

## CHAPTER FOUR

### *Dawn of a New Era*

When Democrat Jim Himes (2009-present) announced that he would challenge Chris Shays for the fourth congressional district, few analysts, including this author, believed Himes would have much of a chance against the more experienced and seasoned Republican maverick. Many predicted that the power of incumbency would likely prevail and that once again Shays would be returned to Congress. After all, Himes had neither name recognition nor the sort of political experience one would expect of a serious congressional candidate. Himes's political experience was essentially limited to his service as board chairman of the Greenwich Housing Authority and a stint on the Greenwich Board of Finance. He also served as chairman on the board of Aspira of Connecticut, a Bridgeport-based organization that assists young Latinos with educational opportunities.<sup>1</sup> Himes was not in any way a public figure, nor had he served in the Connecticut General Assembly. Yet despite a shallow political resume, Himes did bring to the table a very impressive set of professional credentials. He was a former vice president with the Wall Street investment firm Goldman Sachs. He therefore had considerable expertise regarding financial and economic policy. He left his career as a Wall Street executive to lead a non-profit organization that helped companies secure financing for affordable housing projects. He was thus very familiar with the interplay of housing and banking policy. He was a graduate of Harvard University and a former Rhodes Scholar.

Born in Peru to American parents and having lived in Latin America for the first ten years of his life, Himes was fluent in Spanish. His language proficiency would prove to be an asset when he appeared before Latino groups within the fourth district. Himes was at ease speaking in front of large audiences. He was articulate, and at 42 years of age appeared much younger and more vibrant compared to the 63-year-old Shays.<sup>2</sup> Shays's hair was thinning and had turned pure white, while Himes's hair was brown, thick, and nicely combed. In his V-neck sweater, Himes had a somewhat boyish and collegiate look about him. He also had a very attractive family which included two young daughters. The energy level and youthfulness associated with the Himes campaign contrasted rather dramatically with the campaign of Congressman Shays. Himes was the overwhelming choice of his party's convention and became the Democratic Party's official nominee after defeating Lee Whitnum in an August primary. The primary was non-competitive. Figures compiled by the Secretary of State's Office recorded Himes winning 12,260 votes to Whitnum's 1,840.

By 2008, the Iraq War had receded as a primary campaign issue in the minds of many voters. Iraq appeared to be stabilizing politically. Moreover, despite the fact that American soldiers and marines were still dying, the monthly death toll had declined. The military "surge" authorized by President Bush in 2007, which increased the number of American combat units in Iraq, had achieved its objective. The enemy "insurgents" had been neutralized and Iraqi security forces were assuming increased responsibilities. America seemed to be winning the Iraq war.

This is not to suggest, however, that the election of 2008 was devoid of a campaign issue, as the American economy in 2007, without much warning, plunged into a severe recession. Some economists described the recession as the worst in our nation's history. Thus, within the space of only two short years, the burning campaign issue across the land shifted like quicksand from Iraq to the economy. By 2008, the American economy was not only the number one issue according to voters, but the vast majority of voters were also extremely angry and unhappy with political incumbents.

Voter frustration over economic conditions was more than evident in the state of Connecticut. According to the Quinnipiac Poll released on July 1, 2008, only four months prior to the fall election, 59 percent of persons polled were either “somewhat” or “very” dissatisfied with the way things were going in the state. This was the worst dissatisfaction rate recorded by the Quinnipiac Poll since July 31, 2003. At the same time, 60 percent of persons polled indicated that they were “worse off” in 2008 compared to 2007. Forty-four percent of respondents suggested that the economy would likely become worse, 39 percent indicated that it would stay the same, while only 12 percent expressed optimism. Sixty percent of voters replied that they were worse off financially compared to the previous year, and sixty percent of respondents expressed the view that the rise in gas prices was causing a financial hardship for their family. Across the board, in 2008 the Connecticut electorate expressed great dismay and pessimism towards the economy as well as their family’s financial well-being.

In congressional districts that had grown more competitive with time, such as Connecticut’s fourth congressional district, incumbent congressmen were now ripe targets for congressional challengers. Regardless of the fact that Congressman Shays had little to do with the recession, he was nevertheless accused by Jim Himes of being part of a political establishment under whose watch the recession occurred. Moreover, Himes’s relentless criticism of Shays resonated with voters in the fourth district due to the fact so many residents in Fairfield County were (and continue to be) employed in the field of financial services. The bedroom communities of New York City located along Connecticut’s “gold coast” in lower Fairfield county are home to bankers, traders, managers of hedge funds, lawyers, and Wall Street executives, most of whom had been adversely affected by the recession. Himes, like so many Democratic challengers across the land, blamed the economic policies of President George W. Bush and the Republicans in Congress for the recession. “Change” was therefore the dominant theme in the race for the fourth district and in many congressional districts controlled by Republican incumbents. Like the 2006 campaign between Shays and Farrell,

fundraising by Shays and Himes during the 2008 election cycle far exceeded the average House race. Himes, the challenger, raised \$3.8 million while Shays, the incumbent, raised \$3.7 million. On average, the winners of House races in 2008 raised \$1.3 million.<sup>3</sup> This was not by any means a textbook contest in which the incumbent typically raised three or four times as much money compared to the challenger. The incumbent's fundraising advantage was effectively neutralized by the challenger.

A review of the two campaign finance reports reveals that both candidates depended heavily on individual contributors to finance their campaigns. Seventy-two percent of Shays's campaign funds and 78 percent of Himes's money had been generated from individual contributions. Twenty-five percent of Shays's war chest consisted of PAC contributions compared to 11 percent for Himes. With regard to personal money employed for the campaign, the figures show that Shays's campaign fund consisted of only 1 percent of his own money, while 10 percent of Himes's campaign fund was self-financed.<sup>4</sup>

Although a common impression is that Republican candidates are supported by the business community and Democrats by organized labor and "the common people," the fact of the matter is that Wall Street executives and Wall Street PACs were important contributors to both congressional campaigns. As reported by the Center for Responsive Politics, the top five contributors to Shays's campaign included persons and PACS associated with UST Inc. (\$26,500), Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu (\$25,500), JP Morgan Chase & Co. (\$23,600), New York Life Insurance (\$21,150), and Goldman Sachs (\$18,400). Himes's top five contributors included persons or PACs connected to Goldman Sachs (\$155,098), ActBlue (\$45,733), Deutsche Bank AG (\$33,550), Sullivan and Cromwell (\$25,850), and JPMorgan Chase & Co. (\$19,800). With regard to broad categories of industries that donated to both campaigns, the record shows that campaign money from individuals and PACs associated with securities and investment firms constituted the most prominent source of funding for both candidates. Shays received \$477,395 from securities and investment firms, of which \$403,075

was in the form of individual contributions and \$74,320 from PACs. Himes received \$579,454 from securities and investment companies. Individuals employed in this industry donated a total of \$569,954 to his campaign, while connected PACs contributed \$9,500. Within the fourth congressional district, the relationship between politics and Wall Street is obviously quite profound.

Throughout the fall campaign, Shays and Himes debated several times. The economy, not surprisingly, remained the principal point of contention. As in 2006, the challenger waged an offensive campaign, while the incumbent was routinely on the defensive. What was particularly intriguing and perhaps perplexing to many observers was that despite the severe recession, Shays disagreed with Himes that the American economy was in dire straits. The contrast in economic views surfaced during a debate conducted in the city of Stamford. Although Shays acknowledged the fact that the country was in a state of financial crisis due, as he put it, to "dumb lending and dumb borrowing," he nevertheless argued that the overall state of the economy was still sound. As Shays put it, "I believe with all my heart and soul that the fundamentals of the economy are in fact really strong. I think the financial sector is sick. I do not define the financial sector as the fundamentals of our country and our economy."

Himes, not surprisingly, issued a forceful rebuttal and stated that the economy in no uncertain terms was "on its knees." Himes also attributed the recession to both President Bush and Congressman Chris Shays: "None of this is an accident. It is not the result of the business cycle or of bad luck. Where we are today is the result of bad policies and bad decisions made by the Bush administration, supported by Chris Shays."<sup>5</sup> Himes would repeatedly use Shays's words regarding the state of economic affairs to portray the veteran Congressman as out of touch with reality from having worked inside the Beltway for far too long.

As the fall campaign progressed, both candidates would receive strong endorsements from nationally recognized and popular political figures. The most prominent individuals to make their presence known within the fourth district were the Democratic

Party's presidential candidate Barack Obama and New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg. Both political figures had what could best be described as "celebrity" status. On October 13, Bloomberg endorsed Shays by attending a fundraiser held in Westport at the home of Barry and Carol Asness. Speaking to the cameras outside the Asness residence, the mayor spoke in laudatory terms about Shays's sense of "rock solid" judgment and his moderate bipartisan approach to governing.<sup>6</sup> Two weeks later, on October 31, Obama delivered a 31-second radio ad in which he endorsed Himes. Obama spoke of Himes's work with a non-profit corporation, the fact that he was raised by a single mother, and that if elected to Congress he would be an effective agent for change.<sup>7</sup>

As election day approached, polling results suggested an exceptionally close race and not one political pundit could confidently predict the outcome. Of the five congressional races in the state Connecticut, the fourth district was clearly the most competitive. One could observe the fourth district contest rapidly evolving into an even race. The Sacred Heart University Poll of 400 likely voters conducted from September 22-25 indicated that 41 percent of voters expressed support for Shays and 31 percent supported the challenger. Shortly thereafter, however, the University of Connecticut Poll conducted from October 8-15 with a sample of 501 likely voters recorded a perfect tie, with 44 percent of voters for Shays and 44 percent for Himes. The SurveyUSA Poll conducted from October 13-14 generated similar findings, with 45 percent of likely voters supporting Shays, and 48 percent supporting Himes. It was apparent that undecided voters and perhaps those who were at best lukewarm supporters of the incumbent Congressman were breaking towards the challenger as election day drew near. There is an axiom in American politics, although it has never been empirically confirmed, that undecided voters eventually cast their votes for the challenger. Whether or not this is accurate, there is reason to believe that undecided voters in the fourth district supported Himes at the eleventh hour, thus determining the outcome of the election. The polls suggested such movement. On election day, Himes won 51 percent of the vote while Shays received 48 percent.

### The Presidential Election and the Fourth Congressional District

Any discussion and analysis of what transpired in the fourth congressional district during the election of 2008 must necessarily take into account the effects of the presidential election on the congressional election's final outcome. A cursory examination of voting behavior within the fourth district reveals rather convincingly that Jim Himes was the political beneficiary of Barack Obama's coattails. Had Obama not been the Democratic Party's presidential nominee and had he not been so popular in the fourth district, it is quite likely that Congressman Shays would have been reelected, albeit by a razor-thin margin.

The large voter turnout and support for Barack Obama in the fourth district's urban areas contributed in a significant way to Himes's victory. The data in table 10, which compares the 2004 and 2008 elections, clearly underscores the impact that Barack Obama had on voting behavior in the cities of Bridgeport, Norwalk, and Stamford.

Table 10  
Voter Support in Three Urban Communities  
in the Fourth Congressional District for  
Democratic Presidential and Congressional  
Candidates, 2004-2008

	Bridgeport	Norwalk	Stamford
2004			
Kerry/Edwards	26,280=70%	20,615=58%	27,588=58%
Diane Farrell	23,760=70%	17,720=53%	23,063=52%
2008			
Obama/Biden	33,978=84%	24,485=65%	31,733=64%
Jim Himes	31,276=80%	21,000=59%	27,074=57%

*Source:* Compiled by author from data archived in Office of Secretary of State, Hartford, Connecticut.

Obama's political coattails were very long in the district's three major cities, Bridgeport, Stamford, and Norwalk. Voter turnout was impressive in the three urban communities. The Secretary of State's office reported that 59 percent of registered voters cast ballots in Bridgeport, 75 percent in Norwalk, and 82 percent in Stamford. Moreover, voters in large numbers supported Obama and continued to support the Democratic ticket. Split-ticket voting in the three cities was minimal. Although voting machines have been replaced by optical scantrons and the party lever is nothing more than a distant memory, many voters in the three urban communities voted a straight Democratic ticket, as if the lever was still in existence.

To begin with, the Obama/Biden ticket did considerably better in the three cities compared to the 2004 presidential ticket of Kerry/Edwards. In each of the three communities Obama was a more popular and more widely-supported candidate compared to John Kerry. Obama received substantially more votes and a markedly higher percentage of the presidential vote compared to Kerry in each community. And how the Obama phenomenon carried over into the congressional race within the three communities is apparent when the 2004 and 2008 congressional elections are compared. As the data show, Himes benefitted to a much greater extent from Obama's presence at the top of the ticket compared to the benefit Farrell received from Kerry. Although Shays did not win any of the three communities in 2004, he was nevertheless competitive against Farrell in Norwalk and Stamford. But this was not the case in 2008. Obama's appeal effectively suppressed the viability of Shays's reelection campaign within the three urban communities. It should also be noted that Himes in 2008 was cross-endorsed by the left-leaning Working Families Party, which added to his margin of victory in each of the three cities. Collectively, the cross-endorsement netted Himes an additional 5,606 votes. Had this party fielded its own congressional candidate, Himes's margin of victory within each of the three communities would have been slightly less, but impressive nevertheless.

Within the surrounding and outlying suburban communities in the fourth congressional district, Shays was able to win every

community by at least 5-9 points, or in several cases by 10 or more points. As table 11 shows, the suburban communities in 2008 were clearly in Shays's column.

Table 11  
Voting Behavior in the Fourteen Suburban Communities  
in the Fourth Congressional District: 2008  
In Percent

Town	Shays	Himes	Victory Margin
Darien	69	29	+40
Easton	58	39	+19
Fairfield	53	46	+7
Greenwich	56	43	+13
Monroe	55	43	+12
New Canaan	68	31	+37
Oxford	52	46	+6
Redding	53	45	+8
Ridgefield	60	38	+22
Shelton (Part)	52	47	+5
Trumbull	54	45	+9
Weston	54	44	+10
Westport	53	46	+7
Wilton	58	41	+17

*Source:* Compiled by author from data archived in Office of Secretary of State, Hartford, Connecticut.

Tables 10 and 11 demonstrate rather convincingly that the surge in voter support for Barack Obama in the district's three cities was an important factor behind Jim Himes's election to Congress in 2008.

Although straight ticket voting was evident in Bridgeport, Norwalk, and Stamford, the incidence of split-ticket voting was somewhat pervasive in several of the district's suburban communities. Indeed, voters in seven of the fourteen suburban communities split their ticket between the presidential and congressional candidates. More specifically, a number of towns supported Obama for President, and then Shays for Congress.

There were no incidents of towns splitting their votes between McCain and Himes. Table 12 shows the communities in which straight or split-ticket voting occurred.

Table 12  
Straight and Split-Ticket Voting in Fourth  
Congressional District Communities: 2008

Town	Presidential	Congressional
Bridgeport	D	D
Darien	R	R
Easton	R	R
Fairfield	D	R
Greenwich	D	R
Monroe	R	R
New Canaan	R	R
Norwalk	D	D
Oxford	R	R
Redding	D	R
Ridgefield	D	R
Shelton	R	R
Stamford	D	D
Trumbull	R	R
Weston	D	R
Westport	D	R
Wilton	D	R

*Source:* Compiled by author from data archived in Office of Secretary of State, Hartford, Connecticut.

Although voters in every one of the suburban communities in the fourth district continued to support Shays's bid for reelection, the appeal of Obama at the top of the ticket was still evident. As a result of Obama's presence, Shays's margins of victory were considerably smaller in practically every suburban community compared to the previous presidential election. Table 13 compares Shays's margins of victory in 2008 with those of the the 2004 presidential election, in which John Kerry headed the Democratic ticket.

Table 13  
Shays's Margin of Victory over Democratic Opponents  
in Suburban Communities: 2004 and 2008

Town	2004	2008	Change
Darien	+43	+40	-3
Easton	+20	+19	-1
Fairfield	+12	+7	-5
Greenwich	+20	+13	-7
Monroe	+24	+12	-12
New Canaan	+40	+37	-3
Oxford	+8	+6	-2
Redding	+14	+8	-6
Ridgefield	+14	+8	-6
Shelton (part)	+18	+5	-13
Trumbull	+18	+9	-9
Weston	+2	+10	+8
Westport	-2	+7	+5
Wilton	+22	+17	-5

*Source:* Compiled by author from data archived in Office of Secretary of State, Hartford, Connecticut.

What emerges from the data is that Obama's popularity suppressed support for Shays in the suburban communities. Although Shays won the suburbs, Obama's presence at the top of the ticket definitely narrowed the gap between himself and Himes, thus accentuating the significance of the surge in the three Democratic cities.

### Himes: The Freshman Lawmaker

It should be clear that political coattails explain why Himes was elected to the United States Congress. How well he performed as a member of Congress during his first term and how well he served his constituents is, of course, a very subjective judgment and one beyond the purview of this particular work. We can, however, objectively examine what Congressman Himes achieved as a freshman member of Congress and what his ideological orientation towards policy issues appeared to be.

Following his election to Congress, Himes was appointed to two standing committees in the House of Representatives. These included the House Committee on Financial Services and the House Committee on Homeland Security. Serving on the Financial Services committee was an excellent fit for Himes in light of his professional background with Goldman Sachs. Why he was appointed to the Homeland Security Committee and what expertise he brought to this committee is not clear.

Himes's attendance record during his first term was excellent. As of July, 2010, of the 1,345 roll call votes that took place from January 6, 2009, Himes missed only 2 percent.<sup>8</sup> His attendance record during his first term was identical to that of Shays. GovTrack.us identified Himes during his first term in office as a "follower" rather than an innovator or leader of legislation. To be fair, this is to be expected of a freshman member of Congress. Indeed, few, if any, freshmen are, or can be, prominent lawmakers. Overall Himes's legislative activity during his first term was respectable. GovTrack.us identifies eight bills that he personally sponsored and one hundred and seventy-five bills that he cosponsored. Himes's eight sponsored bills included formal commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Federal Credit Union Act; a new means for financing energy conservation for public housing; a prohibition on travel visas to the U.S. for high ranking Iranian officials; the creation of sister-city relationships between cities in the U.S. and cities in Haiti; an expanded role for the U.S. Coast Guard; a limitation on taxes that states can impose on nonresident telecommuters; grants and loans to assist with "green" improvements in federal housing projects; and a competitive grant program to help with early learning of low-income children.<sup>9</sup>

How many of Himes's bills that have actually been passed into law is somewhat difficult to calculate. GovTrack.us summarizes the status of bills based on a bill's House number. For those familiar with the legislative process, it is well understood that bills once introduced into committee do have ways of becoming merged with other bills which may in fact become law. Thus, the nuances and

subtleties of lawmaking are not completely disclosed by simply tracking bills based on a bill's number. Himes's legislative accomplishments, according to his chief legislative aide, have however been more impressive than what is identified by GovTrack.us. Himes's co-sponsorship of bills, it was noted, is also something that should not be downplayed, particularly regarding his original co-sponsorship of the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act (H.R. 5019), which provides tax credits for persons who retrofit their homes with green technology. The Home Star Act passed the House of Representatives on May 6, 2010. Nevertheless, legislative committees are notorious for "killing" more than 90 percent of proposed bills. For a bill to travel beyond the committee stage of the legislative cycle is rather uncommon.

GovTrack.us currently identifies Himes as a "moderate" Democrat, although he normally receives very high ratings from liberal advocacy groups. For example, concerning the highly contentious and divisive issue of abortion, NARAL Pro-Choice America (National Association for Repeal of Abortion Laws) assigns Himes a perfect score of 100. Conversely, the National Right to Life Center gives Himes a score of 0 on this policy issue. Himes receives a rating score of 83 from the ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union), while the American Conservative Union offers a score of 4. Concerning public health policy, the American Public Health Association gives Himes a perfect score of 100. With regard to fiscal policy, the conservative National Taxpayers Union rates Himes a 10 out of 100. Regarding defense and peace issues, the liberal organization known as Peace Action rates Himes in the middle of the road with a score of 54. Environmental organizations apparently appreciate Himes's position with respect to environmental protection. The League of Conservation Voters gives Himes a perfect score of 100.

On a scale of A-F. Numbers USA, an anti-immigration organization gives Himes an A-. This is the only conservative organization that rates Himes highly. With respect to educational policy, the National Education Association assigns a grade of A to Himes. Although not every advocacy organizations has issued a rating for Congressman Himes, it is evident that most liberal

lobbying organizations appreciate his voting record on key policy issues. Conservative organizations, for the most part, are unimpressed with Congressman Himes's legislative behavior.<sup>10</sup>

During his first term of office, Himes could not under any circumstances be regarded as a maverick lawmaker who crossed the aisle on roll calls. The record shows that Himes voted with his political party in Congress 94 percent of the time.<sup>11</sup> Although Himes and four other freshman members of Congress expressed support for a spending cut in the federal budget, thus challenging the position of his party's congressional leadership, he more than often supported the major legislative initiatives of President Obama, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, and his fellow congressional Democrats during his first term of office. Himes supported his party's legislative effort concerning the economic stimulus bill as well as health care reform. Both bills were opposed by Republican lawmakers. Votes for and against were cast along party lines. Speaking to constituents during a teleconference, Himes's partisanship was apparent:

When I came into office with Obama, we were losing hundreds of thousands of jobs. Now we are not in that world. Not close to it. . . . The [\$890 billion] stimulus bill and other initiatives really helped turn things around. The stimulus [represented] the biggest federal commitment to public education. We're moving forward on an energy bill. We are very proud of the health-care reform. It's not perfect but reality is we took an historic step forward. The president has done some terrific things, lifting the stem-cell ban, reversing the travel ban on people with HIV. . . . It's a more humane and just world.<sup>12</sup>

### *Himes's Political Vulnerability*

Freshman members of Congress who seek reelection, as practically all do, are often vulnerable to a serious political challenge and possible defeat. Although the freshman who seeks reelection is now the incumbent, he or she does not enjoy the

extraordinary advantages associated with incumbency. Unlike members of Congress who have served several terms, the name recognition of a freshman incumbent is not that impressive, as he or she has yet to become a household name. The fundraising advantage enjoyed by long-term incumbents is also less impressive for a freshman member of Congress. Moreover, the freshman's district staff is also relatively new, and it normally takes several months for the newly-hired staff to become acquainted with the district and to begin serving the multiple needs of the congressperson's constituents. Thus, constituent service, often regarded by political scientists as one of the keys to an incumbent's reelection, is not as refined in the district office of a freshman member of Congress.<sup>13</sup>

Additionally, a freshman member of Congress is also susceptible to what is practically an "iron law" in the world of congressional politics. In this respect, it is the "surge" and "decline" effect associated with presidential coattails that needs to be considered. Newly-elected presidents often have political coattails, and as a result a number of freshmen members of Congress owe their election to the president. Because of presidential coattails, the president's party gains seats in Congress. This is precisely what happened in 2008. There was a "surge" in the number of Democrats elected to Congress as a direct result of Obama's popularity. Two years later, however, there is a "mid-term" election in which the president is not on the ballot. During a mid-term election, members of the president's party in Congress do not enjoy the luxury of presidential coattails. At the same time, the popularity of the newly-elected president will also experience a decline with the result being a loss of congressional seats for the president's party. The number of seats held by the president's party in Congress will therefore "decline" to what in reality is the more normal level of partisan distribution within Congress. In essence, what the "surge and decline" effect suggests is that those members of Congress who were swept into office on the president's coattails are part of a false congressional majority. Thus, the mid-term election tends to return the distribution of congressional seats to a more realistic reflection

of a party's congressional strength. On average, a president's political party will lose between 25-30 seats during a mid-term election.

During the months prior to the 2010 congressional election, Congressman Himes, compared to the other four members of Connecticut's congressional delegation, all of whom were Democrats, was deemed the most vulnerable incumbent, due to his freshman status. This along with the fact that the fourth congressional district with only a few exceptions had historically voted Republican suggested that he could potentially lose his seat. Although election forecasters still suggested that Himes had the advantage, not one forecaster was willing to classify his seat as "safe" or "solid" Democrat. For example, as the election season approached, the Charles Cook Report rated the fourth district race as "likely Democrat." The *New York Times*, *Real Clear Politics*, and *Congressional Quarterly Politics* were even less convinced of Himes's longevity and rated the seat as "leaning Democrat." Thus, sensing an opportunity to unseat a freshman member of Congress who had been elected largely on the basis of President Obama's political coattails, along with the fact that the public's support of President Obama, as well as the Congress, had declined precipitously since the election of 2008, a number of Republicans decided to seek the fourth congressional seat. The recession and the recent election of Republican governors in New Jersey and Virginia along with the stunning election of Republican Scott Brown in the Massachusetts Senate race further energized Republican efforts in the fourth congressional district.