	9
IA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	6	9	11	11	11	11	11	9	8	8	7	6	6	5	5	4
KS	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	3	7	8	8	8	8	7	6	6	5	5	5	4	4	4
KY	NA	2	6	10	12	13	10	10	9	10	11	11	11	11	11	9	9	8	7	7	7	6	6	6
LA	NA	NA	NA	1	3	3	4	4	5	6	6	6	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	6
ME	NA	NA	NA	NA	7	8	7	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
MD	6	8	9	9	9	8	6	6	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	8	8	8	8	8	8
MA	8	14	17	20	13	12	10	11	10	11	12	13	14	16	16	15	14	14	12	12	11	10	10	9
MI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	3	4	6	9	11	12	12	13	13	17	17	18	19	19	18	16	15	14
MN	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	3	5	7	9	10	10	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8
MS	NA	NA	NA	1	1	2	4	5	5	6	7	7	8	8	8	7	7	6	5	5	5	5	4	4

*Puerto Rican Statehood: Effects on House Apportionment*

ST	1789	1790	1800	1810	1820	1830	1840	1850	1860	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010
MO	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	5	7	9	13	14	15	16	16	16	13	13	11	10	10	9	9	9	8
MT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
NE	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	3	6	6	6	6	5	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
NV	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	4
NH	3	4	5	6	6	5	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
NJ	4	5	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	7	7	8	10	12	12	14	14	14	15	15	14	13	13	12
NM	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
NY	6	10	17	27	34	40	34	33	31	33	33	34	37	43	43	45	45	43	41	39	34	31	29	27
NC	5	10	12	13	13	13	9	8	7	8	9	9	10	10	10	11	12	12	11	11	11	12	13	13
ND	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
OH	NA	NA	1	6	14	19	21	21	19	20	21	21	21	22	22	24	23	23	24	23	21	19	18	16
OK	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	8	8	9	8	6	6	6	6	6	5	5
OR	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5
PA	8	13	18	23	26	28	24	25	24	27	28	30	32	36	36	34	33	30	27	25	23	21	19	18
RI	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
SC	5	6	8	9	9	9	7	6	4	5	7	7	7	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7
SD	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
TN	NA	1	3	6	9	13	11	10	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	10	9	9	8	9	9	9	9
TX	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	4	6	11	13	16	18	18	21	21	22	23	24	27	30	32	36
UT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	4
VT	NA	2	4	6	5	5	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
VA	10	19	22	23	22	21	15	13	11	9	10	10	10	10	10	9	9	10	10	10	10	11	11	11
WA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	2	3	5	5	6	6	7	7	7	8	9	9	10
WV	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	4	4	5	6	6	6	6	6	5	4	4	3	3	3
WI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	3	6	8	9	10	11	11	11	10	10	10	10	9	9	9	8	8
WY	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>US</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>435</b>

**Source:** Produced by author.

**Notes:** Initial seat assignments to states admitted between censuses: After the 1790 census—Kentucky (2, from Virginia); after the 1800 census—Tennessee (1); after the 1810 census—Ohio (1); after the 1820 census—Alabama, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, (1 each), Maine (7, from Massachusetts), Mississippi (1); after the 1830 census—none; after the 1840 census—Arkansas, Michigan, (1 each); after the 1850 census—Oregon (1), Minnesota (2); after the 1860 census—Nevada (1), Nebraska (1), West Virginia (3, from Virginia); after the 1870 census—Colorado (1); after the 1880 census—Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, Washington, Wyoming, (1 each), South Dakota (2); after the 1890 census—Utah (1); after the 1900 census—Oklahoma (5); after the 1910 census—Arizona, New Mexico, (1 each); after the 1950 census—Alaska, Hawaii, (1 each).

The apportionment act of 1911 anticipated the admission of Arizona and New Mexico by providing for an increase in the House size from 433 to 435 if the states were admitted. And, as noted above, the House size was temporarily increased to 437 to accommodate Alaska and Hawaii in 1960.

In 1961, when the President reported the 1960 census results and the resulting reapportionment of seats in the reestablished 435-seat House, Alaska was entitled to one seat, and Hawaii two seats. Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Missouri each received one less seat than they would have if the House size had been increased to 438 (as was proposed by H.R. 10264, in 1962).

## **Puerto Rican Statehood Apportionment Options**

If Puerto Rico were admitted to statehood between censuses, Congress would have at least three options for handling the five Representatives the new state would be entitled to under the current apportionment formula using the 2010 apportionment figures: (1) subtract seats from states that would have lost them if Puerto Rico had been admitted before the previous census; (2) temporarily increase the size of the House until the next census; or (3) permanently increase the size of the House.

The first option, subtracting seats from other states, has only been done by Congress when new states were formed from existing states. If Puerto Rico were to be given statehood after 2012, then this would require the losing states to redraw the new, 2012 district boundaries in their states to account for these losses. The second option, temporarily increasing the House size, has only been done once, in the Alaska and Hawaii precedent. The third option, permanently increasing the House size (probably to 440), was the procedure commonly used in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

## **House Apportionment If Puerto Rico Became a State, Post-2010**

What would the apportionment of the House of Representatives look like if Puerto Rico were to become the 51<sup>st</sup> state? The most recent population figures for the states are from the 2010 Census and are displayed in **Table 2**, below.<sup>2</sup>

One complicating factor concerns the overseas military and federal employees and their dependents. The state figures used in apportioning seats in the House of Representatives are based on the sum of the each state's resident population and the number of persons included in the overseas military and federal employees and their dependents who designate the state as their state of residency (i.e., where they would return to when their tour of duty was completed). The total figure for this number in the 2010 apportionment process was 1,039,648 for all 50 states. However, as Puerto Rico was not a state and was not apportioned seats based on its population,

---

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, "A New Portrait of America, First 2010 Census Results," <http://2010.census.gov/news/press-kits/apportionment/apport.html>, Tables 1-3.



no figure for the overseas population for Puerto Rico was produced. Consequently, only the total 2010 resident population for Puerto Rico is used in **Table 2**.<sup>3</sup>

## **Potential Impact of Puerto Rican Statehood on the 2010 Apportionment**

**Table 2** shows two comparisons. First, the 2010 apportionment of the House of Representatives is shown both without and with Puerto Rico's resident population included. As can be seen, when Puerto Rico is included as the 51<sup>st</sup> state, it is allocated five seats in the House of Representatives. Without Puerto Rican statehood, California, Florida, Minnesota, Texas, and Washington would have been allocated the last five seats rather than Puerto Rico. It is fairly clear that with a population of almost 4 million people, Puerto Rico's statehood would have an impact on the apportionment process unless the size of the House is increased.

---

<sup>3</sup> CRS Report R41584, *House Apportionment 2010: States Gaining, Losing, and on the Margin*, by Royce Crocker. An estimate of the overseas population for Puerto Rico was derived and added to Puerto Rico's resident population. This new, larger population was used to determine the apportionment of seats for Puerto Rico. It had no impact. Puerto Rico still would have received five seats.

**Table 2. Apportionment of Representatives to the U.S. House of Representatives Using 2010 Census Apportionment Population: The 50 States and Puerto Rico**

State	2010 Apportionment Population Excluding PR	2012 Seats	2010 Apportionment Population Including PR	2012 Seats with Puerto Rico	Gains & Losses due to Puerto Rico	2000 Apportionment Population	Current Seats	Gains & Losses Relative to 2000 Not Including PR	Gains & Losses Relative to 2000 Including PR
Alabama	4,802,982	7	4,802,982	7	0	4,461,130	7	0	0
Alaska	721,523	1	721,523	1	0	628,933	1	0	0
Arizona	6,412,700	9	6,412,700	9	0	5,140,683	8	1	1
Arkansas	2,926,229	4	2,926,229	4	0	2,679,733	4	0	0
California	37,341,989	53	37,341,989	52	-1	33,930,798	53	0	-1
Colorado	5,044,930	7	5,044,930	7	0	4,311,882	7	0	0
Connecticut	3,581,628	5	3,581,628	5	0	3,409,535	5	0	0
Delaware	900,877	1	900,877	1	0	785,068	1	0	0
Florida	18,900,773	27	18,900,773	26	-1	16,028,890	25	2	1
Georgia	9,727,566	14	9,727,566	14	0	8,206,975	13	1	1
Hawaii	1,366,862	2	1,366,862	2	0	1,216,642	2	0	0
Idaho	1,573,499	2	1,573,499	2	0	1,297,274	2	0	0
Illinois	12,864,380	18	12,864,380	18	0	12,439,042	19	-1	-1
Indiana	6,501,582	9	6,501,582	9	0	6,090,782	9	0	0
Iowa	3,053,787	4	3,053,787	4	0	2,931,923	5	-1	-1
Kansas	2,863,813	4	2,863,813	4	0	2,693,824	4	0	0
Kentucky	4,350,606	6	4,350,606	6	0	4,049,431	6	0	0
Louisiana	4,553,962	6	4,553,962	6	0	4,480,271	7	-1	-1
Maine	1,333,074	2	1,333,074	2	0	1,277,731	2	0	0
Maryland	5,789,929	8	5,789,929	8	0	5,307,886	8	0	0

State	2010 Apportionment Population Excluding PR	2012 Seats	2010 Apportionment Population Including PR	2012 Seats with Puerto Rico	Gains & Losses due to Puerto Rico	2000 Apportionment Population	Current Seats	Gains & Losses Relative to 2000 Not Including PR	Gains & Losses Relative to 2000 Including PR
Massachusetts	6,559,644	9	6,559,644	9	0	6,355,568	10	-1	-1
Michigan	9,911,626	14	9,911,626	14	0	9,955,829	15	-1	-1
Minnesota	5,314,879	8	5,314,879	7	-1	4,925,670	8	0	-1
Mississippi	2,978,240	4	2,978,240	4	0	2,852,927	4	0	0
Missouri	6,011,478	8	6,011,478	8	0	5,606,260	9	-1	-1
Montana	994,416	1	994,416	1	0	905,316	1	0	0
Nebraska	1,831,825	3	1,831,825	3	0	1,715,369	3	0	0
Nevada	2,709,432	4	2,709,432	4	0	2,002,032	3	1	1
New Hampshire	1,321,445	2	1,321,445	2	0	1,238,415	2	0	0
New Jersey	8,807,501	12	8,807,501	12	0	8,424,354	13	-1	-1
New Mexico	2,067,273	3	2,067,273	3	0	1,823,821	3	0	0
New York	19,421,055	27	19,421,055	27	0	19,004,973	29	-2	-2
North Carolina	9,565,781	13	9,565,781	13	0	8,067,673	13	0	0
North Dakota	675,905	1	675,905	1	0	643,756	1	0	0
Ohio	11,568,495	16	11,568,495	16	0	11,374,540	18	-2	-2
Oklahoma	3,764,882	5	3,764,882	5	0	3,458,819	5	0	0
Oregon	3,848,606	5	3,848,606	5	0	3,428,543	5	0	0
Pennsylvania	12,734,905	18	12,734,905	18	0	12,300,670	19	-1	-1
Rhode Island	1,055,247	2	1,055,247	2	0	1,049,662	2	0	0
South Carolina	4,645,975	7	4,645,975	7	0	4,025,061	6	1	1
South Dakota	819,761	1	819,761	1	0	756,874	1	0	0
Tennessee	6,375,431	9	6,375,431	9	0	5,700,037	9	0	0
Texas	25,268,418	36	25,268,418	35	-1	20,903,994	32	4	3

State	2010 Apportionment Population Excluding PR	2012 Seats	2010 Apportionment Population Including PR	2012 Seats with Puerto Rico	Gains & Losses due to Puerto Rico	2000 Apportionment Population	Current Seats	Gains & Losses Relative to 2000 Not Including PR	Gains & Losses Relative to 2000 Including PR
Utah	2,770,765	4	2,770,765	4	0	2,236,714	3	1	1
Vermont	630,337	1	630,337	1	0	609,890	1	0	0
Virginia	8,037,736	11	8,037,736	11	0	7,100,702	11	0	0
Washington	6,753,369	10	6,753,369	9	-1	5,908,684	9	1	0
West Virginia	1,859,815	3	1,859,815	3	0	1,813,077	3	0	0
Wisconsin	5,698,230	8	5,698,230	8	0	5,371,210	8	0	0
Wyoming	568,300	1	568,300	1	0	495,304	1	0	0
Puerto Rico			3,725,789	5	5				5
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>309,183,463</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>312,909,252</b>	<b>435</b>		<b>281,424,177</b>	<b>435</b>		

**Source:** U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, "A New Portrait of America, First 2010 Census Results," <http://2010.census.gov/news/press-kits/apportionment/apport.html>, Tables 1-3. All apportionment calculations were performed by the author.

The second comparison, and the more involved, is between the current allocation of seats based on the 2000 Census population and the allocation of the 2012 seats based on the, just released, 2010 apportionment population figures. Examining the “winners” and “losers” with respect to the change between 2000 and 2010, several points are worth noting.

First, Arizona, Georgia, Nevada, South Carolina and Utah will all gain a seat relative to the current allocation, regardless of the statehood status of Puerto Rico.

Second, Florida will gain two seats relative to its current status, but if Puerto Rico became a state Florida would only gain one seat. Similarly, Texas will gain four seats relative to its current status, but would only gain three seats if Puerto Rico were to become a state.

Third, Washington will gain a seat relative to its current status, but if Puerto Rico were to become a state, Washington remains at its 2000 allocation of House seats.

Fourth, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania will each lose a seat relative to their current allocation of House seats, regardless of the status of Puerto Rico. Similarly, New York and Ohio will each lose two seats relative to their current allocation, regardless of the status of Puerto Rico.

Fifth, California and Minnesota will lose a seat if Puerto Rico were to become a state, but will retain the same number of seats relative to its current allocation of House seats if Puerto Rico does not become a state.

## **Increasing the Size of the House and the Tradition of a 435-Seat House**

The strong 20<sup>th</sup> century tradition that the total number of Representatives in the House of Representatives should total 435 Members might prevent an increase in the House size should Puerto Rico be admitted to statehood.<sup>4</sup>

The U.S. Constitution (Article I, Section 2) requires that “Representatives shall be apportioned among the several states according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each state.” The requirement that districts must be apportioned *among* states means that district boundaries cannot cross state lines. The Constitution also sets a minimum size for the House of Representatives (one Representative for every state) and a maximum size for the House

---

<sup>4</sup> If Puerto Rico was to be admitted to statehood with a proviso that the Census Bureau first calculate how many seats it would have been entitled to under a 435-seat House, and then add that total to the House size for the final calculation (resulting in 440 seats), Puerto Rico would still obtain five seats; the five states that otherwise would each have lost a seat with a 435-seat House would thus retain the seats. (The fact that the same five states would regain the seats that they lost to Puerto Rico in the above scenarios would not necessarily hold in all such scenarios. It is possible that increasing the House size could change the states’ fractional shares allocated by the apportionment formula so that not all the “losing states” would necessarily regain the lost seats; other states might have greater claims. For a more complete discussion of how the apportionment formula works, please see CRS Report R41382, *The House of Representatives Apportionment Formula: An Analysis of Proposals for Change and Their Impact on States*, by Royce Crocker.

(one Representative for every 30,000 persons). Congress is free to choose a House size within these parameters by changing the relevant law.

Thus, the House size of 435 may be altered by changing statutory law rather than by enacting a constitutional amendment.<sup>5</sup> Based on the 2010 apportionment population of 309,183,463 from **Table 2** above, the House could be as large as 10,306 Representatives (based on the constitutional maximum of one Representative for every 30,000 persons). Statehood for Puerto Rico would raise the maximum to 10,430 Members.

The House size was increased in every decade except one in the 19<sup>th</sup> century to accommodate the growth of the country's population, but the permanent increases stopped after the 1910 census, when the House reached 435 Members. As noted previously, the House size was increased temporarily to 437 in 1960, to accommodate the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as states, but the total went back to 435 in 1963, with the new reapportionment following the 1960 census.

Although one cannot say for sure why the House size has not been permanently increased since the 1910 census, the arguments most often raised center on efficiency and cost. Proponents of the status quo suggest that a larger House would work less efficiently and at greater cost, due to Member and staff salaries and allowances. Proponents of increasing the House size often argue that other legislative bodies seem to work well with larger memberships, and less populous districts might give minorities greater representation in Congress. Since 1940, the average population of a congressional district has more than doubled (from 303,827 in 1940 to 710,767 in 2010).

## **Author Contact Information**

Royce Crocker  
Specialist in American National Government  
rcrocker@crs.loc.gov, 7-7871

---

<sup>5</sup> 46 Stat. 21, 26-27, as codified in 2 U.S.C. 2a(a).