

Thank you, Chairman Grove, and members of the committee for the opportunity to testify today.

I am Jim Greenwood. I am currently with the DLA Piper law firm and my wife, and I reside in Upper Makefield Township in Bucks County. From 2005 through 2020 I served as the President and CEO of the Biotechnology Innovation Organization, the trade association for more than a thousand biopharmaceutical companies. From 1993 through 2005 I represented what was then the 8th Congressional district comprised of all of Bucks County and portions of Montgomery County and Philadelphia. I served in the Pennsylvania Senate from 1987 to 1993 and in the Pennsylvania House from 1981 to 1987. I am a Republican.

In 1991, I announced my intention to run for Congress. I was challenging Democrat incumbent, Peter Kostmayer, who had been elected in 1976. I had been the campaign manager for the Republican candidate that year. Also, in 1991 Democrat State Representative Paul McHale announced his intention to challenge Republican incumbent Congressman, Don Ritter, who had been elected to represent the Lehigh Valley district just to the north of Bucks County in 1979. In 1991 was the year that the Congressional districts were to be redrawn to reflect the 1990 census results.

Congressmen Kostmayer and Ritter were sufficiently threatened by McHale and me that they collaborated to devise a gerrymander that would divide their two districts east and west, instead of north and south. Had they succeeded, they would have created for themselves districts that put many of Ritter's Democrats into Kostmayer's district and many of Kostmayer's Republicans into Ritter's. The gerrymander would not have benefitted their constituents at all, splitting asunder the Bucks County and the Lehigh-Northampton County communities.

The problem Kostmayer and Ritter had was that their challengers, Representative McHale, and I were serving in the legislature and thus

positioned to frustrate their scheme. We kept the districts much as they were, and we each defeated the incumbent.

Ten years later I was the incumbent during the 2001 redistricting process. And there I was in Harrisburg staring over the Republican staff's shoulders pouring over their computer screens trying to figure out how to keep my district as safe for my re-election as possible – in this case by getting Philadelphia Democrat precincts out and replacing them with Republican precincts from Montgomery County. In neither of these cases was the goal to benefit the constituents, but rather to increase the likelihood of my re-election. What I was engaged in and what Congressmen Kostmayer and Ritter attempted was gerrymandering, plain and simple and it is the normal behavior of incumbents across the country.

In the 2020 General election more seats were contested than had been since 1920 – 415 of 435 – yet only 13 incumbents were defeated – all Democrats. It's no wonder that so few incumbents lost their elections. In the 1980s and 90s there were on average about 150 toss-up races for House seats, meaning the candidates' polling numbers were close enough that the election could have swung either way. In recent years there have been no more than 40. The Cook political report analyzes the nation's congressional districts and assigns a Partisan Voter Index or PVI to each. In 1997 165 districts had PVI scores that were within the national average of plus or minus 5% of either party. By 2016 that number had been reduced to 72. More than half of the House seats have nine or more percent of voters registered in one party than the other. In these overwhelmingly lopsided districts, when there is any real competition, it is in the Primary elections – not the General.

This has two effects. First, people who aspire to serve in Congress in these lopsided districts have no viable choice but to challenge the incumbent in the Primary. Knowing that the turnout in Primaries is generally low and consists largely of the most partisan and activist voters, Republican challengers often try to run to the right of the incumbent and Democrats

to the left of the incumbent. That's how House Republican Majority Leader, Eric Cantor, lost his Virginia seat in the Primary to an unknown Tea Party candidate in 2014 and how House Democrat Caucus Chair Joe Crowley lost the New York Primary to Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez in 2018. The overall result is further polarization in Congress which is increasingly composed of far right and far left Members. It also results in incumbents being unwilling to compromise with the other party for fear of making themselves ideologically "impure" and vulnerable to Primary challengers. And that leads to the worsening paralysis of the Congress and our nation's inability to address critical challenges.

The second impact is that incumbents with overwhelming registration leads don't feel threatened in the General Election and thus have no need or incentive to move toward the center to keep their seats. Again, more ideological extremism, polarization, and government paralysis.

Gerrymandering also leads to public cynicism as the voters observe another example of politicians scratching each other's backs, rather than working to serve the public. Voter turnout declines and Members of Congress retire out of frustration.

Our Founding Fathers worried about the danger of political parties and partisanship. In his Farewell Address George Washington said, "Over the decades the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it." We've long since tolerated and, indeed, embraced political parties. During my 24 years in elective office, I fought hard to win my elections and to help gain and retain Republican majorities in the Pennsylvania House and Senate and in Congress.

But the real value of parties is not to simply divide us into red and blue teams battling for power, but rather for Americans to associate with other citizens who share their basic values and beliefs and to engage in the intellectual debates learning from the differences in perspective born of our varying professions, our religions, our life experiences, and our

circumstances. When candidates are elected by winning these debates, rather than having gerrymandered their way to victory, the political process attracts and rewards those who do their homework, master the facts, and have the intelligence to persuade the voters to their point of view. As is the case wherever competition is stifled, the quality of outcome is diminished. Where competition is encouraged, the product is excellence.

I'm a self-proclaimed centrist – not because I fail to steadfastly adhere to a set of principles, but because it has been my experience that the truth usually lies closer to the middle than to the extremes. When far too few Congressional contests include candidates from each party who have a chance to prevail by winning the issue debates, we sacrifice the opportunity to sharpen our thinking and to be convinced by factual arguments.

As I illustrated in my opening, I fully understand that political parties want to use whatever leverage they have to protect their incumbents and to defeat candidates of the other party. I know that arena well.

So, my recommendation to you is to take the long view. Rather than drawing Congressional districts designed so that the politicians choose their constituents, where you can draw truly competitive districts, so the constituents choose their elected representatives. Clearly, given the geographic distribution of Republican and Democrats in Pennsylvania, not all districts can be drawn to be competitive in General elections. But in areas where voters of the two major parties are more evenly balanced, I urge you to resist the political pressure to undo that balance by manipulating the Congressional district boundaries to artificially favor one party over the other. Bucks County's 1st district is a perfect example of a swing district that should not be so divided.

True patriotic leaders put the long-term strength of our nation ahead of short-term partisan issues. Martin Luther King said. "It's time for political leaders across the ideological spectrum to realize that, while partisanship is

understandable, hyper-partisanship is destructive to our country. We need more visionary leaders who will earnestly strive for bipartisanship and finding policy solutions that can move America forward.”

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to share my views.