

## CAMPAIGN FINANCE & CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITS QUESTIONNAIRE

**Fielded by:** Nielsen Scarborough  
**Sample size:** 3045 registered voters

**Fielding Dates:** August 3-16, 2017  
**Margin of Error:** +/- 1.8%

In this survey, you will be asked to evaluate a number of proposals for making changes to the way the U.S. federal government works.

These proposals have the following goals:

- To reduce or counterbalance the influence of big campaign donors—including special interests, corporations and wealthy people—on the Federal government.
- To increase the responsiveness of elected officials in Washington to the interests and views of the American people.

Whether or not these goals are important, as well as the specifics of the proposals have sparked considerable debate in Congress and elsewhere for a variety of reasons.

First, we are going to consider some proposals that have the goal of reducing or counterbalancing the influence of big campaign donors—including special interests, corporations and wealthy people—on the Federal government.

**Note:** Text in [Brackets] was not presented to survey respondents.

Q1. How important is this goal to you?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Very – Somewhat important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Slightly – Not at all important	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	60.0%	28.0%	<b>88.0%</b>	8.5%	3.3%	<b>11.8%</b>	0.2%
GOP	48.8%	35.1%	<b>83.9%</b>	11.8%	4.0%	<b>15.8%</b>	0.1%
Dem.	72.4%	19.8%	<b>92.2%</b>	5.7%	1.9%	<b>7.6%</b>	0.2%
Indep.	53.9%	32.4%	<b>86.3%</b>	8.3%	5.2%	<b>13.5%</b>	0.3%

### Cook's PVI (D-R)

Very red	55.9%	31.4%	<b>87.3%</b>	8.8%	3.9%	<b>12.7%</b>	0.0%
Red	62.2%	25.5%	<b>87.7%</b>	8.4%	3.7%	<b>12.1%</b>	0.2%
Lean red	60.0%	27.7%	<b>87.7%</b>	8.3%	3.9%	<b>12.2%</b>	0.2%
Lean blue	62.5%	27.1%	<b>89.6%</b>	8.1%	2.3%	<b>10.4%</b>	0.0%
Blue	60.4%	28.2%	<b>88.6%</b>	7.4%	3.3%	<b>10.7%</b>	0.6%
Very blue	63.8%	24.1%	<b>87.9%</b>	8.7%	3.1%	<b>11.8%</b>	0.2%

**Note:** In the analysis above and throughout the survey was divided into sextiles, with “Very red” districts having a Cook PVI rating (D-R) of -33 to -14, “Red” districts a PVI rating of -13 to -8, “Lean red” districts a PVI rating of -7 to -1, “Lean Blue” districts a PVI rating of +1 to +8, “Blue” districts a PVI rating of +9 to +17, and “Very blue” districts a PVI rating of +18 to +44.

## [CAMPAIGN FINANCE]

Here is some background on this issue:

In recent decades, Congress passed new laws to reduce the influence of big campaign donors by putting greater limits on campaign donations.

However, many of those limits were rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court as contrary to First Amendment protections on freedom of expression. While there are still some limits on what one donor can give to a campaign, there are also alternative channels that still allow large donations.

Of particular importance, the Supreme Court made some decisions in 2010, especially the one known as ‘Citizens United,’ which opened up new channels for donations, especially through organizations called ‘SuperPacs.’ As a result, the amount of contributions from big donors increased substantially.

In response to these Supreme Court decisions and the increasing amount of donations from big donors, some people have proposed passing an amendment to the Constitution to enable Congress to impose greater limits on campaign donations. Later, we will consider this possibility.

## [REFUNDABLE TAX CREDIT]

First, we would like you to consider a number of other proposals that do not require a Constitutional amendment, but also have the potential to reduce or counterbalance the influence of big campaign donors.

One set of proposals that seeks to reduce or counter-balance the influence of big donors would reduce the percentage of donations that come from big donors by increasing the percentage that comes from small donors.

Here is one of the proposals in a proposed Congressional bill:

When a citizen contributes up to \$50 to a specific candidate, half of the contribution would be refundable in the form of a tax credit. This would be limited to small donors, which would be people whose donations to that candidate are no more than \$300. The idea is that, by reducing the cost of making donations, more citizens will make donations and small donors will make somewhat larger donations, thus increasing the total amount coming from small donors.

Here is an argument **in favor of** this tax credit proposal:

Q2. Campaigns cost money. If we encourage many small donors and increase the portion of money coming from small donations, this can free candidates from reliance on a few large donors and make them less influential. Congress will then be responsible to voters, not well-financed special interests. Candidates who do not want to be beholden to big donors will be more able to run for office and succeed.

Please select how convincing or unconvincing you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	21.9%	48.2%	<b>70.1%</b>	19.0%	10.5%	<b>29.5%</b>	0.3%
GOP	21.2%	45.7%	<b>66.9%</b>	19.7%	12.9%	<b>32.6%</b>	0.4%
Dem.	23.0%	51.0%	<b>74.0%</b>	18.1%	7.6%	<b>25.7%</b>	0.2%
Indep.	20.5%	46.8%	<b>67.3%</b>	19.9%	12.6%	<b>32.5%</b>	0.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	22.2%	49.6%	<b>71.8%</b>	17.6%	10.6%	<b>28.2%</b>	0.0%
Red	18.0%	50.4%	<b>68.4%</b>	20.9%	10.3%	<b>31.2%</b>	0.4%
Lean red	22.4%	46.8%	<b>69.2%</b>	19.6%	10.6%	<b>30.2%</b>	0.6%
Lean blue	20.3%	49.4%	<b>69.7%</b>	18.4%	11.4%	<b>29.8%</b>	0.4%
Blue	21.4%	48.2%	<b>69.6%</b>	19.8%	10.1%	<b>29.9%</b>	0.4%
Very blue	22.5%	44.0%	<b>66.5%</b>	21.7%	11.6%	<b>33.3%</b>	0.2%

Here is an argument **against** this tax credit proposal:

Q3. Giving away tax credits to increase the amount of money from small donors effectively spends government funds on election campaigns. This is not a good use of taxpayer money. Furthermore, it is not clear that it will even work. Big donors will still have a lot more influence than small donors, even if the small donors are more numerous or are able to give a little bit more than they are now.

Please select how convincing or unconvincing you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref. / Don't know
<b>National</b>	27.5%	40.8%	<b>68.3%</b>	22.5%	8.5%	<b>31.0%</b>	0.8%
<b>GOP</b>	31.5%	38.8%	<b>70.3%</b>	22.0%	7.0%	<b>29.0%</b>	0.8%
<b>Dem.</b>	23.3%	42.3%	<b>65.6%</b>	23.8%	9.6%	<b>33.4%</b>	1.1%
<b>Indep.</b>	28.9%	41.6%	<b>70.5%</b>	20.2%	9.0%	<b>29.2%</b>	0.2%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
<b>Very red</b>	29.0%	39.6%	<b>68.6%</b>	20.4%	10.0%	<b>30.4%</b>	1.0%
<b>Red</b>	26.0%	44.0%	<b>70.0%</b>	22.6%	6.4%	<b>29.0%</b>	0.9%
<b>Lean red</b>	27.9%	41.5%	<b>69.4%</b>	21.7%	8.3%	<b>30.0%</b>	0.7%
<b>Lean blue</b>	28.2%	43.4%	<b>71.6%</b>	22.5%	5.5%	<b>28.0%</b>	0.4%
<b>Blue</b>	26.6%	40.4%	<b>67.0%</b>	21.6%	10.7%	<b>32.3%</b>	0.6%
<b>Very blue</b>	24.6%	40.6%	<b>65.2%</b>	23.0%	11.2%	<b>34.2%</b>	0.7%

So, here, again is the proposal:

When a citizen contributes up to \$50 to a specific candidate, half of the contribution would be refundable in the form of a tax credit. This would be limited to small donors, which would be people whose total donations to that candidate are no more than \$300.

Q4. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you on the scale below.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable 0	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable 5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable 10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	5.6	29.2%	20.5%	50.0%	0.3%
<b>GOP</b>	5.2	35.0%	17.8%	47.0%	0.2%
<b>Dem.</b>	6.0	23.1%	20.6%	55.7%	0.5%
<b>Indep.</b>	5.1	31.4%	26.9%	41.7%	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
<b>Very red</b>	5.6	29.2%	16.9%	53.3%	0.6%
<b>Red</b>	5.6	28.2%	20.9%	51.0%	0.0%
<b>Lean red</b>	5.5	28.8%	22.4%	48.3%	0.6%
<b>Lean blue</b>	5.5	29.9%	20.1%	49.8%	0.2%
<b>Blue</b>	5.6	29.7%	19.2%	51.1%	0.0%
<b>Very blue</b>	5.5	31.0%	20.8%	47.8%	0.4%

Q5. So, would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	In Favor of	Against	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	59.5%	40.0%	0.6%
GOP	53.4%	46.3%	0.4%
Dem.	66.6%	33.0%	0.4%
Indep.	55.1%	43.4%	1.6%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	59.0%	40.6%	0.4%
Red	57.6%	41.5%	0.9%
Lean red	59.3%	40.4%	0.4%
Lean blue	60.6%	39.2%	0.2%
Blue	61.0%	38.4%	0.6%
Very blue	58.3%	40.8%	0.9%

Q6. How effective do you think this proposal, if enacted, would likely be in reducing or counterbalancing the influence of big campaign donors?

	Very	Somewhat	A little	Not at all	Ref. / Don't know
<b>National</b>	6.2%	32.4%	31.7%	29.6%	0.2%
GOP	6.2%	27.2%	31.2%	35.2%	0.3%
Dem.	6.7%	37.1%	31.8%	24.2%	0.2%
Indep.	4.7%	32.2%	32.5%	30.3%	0.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	6.7%	31.4%	32.7%	28.8%	0.4%
Red	2.3%	33.7%	31.6%	32.1%	0.4%
Lean red	6.6%	30.8%	30.6%	31.7%	0.2%
Lean blue	6.4%	30.7%	32.6%	30.1%	0.2%
Blue	6.8%	32.6%	31.3%	28.7%	0.6%
Very blue	5.4%	31.7%	32.6%	30.4%	0.0%

### [ENCOURAGING SMALL DONATIONS]

Here is another proposal in a Congressional bill that seeks to reduce or counterbalance the influence of big donors by increasing the percentage of donations that come from small donors.

This proposal requires that a candidate must first agree not to take any donations over \$1,000. Then, the government will match 6 to 1 all donations up to \$150. Thus, for example, if someone were to make a donation of \$100, the government would provide \$600.

Q7. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you on the scale below.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable 0	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable 5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable 10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6- 10)	Ref. / Don't know
<b>National</b>	3.1	62.5%	15.1%	22.2%	0.2%
GOP	2.3	74.2%	11.1%	14.5%	0.1%
Dem.	3.9	51.4%	18.3%	30.1%	0.2%
Indep.	3.0	63.9%	16.0%	19.7%	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	2.9	64.5%	14.7%	20.4%	0.4%
Red	2.9	65.2%	12.3%	22.1%	0.4%
Lean red	3.1	63.7%	15.8%	20.6%	0.0%
Lean blue	3.1	64.2%	14.2%	21.4%	0.2%
Blue	3.3	59.2%	15.7%	25.2%	0.0%
Very blue	3.6	55.1%	18.8%	25.9%	0.2%

Q8. So, would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	27.8%	71.9%	0.4%
GOP	17.9%	82.0%	0.1%
Dem.	37.1%	62.6%	0.3%
Indep.	26.5%	72.3%	1.2%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	25.9%	73.7%	0.4%
Red	25.8%	73.3%	0.9%
Lean red	25.7%	74.1%	0.2%
Lean blue	28.0%	71.8%	0.2%
Blue	31.1%	68.0%	0.8%
Very blue	32.6%	67.2%	0.2%

Q9. How effective do you think this proposal, if enacted, would likely be in reducing or counterbalancing the influence of big campaign donors?

	Very	Somewhat	A little	Not at all	Ref. / Don't know
<b>National</b>	6.4%	23.4%	27.1%	42.9%	0.2%
GOP	4.5%	17.2%	24.0%	53.9%	0.3%
Dem.	7.7%	28.8%	30.5%	32.9%	0.1%
Indep.	7.1%	24.2%	25.3%	43.2%	0.2%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	5.1%	19.2%	28.8%	46.3%	0.6%
Red	5.2%	21.9%	25.7%	47.2%	0.0%
Lean red	4.8%	23.3%	27.0%	45.0%	0.0%
Lean blue	5.3%	24.8%	25.4%	44.1%	0.4%
Blue	7.6%	25.2%	28.0%	38.4%	0.8%
Very blue	7.6%	25.7%	30.6%	36.2%	0.0%

Here is another proposal in a proposed Congressional bill that seeks to reduce the influence of big donors on Members of Congress.

Members of Congress would be prohibited from personally asking a donor for money at any time. It allows them to attend and speak at fundraising events, but prohibits direct one-on-one appeals for donations.

Here is an argument **in favor of** such limits on fundraising by Members of Congress:

Q10. Members spend more time fundraising than doing their job. If all Members were to do less fundraising there would probably be less money going into campaigns in general, which would be good. Furthermore, when the Members themselves do the fundraising it is most likely to lead to implicit understandings--with winks and nods--that the Members will do favors for the donor.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref. / Don't know
<b>National</b>	27.5%	43.7%	<b>71.2%</b>	18.5%	10.1%	<b>28.6%</b>	0.2%
GOP	27.5%	42.2%	<b>69.7%</b>	19.0%	11.3%	<b>30.3%</b>	0.1%
Dem.	28.1%	45.3%	<b>73.4%</b>	17.0%	9.4%	<b>26.4%</b>	0.2%
Indep.	26.2%	43.0%	<b>69.2%</b>	21.4%	8.9%	<b>30.3%</b>	0.5%

**Cook's PVI (D-R)**

Very red	26.1%	48.2%	<b>74.3%</b>	15.1%	10.4%	<b>25.5%</b>	0.2%
Red	26.0%	41.4%	<b>67.4%</b>	22.5%	9.8%	<b>32.3%</b>	0.4%
Lean red	26.1%	42.8%	<b>68.9%</b>	17.8%	13.0%	<b>30.8%</b>	0.4%
Lean blue	25.2%	47.7%	<b>72.9%</b>	17.8%	9.3%	<b>27.1%</b>	0.0%
Blue	28.5%	43.3%	<b>71.8%</b>	17.1%	10.9%	<b>28.0%</b>	0.2%
Very blue	30.1%	40.4%	<b>70.5%</b>	20.1%	9.2%	<b>29.3%</b>	0.2%

Here is an argument **against** such limits on fundraising by Members of Congress:

Q11. Imposing limits on the fundraising activities of Members of Congress would give an unfair advantage to challengers who would not have the same limits. Enforcing it would be nearly impossible. Furthermore, limiting their right to ask for a donation is a violation of the freedom of speech of Members of Congress and would probably be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	21.0%	45.7%	<b>66.7%</b>	22.1%	10.7%	<b>32.8%</b>	0.5%
GOP	23.6%	43.5%	<b>67.1%</b>	21.1%	11.4%	<b>32.5%</b>	0.4%
Dem.	19.3%	47.6%	<b>66.9%</b>	22.5%	10.0%	<b>32.5%</b>	0.6%
Indep.	19.2%	45.8%	<b>65.0%</b>	23.4%	11.1%	<b>34.5%</b>	0.5%

**Cook's PVI (D-R)**

Very red	22.4%	43.7%	<b>66.1%</b>	21.8%	11.6%	<b>33.4%</b>	0.4%
Red	20.1%	46.3%	<b>66.4%</b>	22.1%	10.7%	<b>32.8%</b>	0.7%
Lean red	22.9%	44.2%	<b>67.1%</b>	20.6%	11.6%	<b>32.2%</b>	0.7%
Lean blue	19.1%	47.0%	<b>66.1%</b>	23.7%	9.5%	<b>33.2%</b>	0.6%
Blue	23.1%	45.4%	<b>68.5%</b>	19.6%	11.5%	<b>31.1%</b>	0.4%
Very blue	17.9%	46.9%	<b>64.8%</b>	24.6%	10.3%	<b>34.9%</b>	0.4%

So, here, again, is the proposal:

Members of Congress would be prohibited from personally asking a donor for money at any time. It allows them to attend and speak at fundraising events, but prohibits direct one-on-one appeals for donations.

Q12. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable 0	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable 5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable 10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref. / Don't know
<b>National</b>	5.6	29.0%	20.7%	49.9%	0.4%
<b>GOP</b>	5.4	31.4%	20.5%	47.4%	0.7%
<b>Dem.</b>	5.8	27.9%	19.6%	52.5%	0.0%
<b>Indep.</b>	5.7	26.4%	24.3%	48.8%	0.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
<b>Very red</b>	5.7	28.4%	19.2%	52.2%	0.2%
<b>Red</b>	5.5	29.9%	19.4%	49.9%	0.7%
<b>Lean red</b>	5.4	33.0%	19.3%	47.5%	0.2%
<b>Lean blue</b>	5.7	25.8%	21.4%	52.8%	0.0%
<b>Blue</b>	5.5	29.5%	23.1%	47.4%	0.0%
<b>Very blue</b>	5.7	27.2%	20.8%	51.3%	0.7%

Q13. Would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	In Favor of	Against	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	55.1%	44.2%	0.7%
<b>GOP</b>	50.9%	48.5%	0.6%
<b>Dem.</b>	58.3%	41.1%	0.6%
<b>Indep.</b>	56.3%	42.2%	1.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
<b>Very red</b>	57.1%	42.2%	0.6%
<b>Red</b>	51.5%	47.2%	1.2%
<b>Lean red</b>	52.5%	47.0%	0.6%
<b>Lean blue</b>	61.0%	38.6%	0.4%
<b>Blue</b>	55.1%	44.3%	0.6%
<b>Very blue</b>	54.2%	44.6%	1.1%

Q14. How effective do you think this proposal, if enacted, would likely be in reducing or counterbalancing the influence of big campaign donors?

	Very	Somewhat	A little	Not at all	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	8.3%	30.6%	30.2%	30.4%	0.4%
GOP	7.3%	27.0%	30.8%	34.0%	0.9%
Dem.	9.1%	32.4%	30.3%	28.0%	0.1%
Indep.	8.8%	34.4%	28.6%	28.2%	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	8.4%	29.8%	32.0%	29.4%	0.4%
Red	5.5%	31.4%	27.8%	34.9%	0.4%
Lean red	8.6%	28.6%	29.2%	33.6%	0.0%
Lean blue	8.7%	32.2%	31.8%	26.3%	1.1%
Blue	8.9%	31.8%	28.0%	30.9%	0.4%
Very blue	8.5%	30.4%	34.6%	26.1%	0.4%

### [DISCLOSURE RULES]

Another idea for reducing or counterbalancing the influence of big donors is to require that donations to candidates and political causes be publicly disclosed or made more transparent.

While many forms of campaign-related donations and spending are required to be publicly disclosed, there are donations that can be made anonymously to certain organizations that can support candidates and political causes. Critics of this kind of giving call it 'dark money' because it is anonymous.

Until recently, the amount that could be donated to such organizations was limited, but with the U.S. Supreme Court's "Citizens United" decision, these limits were removed as an interference with free speech. Since then, the amount of such anonymous donations has gone up dramatically. There are a number of proposals for requiring that such donations be publicly disclosed. There is also a debate about whether there should be greater public disclosure of campaign-related donations.

Here are two arguments **in favor of** greater public disclosure of campaign-related donations:

Q15. When campaign-related donations are fully disclosed, it makes it more difficult for elected officials to do favors, taking actions that serve the interests of the donor, rather than the common good. If the donation is disclosed, the public, the media, and watchdog groups can question whether an action was a favor in exchange for a donation. This will create political costs for the elected official as well as discourage donors from seeking favors through donations.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	46.5%	39.9%	<b>86.4%</b>	9.2%	4.1%	<b>13.3%</b>	0.3%
GOP	42.2%	42.4%	<b>84.6%</b>	9.9%	5.4%	<b>15.3%</b>	0.1%
Dem.	52.3%	36.6%	<b>88.9%</b>	8.1%	2.8%	<b>10.9%</b>	0.2%
Indep.	41.2%	42.3%	<b>83.5%</b>	10.6%	4.7%	<b>15.3%</b>	1.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	46.5%	40.6%	<b>87.1%</b>	8.6%	4.3%	<b>12.9%</b>	0.0%
Red	44.2%	40.5%	<b>84.7%</b>	9.8%	5.0%	<b>14.8%</b>	0.5%
Lean red	48.8%	37.1%	<b>85.9%</b>	9.0%	5.0%	<b>14.0%</b>	0.2%
Lean blue	43.9%	41.3%	<b>85.2%</b>	9.3%	5.1%	<b>14.4%</b>	0.4%
Blue	49.1%	37.5%	<b>86.6%</b>	9.7%	3.1%	<b>12.8%</b>	0.6%
Very blue	47.8%	42.0%	<b>89.8%</b>	6.7%	3.3%	<b>10.0%</b>	0.2%



Q16. When judging a candidate people have a right to know who is providing money in support of the candidate. Voters can get a better sense of the allegiances that the candidate might have and the interests they might support.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	58.6%	31.2%	<b>89.8%</b>	7.0%	2.9%	<b>9.9%</b>	0.3%
GOP	53.3%	34.0%	<b>87.3%</b>	8.6%	3.7%	<b>12.3%</b>	0.3%
Dem.	65.8%	27.1%	<b>92.9%</b>	5.3%	1.7%	<b>7.0%</b>	0.2%
Indep.	52.6%	35.3%	<b>87.9%</b>	7.7%	4.0%	<b>11.7%</b>	0.3%

**Cook's PVI (D-R)**

Very red	60.8%	29.8%	<b>90.6%</b>	5.9%	3.3%	<b>9.2%</b>	0.2%
Red	60.2%	30.1%	<b>90.3%</b>	6.4%	3.2%	<b>9.6%</b>	0.0%
Lean red	57.4%	30.1%	<b>87.5%</b>	7.9%	4.2%	<b>12.1%</b>	0.4%
Lean blue	58.9%	30.7%	<b>89.6%</b>	7.0%	3.2%	<b>10.2%</b>	0.2%
Blue	59.0%	31.3%	<b>90.3%</b>	7.2%	1.4%	<b>8.6%</b>	1.0%
Very blue	58.5%	32.8%	<b>91.3%</b>	6.3%	2.5%	<b>8.8%</b>	0.0%

Here are two arguments **against** greater public disclosure of campaign-related donations:

Q17. Making a campaign donation has been established by the U.S. Supreme Court as a basic right as part of the principle of free speech. If every donation is subject to public scrutiny, it can lead to claims that it was basically a bribe, when in fact it might not be at all. People may also get harassed or threatened for making donations. This will discourage people from making such donations, including completely legitimate ones.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	10.0%	28.8%	<b>38.8%</b>	33.2%	27.5%	<b>60.7%</b>	0.5%
GOP	13.0%	33.7%	<b>46.7%</b>	30.5%	22.0%	<b>52.5%</b>	0.8%
Dem.	7.4%	24.0%	<b>31.4%</b>	35.0%	33.4%	<b>68.4%</b>	0.2%
Indep.	10.1%	30.0%	<b>40.1%</b>	34.4%	24.8%	<b>59.2%</b>	0.6%

**Cook's PVI (D-R)**

Very red	10.2%	27.1%	<b>37.3%</b>	33.9%	28.8%	<b>62.7%</b>	0.0%
Red	9.6%	28.5%	<b>38.1%</b>	34.9%	26.4%	<b>61.3%</b>	0.5%
Lean red	7.2%	27.2%	<b>34.4%</b>	35.6%	29.2%	<b>64.8%</b>	0.9%
Lean blue	10.8%	27.5%	<b>38.3%</b>	36.0%	25.2%	<b>61.2%</b>	0.4%
Blue	9.9%	28.9%	<b>38.8%</b>	33.0%	27.6%	<b>60.6%</b>	0.6%
Very blue	8.9%	26.8%	<b>35.7%</b>	30.6%	33.7%	<b>64.3%</b>	0.0%

Q18. Public disclosure is not going to prevent elected officials from doing favors in exchange for financial support. Even if elected officials are, in fact, taking a position to serve the interests of a donor (in exchange for support), the officials can simply say that they think the position is the right one--and there's no way to prove they don't think that. Furthermore, in some cases the politician may genuinely support the position. Disclosure will not clarify what's really going on.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	14.2%	39.2%	<b>53.4%</b>	28.4%	17.6%	<b>46.0%</b>	0.7%
GOP	16.3%	43.3%	<b>59.6%</b>	25.8%	13.5%	<b>39.3%</b>	1.1%
Dem.	11.3%	35.9%	<b>47.2%</b>	30.7%	21.5%	<b>52.2%</b>	0.6%
Indep.	16.6%	37.8%	<b>54.4%</b>	28.5%	16.8%	<b>45.3%</b>	0.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	15.5%	37.3%	<b>52.8%</b>	26.9%	20.0%	<b>46.9%</b>	0.2%
Red	11.9%	40.6%	<b>52.5%</b>	31.0%	15.5%	<b>46.5%</b>	0.9%
Lean red	12.7%	37.1%	<b>49.8%</b>	30.6%	18.3%	<b>48.9%</b>	1.3%
Lean blue	14.4%	38.8%	<b>53.2%</b>	30.7%	15.9%	<b>46.6%</b>	0.2%
Blue	14.2%	39.6%	<b>53.8%</b>	28.7%	16.7%	<b>45.4%</b>	0.8%
Very blue	12.9%	36.6%	<b>49.5%</b>	27.2%	23.0%	<b>50.2%</b>	0.2%

Now, here is one proposal for greater public disclosure that is included in a Congressional bill under consideration.

Currently, all donations made directly to campaigns must be made public, but there is no requirement for a variety of organizations that spend money on campaign-related efforts to disclose the names of their donors and the amounts donated.

Q19. This proposal would require that all individuals or organizations that donate or receive a total of \$10,000 or more for campaign-related activities promptly register with the Federal Election Commission, and have their name and the amount of the donations listed on the Commission's website.

Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable 0	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable 5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable 10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	7.5	10.7%	13.4%	75.7%	0.2%
GOP	7.1	13.2%	15.0%	71.4%	0.4%
Dem.	8.0	7.2%	11.0%	81.8%	0.1%
Indep.	7.1	14.3%	15.9%	69.8%	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	7.6	10.6%	12.2%	76.9%	0.2%
Red	7.4	11.6%	13.7%	74.5%	0.2%
Lean red	7.5	10.6%	11.7%	77.4%	0.2%
Lean blue	7.5	10.6%	12.3%	76.9%	0.2%
Blue	7.5	10.7%	13.0%	75.9%	0.4%
Very blue	7.8	8.9%	12.7%	78.1%	0.2%

Q20. So, would you recommend that your Member of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	In Favor of	Against	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	81.8%	17.5%	0.7%
GOP	76.5%	23.2%	0.3%
Dem.	88.4%	10.9%	0.8%
Indep.	77.0%	21.8%	1.2%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	83.7%	16.1%	0.2%
Red	79.0%	20.0%	1.1%
Lean red	84.0%	15.6%	0.4%
Lean blue	84.5%	14.8%	0.6%
Blue	82.1%	17.1%	0.8%
Very blue	80.4%	19.0%	0.7%

Q21. How effective do you think this proposal, if enacted, would likely be in reducing or counterbalancing the influence of big campaign donors?

	Very	Somewhat	A little	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	18.6%	46.4%	24.4%	10.1%	0.5%
GOP	14.8%	43.5%	27.5%	13.7%	0.6%
Dem.	22.5%	50.0%	20.7%	6.6%	0.2%
Indep.	17.2%	43.6%	27.1%	10.6%	1.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	19.6%	43.9%	26.9%	9.0%	0.6%
Red	14.6%	48.1%	24.2%	12.5%	0.5%
Lean red	18.2%	46.8%	24.2%	10.6%	0.2%
Lean blue	15.7%	50.8%	23.9%	8.7%	0.8%
Blue	23.7%	42.5%	23.9%	9.3%	0.6%
Very blue	21.0%	46.2%	22.8%	9.2%	0.9%

**[DISCLOSURES – REPORTING CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS BY ORGANIZATIONS]**

Here is a proposal for greater public disclosure that is included in a Congressional bill under consideration.

Currently, when corporations, unions, and other groups spend money on their own campaign-related activity, such as running a TV ad that is supportive of a candidate, they do not have to report it.

Q22. This proposal would require that, these groups:

- report this spending, within 24 hours, to their shareholders and members
- make this information available to the public on their websites
- report it to the FEC

Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable
0					5					10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	7.8	8.7%	10.4%	80.7%	0.2%
<b>GOP</b>	7.7	9.4%	11.2%	79.3%	0.2%
<b>Dem.</b>	8.0	7.4%	9.5%	82.8%	0.2%
<b>Indep.</b>	7.5	10.4%	10.8%	78.4%	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
<b>Very red</b>	7.8	8.4%	8.8%	82.8%	0.0%
<b>Red</b>	7.7	8.6%	10.4%	81.0%	0.0%
<b>Lean red</b>	7.7	9.0%	8.6%	82.4%	0.0%
<b>Lean blue</b>	7.5	10.5%	11.7%	77.8%	0.0%
<b>Blue</b>	7.8	8.9%	10.0%	79.9%	1.2%
<b>Very blue</b>	8.3	4.5%	9.0%	86.5%	0.0%

Q23. So would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	In Favor of	Against	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	85.3%	14.3%	0.5%
<b>GOP</b>	82.7%	17.0%	0.3%
<b>Dem.</b>	87.9%	11.4%	0.7%
<b>Indep.</b>	84.5%	15.1%	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
<b>Very red</b>	88.0%	11.6%	0.4%
<b>Red</b>	83.3%	16.0%	0.7%
<b>Lean red</b>	84.3%	15.7%	0.0%
<b>Lean blue</b>	84.9%	14.2%	0.8%
<b>Blue</b>	85.7%	13.5%	0.8%
<b>Very blue</b>	90.1%	9.4%	0.4%

Q24. How effective do you think this proposal, if enacted, would likely be in reducing or counterbalancing the influence of big campaign donors?

	Very	Somewhat	A little	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	20.2%	45.0%	24.8%	8.9%	1.1%
<b>GOP</b>	21.0%	41.8%	23.5%	12.2%	1.5%
<b>Dem.</b>	21.7%	47.7%	23.8%	6.0%	0.9%
<b>Indep.</b>	14.5%	45.7%	30.0%	9.0%	0.7%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
<b>Very red</b>	21.6%	42.4%	28.8%	6.8%	0.4%
<b>Red</b>	16.0%	48.7%	22.3%	11.9%	1.1%
<b>Lean red</b>	17.6%	44.7%	27.1%	10.6%	0.0%
<b>Lean blue</b>	16.7%	52.3%	20.5%	8.8%	1.7%
<b>Blue</b>	22.8%	44.8%	25.5%	6.2%	0.8%
<b>Very blue</b>	21.1%	44.4%	24.2%	9.4%	0.9%

**[PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF ADS]**

Here is a proposal for greater public disclosure that is included in a Congressional bill under consideration.

Currently, when significant donors spend money on their own campaign-related activity, such as running a TV ad that is supportive of a candidate, they do not have to report it.

Q25. This proposal says that the Federal Communications Commission would require the public disclosure of the names of significant donors in paying for TV or radio ads in support of candidates or related to controversial public issues.

Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable 0	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable 5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable 10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	7.5	11.2%	12.6%	75.7%	0.5%
<b>GOP</b>	7.0	13.5%	16.3%	69.6%	0.6%
<b>Dem.</b>	8.1	8.0%	8.2%	83.3%	0.5%
<b>Indep.</b>	7.1	14.6%	15.5%	69.9%	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
<b>Very red</b>	7.7	8.8%	12.1%	78.8%	0.4%
<b>Red</b>	7.5	12.0%	11.6%	76.4%	0.0%
<b>Lean red</b>	7.6	9.0%	12.4%	78.3%	0.3%
<b>Lean blue</b>	7.5	11.6%	12.0%	76.0%	0.4%
<b>Blue</b>	7.6	11.1%	11.5%	77.0%	0.4%
<b>Very blue</b>	7.6	12.9%	10.7%	75.1%	1.3%

Q26. So, would you recommend that your Member of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	In Favor of	Against	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	81.1%	17.5%	1.4%
<b>GOP</b>	74.1%	24.6%	1.3%
<b>Dem.</b>	88.5%	10.7%	0.8%
<b>Indep.</b>	77.9%	18.8%	3.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
<b>Very red</b>	84.6%	13.8%	1.7%
<b>Red</b>	79.1%	19.5%	1.4%
<b>Lean red</b>	81.7%	17.2%	1.0%
<b>Lean blue</b>	84.1%	15.5%	0.4%
<b>Blue</b>	81.9%	16.8%	1.3%
<b>Very blue</b>	79.6%	19.1%	1.3%

Q27. How effective do you think this proposal, if enacted, would likely be in reducing or counterbalancing the influence of big campaign donors?

	Very	Somewhat	A little	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	17.5%	44.7%	26.4%	11.0%	0.4%
GOP	11.3%	42.4%	30.0%	15.9%	0.5%
Dem.	23.9%	46.7%	23.0%	6.1%	0.3%
Indep.	15.3%	44.4%	27.1%	12.5%	0.7%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	14.6%	47.9%	28.3%	9.2%	0.0%
Red	14.4%	46.2%	26.0%	13.4%	0.0%
Lean red	19.3%	44.1%	24.1%	11.7%	0.7%
Lean blue	18.0%	42.9%	28.8%	9.9%	0.4%
Blue	21.2%	42.5%	24.8%	10.6%	0.9%
Very blue	21.3%	40.4%	28.9%	8.9%	0.4%

**[PUNISHING FEDERAL CONTRACTORS THAT DO NOT DISCLOSE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS]**

Let's suppose Congress does not pass the proposal described above.

Q28. Here is an action that could be taken by the President to require greater disclosure. As you may know, some federal contractors are big campaign donors. The President could require federal contractors to publicly disclose their donations to groups that spend money on campaign-related activities.

Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable 0	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable 5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable 10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	7.6	9.5%	11.7%	78.3%	0.4%
GOP	7.5	9.3%	11.6%	78.7%	0.4%
Dem.	7.9	8.0%	10.4%	81.3%	0.3%
Indep.	7.1	13.9%	15.6%	69.9%	0.6%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	7.5	9.8%	12.2%	77.8%	0.2%
Red	7.7	8.6%	9.8%	81.3%	0.4%
Lean red	7.9	6.1%	11.6%	82.0%	0.4%
Lean blue	7.5	10.0%	12.7%	76.9%	0.4%
Blue	7.5	10.9%	11.8%	76.9%	0.4%
Very blue	7.5	10.9%	10.5%	78.6%	0.0%

Q29. So, would you favor or oppose the President requiring Federal contractors to publicly disclose their donations to groups that spend money on campaign-related activities?

	Favor of	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	85.2%	13.8%	0.9%
GOP	84.0%	15.4%	0.7%
Dem.	88.8%	10.3%	0.9%
Indep.	78.9%	19.5%	1.7%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	86.5%	13.3%	0.2%
Red	85.2%	13.2%	1.6%
Lean red	88.3%	11.4%	0.4%
Lean blue	85.6%	13.3%	1.1%
Blue	82.5%	16.7%	0.8%
Very blue	86.2%	12.5%	1.3%

Q30. How effective do you think this proposal, if enacted, would likely be in reducing or counterbalancing the influence of big campaign donors?

	Very	Somewhat	A little	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	18.1%	45.0%	26.6%	9.5%	0.9%
GOP	18.1%	44.5%	25.5%	10.6%	1.3%
Dem.	19.1%	47.1%	25.7%	7.5%	0.5%
Indep.	15.4%	40.4%	31.6%	11.9%	0.8%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	18.8%	42.0%	29.8%	9.4%	0.0%
Red	12.8%	48.8%	27.8%	10.2%	0.4%
Lean red	19.1%	45.3%	25.5%	9.2%	0.9%
Lean blue	19.5%	46.2%	23.7%	9.7%	0.8%
Blue	20.2%	44.3%	23.9%	10.5%	1.0%
Very blue	15.8%	47.5%	26.8%	8.7%	1.1%

### [CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE]

As you may recall, we discussed earlier how the U.S. Supreme Court in the last few years has made decisions that struck down a number of limits on campaign-related spending by organizations that are independent of campaigns. This has led to a major increase in campaign spending by big donors.

We have been considering proposals that seek to counter the influence of big donors by enhancing the influence of small donors or requiring greater transparency of all donations. Some people think this is not adequate to counter the influence of big donors and say that Congress should directly limit all forms of campaign-related donations.

For Congress to do this, however, would require a new Constitutional amendment, which would override the Supreme Court's past decisions on this subject, including 'Citizens United,' and prevent the courts from striking down campaign finance laws in the future.

Passing any Constitutional amendment is quite challenging. It requires ratification by two thirds of Congress and three quarters of all states.

Such an amendment has been proposed in both houses of Congress. It has two parts, which we will consider one at a time.

**The first part of the proposed Constitutional amendment** would say Congress and the states may regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others seeking to influence elections. Here is an argument **in favor** of this part of the proposed amendment:

Q31. Clearly, we cannot go on letting people and organizations use the cover of the First Amendment to allow what is essentially bribery of Members of Congress. Since the recent Supreme Court decision to allow unlimited contributions, there has been a flood of money pouring into organizations seeking to influence elections. The rich should not have more influence just because they have more money. They are drowning out the voice of most ordinary voters. The Founders would be horrified by the amount of money in elections and this is just the kind of problem that they established the Constitutional amendment process to address. Congress should be able to set reasonable limits on political spending.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	44.4%	36.5%	<b>80.9%</b>	10.1%	7.6%	<b>17.7%</b>	1.3%
GOP	35.5%	39.9%	<b>75.4%</b>	12.0%	11.2%	<b>23.2%</b>	1.3%
Dem.	53.6%	33.7%	<b>87.3%</b>	8.3%	3.9%	<b>12.2%</b>	0.6%
Indep.	41.3%	36.1%	<b>77.4%</b>	10.5%	8.7%	<b>19.2%</b>	3.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	44.1%	36.9%	<b>81.0%</b>	10.0%	8.6%	<b>18.6%</b>	0.4%
Red	44.2%	38.5%	<b>82.7%</b>	7.1%	9.4%	<b>16.5%</b>	0.7%
Lean red	41.8%	38.2%	<b>80.0%</b>	9.5%	9.0%	<b>18.5%</b>	1.5%
Lean blue	41.5%	39.0%	<b>80.5%</b>	10.6%	6.8%	<b>17.4%</b>	2.1%
Blue	47.2%	35.5%	<b>82.7%</b>	10.5%	5.6%	<b>16.1%</b>	1.2%
Very blue	45.3%	35.5%	<b>80.8%</b>	10.9%	7.1%	<b>18.0%</b>	1.1%

Here is an argument **against** this part of the proposed amendment:

Q32. This proposal is an end run around Constitutional principles—practically an attempt to repeal the First Amendment. If people want to spend money making their views heard about a candidate, the government should not have the right to stop them. Should we assume that the government knows what the right amount of free speech is? Real freedom of speech is often inconvenient for somebody. You can't just pick and choose where you want it to apply. Tampering with the Constitution is a risky idea. Once you start limiting some forms of speech it becomes a slippery slope toward more and more limits on our freedoms.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	16.2%	30.9%	<b>47.1%</b>	27.5%	24.5%	<b>52.0%</b>	0.9%
GOP	22.1%	33.4%	<b>55.5%</b>	24.7%	19.1%	<b>43.8%</b>	0.8%
Dem.	10.3%	28.0%	<b>38.3%</b>	29.9%	31.1%	<b>61.0%</b>	0.6%
Indep.	17.6%	32.5%	<b>50.1%</b>	28.1%	19.9%	<b>48.0%</b>	2.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	16.7%	32.9%	<b>49.6%</b>	27.1%	22.9%	<b>50.0%</b>	0.4%
Red	16.8%	28.0%	<b>44.8%</b>	29.2%	25.5%	<b>54.7%</b>	0.5%
Lean red	15.6%	30.3%	<b>45.9%</b>	27.9%	25.1%	<b>53.0%</b>	1.1%
Lean blue	14.4%	33.5%	<b>47.9%</b>	28.0%	22.9%	<b>50.9%</b>	1.3%
Blue	16.5%	27.8%	<b>44.3%</b>	26.8%	28.2%	<b>55.0%</b>	0.6%
Very blue	13.6%	30.4%	<b>44.0%</b>	27.7%	27.2%	<b>54.9%</b>	1.1%



Now that you have reviewed these arguments, please select how acceptable this proposal would be:

Q33. A new **Constitutional amendment** that would say Congress and the states may regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections.

Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable 0	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable 5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable 10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	6.6	20.4%	14.6%	64.3%	0.7%
<b>GOP</b>	5.9	27.6%	14.3%	57.2%	0.9%
<b>Dem.</b>	7.3	12.5%	13.7%	73.6%	0.2%
<b>Indep.</b>	6.2	24.1%	18.1%	56.3%	1.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
<b>Very red</b>	6.5	20.8%	14.7%	64.1%	0.4%
<b>Red</b>	6.6	19.6%	14.1%	65.8%	0.5%
<b>Lean red</b>	6.5	20.2%	14.7%	64.4%	0.7%
<b>Lean blue</b>	6.5	21.2%	14.4%	63.3%	1.1%
<b>Blue</b>	6.8	19.4%	13.0%	67.0%	0.6%
<b>Very blue</b>	6.7	20.5%	13.2%	65.4%	0.9%

The **second part of the proposed Constitutional amendment** would say that, in writing campaign finance laws, Congress would have the right to treat corporations and other organizations differently from 'natural persons.' This would allow Congress to restrict or even prohibit corporations and other organizations from spending money to influence elections.

Here is an argument **in favor of** this part of the proposed amendment:

Q34. A corporation should not have the same rights as a person. The idea that it is a group of people expressing their point of view is a fallacy. All of the people who are part of the corporation do not necessarily share a single point of view. A corporation is created to perform a function or to make money. It does not have the right to vote. Pursuing political influence through campaign-related donations in the service of a corporation's goals is not something the Constitution was ever meant to protect. If the individuals associated with a corporation want to express a point of view or donate to a campaign, they are still free to do so.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	44.0%	33.1%	<b>77.1%</b>	13.3%	8.3%	<b>21.6%</b>	1.2%
<b>GOP</b>	35.2%	36.3%	<b>71.5%</b>	15.0%	12.1%	<b>27.1%</b>	1.3%
<b>Dem.</b>	53.1%	29.5%	<b>82.6%</b>	11.4%	5.2%	<b>16.6%</b>	0.8%
<b>Indep.</b>	40.9%	35.1%	<b>76.0%</b>	14.2%	7.5%	<b>21.7%</b>	2.2%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
<b>Very red</b>	41.2%	36.9%	<b>78.1%</b>	13.1%	8.2%	<b>21.3%</b>	0.6%
<b>Red</b>	45.6%	31.6%	<b>77.2%</b>	11.8%	9.8%	<b>21.6%</b>	1.2%
<b>Lean red</b>	44.2%	31.9%	<b>76.1%</b>	13.2%	9.5%	<b>22.7%</b>	1.1%
<b>Lean blue</b>	45.3%	31.6%	<b>76.9%</b>	11.7%	9.5%	<b>21.2%</b>	1.9%
<b>Blue</b>	45.8%	33.2%	<b>79.0%</b>	12.6%	7.4%	<b>20.0%</b>	1.0%
<b>Very blue</b>	49.6%	28.3%	<b>77.9%</b>	14.1%	7.1%	<b>21.2%</b>	0.9%

Here is an argument **against** this part of the proposed amendment:

Q35. People have the right to come together and become shareholders in a corporation. As shareholders they have a shared interest in the goals of the corporation. Thus, the corporation should have the same rights of free expression as do the individual shareholders. The fact that they are also seeking to make money should not make any difference. Making a Constitutional amendment that would restrict the freedom of shareholders to act together would subvert the underlying principles of the Constitution. Furthermore, some of the corporations that would be limited by this law are nonprofit corporations that serve good causes and should not be prevented from making their voice heard.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	8.5%	28.3%	<b>36.8%</b>	30.7%	31.0%	<b>61.7%</b>	1.6%
<b>GOP</b>	11.2%	33.3%	<b>44.5%</b>	31.7%	22.1%	<b>53.8%</b>	1.8%
<b>Dem.</b>	6.8%	22.6%	<b>29.4%</b>	29.7%	39.8%	<b>69.5%</b>	1.1%
<b>Indep.</b>	6.3%	31.6%	<b>37.9%</b>	30.8%	28.9%	<b>59.7%</b>	2.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
<b>Very red</b>	7.3%	30.6%	<b>37.9%</b>	29.2%	31.8%	<b>61.0%</b>	1.0%
<b>Red</b>	8.7%	25.1%	<b>33.8%</b>	31.9%	32.8%	<b>64.7%</b>	1.4%
<b>Lean red</b>	6.2%	30.5%	<b>36.7%</b>	31.2%	30.3%	<b>61.5%</b>	1.8%
<b>Lean blue</b>	8.9%	28.8%	<b>37.7%</b>	31.8%	28.6%	<b>60.4%</b>	1.9%
<b>Blue</b>	10.1%	27.0%	<b>37.1%</b>	28.7%	33.6%	<b>62.3%</b>	0.6%
<b>Very blue</b>	7.6%	23.9%	<b>31.5%</b>	29.0%	37.7%	<b>66.7%</b>	1.8%

Now that you have reviewed these arguments, please select how acceptable this proposal would be:

Q36. **A new Constitutional amendment** that says that, in writing campaign finance laws, Congress would have the right to treat corporations and other organizations differently from 'natural persons.' This would allow Congress to restrict or even prohibit corporations and other organizations from spending money to influence elections.

Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable 0	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable 5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable 10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	6.8	19.7%	13.3%	66.0%	1.0%
<b>GOP</b>	6.1	26.1%	13.7%	59.1%	1.0%
<b>Dem.</b>	7.5	13.4%	11.9%	74.2%	0.5%
<b>Indep.</b>	6.6	20.8%	16.2%	60.9%	2.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
<b>Very red</b>	6.6	21.0%	13.9%	64.3%	0.8%
<b>Red</b>	6.9	18.5%	11.6%	69.0%	0.9%
<b>Lean red</b>	6.8	18.3%	14.7%	65.7%	1.3%
<b>Lean blue</b>	6.8	19.7%	12.3%	66.7%	1.3%
<b>Blue</b>	7.0	18.6%	11.8%	69.3%	0.4%
<b>Very blue</b>	6.9	19.4%	12.5%	67.2%	0.9%

Now, let's look at the proposal as a whole:

The proposal is for a new Constitutional amendment that would have two parts. It would allow Congress and the states to write campaign finance laws that:

- May regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections.

- Can distinguish between people and corporations or other organizations, thus allowing legislators to restrict or prohibit corporations and other organizations from spending money to influence elections.

Q37. Would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor or against this proposed Constitutional amendment?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	75.0%	23.5%	1.6%
GOP	65.9%	32.6%	1.5%
Dem.	84.9%	14.1%	0.9%
Indep.	70.4%	26.4%	3.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	73.5%	25.3%	1.2%
Red	74.5%	23.9%	1.6%
Lean red	74.1%	24.6%	1.3%
Lean blue	75.6%	22.7%	1.7%
Blue	78.4%	20.0%	1.6%
Very blue	75.7%	23.2%	1.1%

Q38. How effective do you think this Constitutional amendment would likely be in reducing or counterbalancing the influence of big campaign donors?

	Very	Somewhat	A little	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	28.5%	38.6%	19.7%	12.2%	1.0%
GOP	19.1%	38.1%	22.5%	19.1%	1.3%
Dem.	39.1%	38.5%	16.6%	5.2%	0.5%
Indep.	23.1%	39.9%	21.1%	14.0%	1.8%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	26.3%	39.4%	22.4%	11.4%	0.4%
Red	29.1%	37.3%	19.6%	12.7%	1.4%
Lean red	27.5%	38.9%	20.0%	13.0%	0.6%
Lean blue	30.3%	39.0%	16.7%	12.7%	1.3%
Blue	32.0%	36.7%	21.0%	9.9%	0.4%
Very blue	32.1%	36.6%	18.8%	11.2%	1.3%

We will now turn to proposals that seek to increase the responsiveness of elected officials in Washington to the interests and views of the American people.

Q39. How **important is it** to you to increase the responsiveness of elected officials in Washington to the interests and views of the American people?

	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	73.5%	18.1%	5.8%	1.8%	0.8%
GOP	77.4%	14.8%	5.2%	2.1%	0.6%
Dem.	73.6%	19.1%	5.8%	0.9%	0.6%
Indep.	64.4%	23.4%	7.1%	3.4%	1.7%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	75.9%	17.1%	4.9%	1.8%	0.2%
Red	72.5%	17.5%	6.2%	2.1%	1.6%
Lean red	78.2%	14.9%	4.2%	2.2%	0.6%
Lean blue	71.4%	20.6%	5.7%	1.5%	0.8%
Blue	72.4%	19.0%	6.4%	1.4%	0.8%
Very blue	71.7%	19.4%	6.7%	1.8%	0.4%

## CAMPAIGN FINANCE: WAVE 2

Fielding Dates: Sept. 7 – Oct. 3, 2017 Sample Size: 2,482 registered voters Margin of Error: +/- 2.0%

Q1-29. Questions released previously

### [Public Funding of Presidential Campaigns – Cole Bill]

We will now consider a bill in Congress that proposes ending the program for public funding of presidential campaigns.

As you may know, in the 1970's, the federal government established a program to make presidential campaigns less dependent on private contributions by providing them government funds. Presidential campaigns receive these funds, though, only if they agree to limit the total amount of money they spend in their campaign, and the amount of money they get from private sources. The program is funded by taxpayers, who check a box on their IRS tax forms directing \$3 to the fund for this purpose. Contributing to the fund does not increase an individual's taxes or reduce any refund they are owed.

For some time, all major presidential candidates adhered to the spending limits and received the funding. With time, though, some candidates found they could raise so much more money through private sources that they chose not to accept the limits on their spending, even though they would have to forego the public funds. By the 2016 election, all of the major candidates chose to exceed the spending limits, foregoing the public funds. Thus, the fund has been rarely used and now has nearly \$300 million available.

The legislation proposes to end the Federal program providing public support for presidential campaigns. The \$3 check off on taxpayers' IRS forms would be ended and the unused funds would be directed to pediatric research or deficit reduction.

Here is an argument **in favor of** the proposal:

Q30. This program for public funding of presidential campaigns is clearly not working. The amount of private money flowing into the leading campaigns keeps going up. The only candidates using the public funds are ones who do not have a remote chance of winning. Furthermore, the whole idea of using taxpayers' money to subsidize presidential campaigns is a dubious idea to begin with. It's simply welfare for presidential candidates. It would be better for these tax dollars to go to something like pediatric research or deficit reduction.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	49.4%	32.4%	<b>81.8%</b>	10.7%	7.3%	<b>18.0%</b>	0.3%
GOP	61.5%	28.1%	<b>89.6%</b>	6.3%	3.7%	<b>10.0%</b>	0.4%
Dem.	38.6%	36.3%	<b>74.9%</b>	13.8%	11.0%	<b>24.8%</b>	0.3%
Indep.	48.1%	32.5%	<b>80.6%</b>	13.0%	6.4%	<b>19.4%</b>	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	51.6%	32.8%	<b>84.4%</b>	11.3%	4.3%	<b>15.6%</b>	0.0%
Red	52.1%	32.5%	<b>84.6%</b>	9.8%	5.5%	<b>15.3%</b>	0.2%
Lean red	54.9%	26.5%	<b>81.4%</b>	9.6%	8.6%	<b>18.2%</b>	0.4%
Lean blue	43.8%	34.7%	<b>78.5%</b>	12.5%	8.7%	<b>21.2%</b>	0.3%
Blue	49.4%	35.4%	<b>84.8%</b>	8.2%	6.9%	<b>15.1%</b>	0.1%
Very blue	42.2%	34.3%	<b>76.5%</b>	12.5%	10.3%	<b>22.8%</b>	0.7%

**Note:** In the analysis above and throughout, the survey was divided into sextiles, with "Very red" districts having a Cook PVI rating (D-R) of -33 to -14, "Red" districts a PVI rating of -13 to -8, "Lean red" districts a PVI rating of -7 to -1, "Lean Blue" districts a PVI rating of +1 to +8, "Blue" districts a PVI rating of +9 to +17, and "Very blue" districts a PVI rating of +18 to +44.

Here is an argument **against** the proposal.

Q31. It is critical that we limit the corrupting power of campaign donors in presidential races. Public financing can play a key role in counterbalancing their influence. For many years, this program was effective in helping presidential candidates be less dependent on big campaign donors and limiting the role of big money. It's true the current system is having some problems. But it can be fixed through raising the limits and making them more realistic in the current environment. We cannot wave the flag of surrender and let big special interests dominate elections and ultimately our government. We need to fix the program, not throw it out.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	25.5%	34.1%	<b>59.6%</b>	20.7%	19.1%	<b>39.8%</b>	0.5%
GOP	18.1%	30.2%	<b>48.3%</b>	24.7%	26.3%	<b>51.0%</b>	0.6%
Dem.	33.3%	38.9%	<b>72.2%</b>	16.4%	11.1%	<b>27.5%</b>	0.3%
Indep.	23.2%	30.9%	<b>54.1%</b>	22.4%	22.6%	<b>45.0%</b>	0.8%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	20.2%	37.5%	<b>57.7%</b>	22.9%	19.3%	<b>42.2%</b>	0.2%
Red	20.8%	33.2%	<b>54.0%</b>	23.9%	21.6%	<b>45.5%</b>	0.6%
Lean red	27.2%	33.5%	<b>60.7%</b>	18.5%	20.7%	<b>39.2%</b>	0.0%
Lean blue	22.7%	37.0%	<b>59.7%</b>	23.1%	16.9%	<b>40.0%</b>	0.4%
Blue	29.3%	31.9%	<b>61.2%</b>	19.0%	18.9%	<b>37.9%</b>	0.9%
Very blue	32.9%	31.3%	<b>64.2%</b>	17.5%	17.0%	<b>34.5%</b>	1.3%

So, again, the bill proposes to end the Federal program providing public support for presidential campaigns. The \$3 check off on taxpayers' IRS forms would be ended and the unused funds would be directed to pediatric research or deficit reduction.

Q32. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable 0	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable 5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable 10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	6.8	19.9%	15.6%	64.3%	0.2%
GOP	7.7	11.5%	12.3%	76.0%	0.2%
Dem.	6.0	27.8%	18.8%	53.2%	0.2%
Indep.	6.9	19.4%	15.3%	64.9%	0.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	6.9	17.4%	20.6%	62.0%	0.0%
Red	7.2	15.5%	16.3%	67.8%	0.4%
Lean red	6.7	20.2%	13.2%	66.4%	0.2%
Lean blue	7.0	19.6%	12.8%	67.5%	0.0%
Blue	6.9	20.3%	13.4%	65.7%	0.6%
Very blue	6.2	26.3%	16.7%	56.7%	0.3%

Q33. So, would you recommend that your Members of Congress:

1. vote in favor of the proposal to eliminate the program for public financing of presidential campaigns.
2. vote against the proposal, thus preserving the program for public financing of presidential campaigns.

	In Favor of	Against	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	66.0%	32.6%	1.4%
GOP	79.4%	19.4%	1.2%
Dem.	53.0%	45.6%	1.4%
Indep.	67.4%	30.6%	2.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	62.8%	33.7%	3.5%
Red	69.1%	29.8%	1.1%
Lean red	66.1%	32.9%	1.0%
Lean blue	70.8%	29.0%	0.2%
Blue	67.7%	31.9%	0.4%
Very blue	60.1%	37.9%	2.0%

[IF "vote in favor of the proposal . . ." Q33=1, PRESENT Q34a]

Q34a. How important do you think it is to eliminate the program for public financing of presidential campaigns? (Note: results are percent of total)

	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	24.7%	26.5%	12.1%	2.6%	0.1%
GOP	31.0%	31.8%	13.9%	2.6%	0.0%
Dem.	18.0%	20.7%	11.3%	2.9%	0.2%
Indep.	26.7%	28.6%	10.1%	1.7%	0.2%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	22.2%	25.1%	12.9%	2.4%	0.2%
Red	21.3%	31.3%	13.1%	3.4%	0.0%
Lean red	27.6%	23.2%	12.3%	2.5%	0.4%
Lean blue	24.8%	30.6%	13.5%	1.8%	0.1%
Blue	28.3%	25.8%	10.7%	2.9%	0.0%
Very blue	23.1%	24.5%	9.8%	2.7%	0.0%

[IF "vote against the proposal . . ." Q33=2, PRESENT Q34b]

Q34b. How important do you think it is to preserve the program for public financing of presidential campaigns? (Note: results are percent of total)

	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	11.6%	12.2%	7.0%	1.8%	0.0%
GOP	5.6%	7.9%	5.2%	0.7%	0.0%
Dem.	18.8%	15.7%	9.3%	1.7%	0.0%
Indep.	7.1%	13.7%	5.1%	4.6%	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	8.7%	13.8%	8.5%	2.6%	0.0%
Red	10.2%	12.0%	6.3%	1.2%	0.0%
Lean red	14.5%	10.9%	6.8%	0.6%	0.0%
Lean blue	10.7%	11.9%	4.7%	1.5%	0.1%
Blue	12.0%	10.3%	7.6%	2.0%	0.0%
Very blue	13.1%	15.0%	6.7%	3.1%	0.0%

## CAMPAIGN FINANCE: WAVE 3

Fielding Dates: Sept. 22 – Oct. 17, 2017

Sample Size: 2,569 registered voters

Margin of Error: +/- 1.9%

### [Online Credit Card Donations]

Currently, there is a bill in Congress that proponents say will reduce the possibility of illegal online donations to Federal campaigns made by foreigners, in excess of legal limits, or with stolen credit cards. Opponents say there is no evidence these are real problems and that the proposed solutions discourage people from making donations.

As you may know, it is illegal for foreign sources—individuals or organizations—to make contributions to US campaigns. However, Americans living abroad may make such donations. The bill would:

- require that donors to Federal campaigns who make online credit card donations from abroad are not only US citizens, but also registered voters and that they provide their US voting address.

Here is an argument **in favor of** the proposal:

Q1. We need to ensure that foreigners are not influencing our Federal election process by making illegal contributions. If online credit card donors are required to provide the billing address and the CVV code of the credit cards they are using, it will be harder for foreign sources to make campaign donations. If a foreign source gives a false U.S. address, the CVV code would help identify this misinformation.

Please select how convincing or unconvincing you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	36.4%	45.3%	<b>81.7%</b>	12.7%	5.3%	<b>18.0%</b>	0.3%
<b>GOP</b>	37.0%	46.3%	<b>83.3%</b>	11.9%	4.7%	<b>16.6%</b>	0.1%
<b>Dem.</b>	37.1%	44.0%	<b>81.1%</b>	13.3%	5.2%	<b>18.5%</b>	0.4%
<b>Indep.</b>	33.2%	46.0%	<b>79.2%</b>	13.5%	6.8%	<b>20.3%</b>	0.6%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
<b>Very red</b>	37.9%	42.7%	<b>80.6%</b>	12.1%	7.3%	<b>19.4%</b>	0.0%
<b>Red</b>	33.5%	50.6%	<b>84.1%</b>	11.4%	3.9%	<b>15.3%</b>	0.5%
<b>Lean red</b>	39.1%	45.0%	<b>84.1%</b>	9.8%	5.9%	<b>15.7%</b>	0.3%
<b>Lean blue</b>	39.8%	42.2%	<b>82.0%</b>	12.8%	4.4%	<b>17.2%</b>	0.9%
<b>Blue</b>	37.3%	41.3%	<b>78.6%</b>	15.4%	6.0%	<b>21.4%</b>	0.1%
<b>Very blue</b>	32.2%	48.2%	<b>80.4%</b>	14.6%	4.7%	<b>19.3%</b>	0.3%

Here is an argument **against** the proposal.

Q2. This bill is a solution without a problem. The Federal Election Commission has not reported any significant problem of online credit cards being used by foreign sources to make illegal contributions. The bill would create a new limitation on Americans living abroad by requiring that they be currently registered to vote and have a US address—something that people living abroad may not be able to do.

Please select how convincing or unconvincing you find this argument:

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused/ Don't know
<b>National</b>	11.7%	31.6%	<b>43.3%</b>	31.6%	24.3%	<b>55.9%</b>	0.7%
<b>  </b> GOP	9.6%	28.8%	<b>38.4%</b>	32.6%	28.4%	<b>61.0%</b>	0.7%
Dem.	13.1%	33.9%	<b>47.0%</b>	31.5%	20.7%	<b>52.2%</b>	0.8%
Indep.	13.4%	32.7%	<b>46.1%</b>	29.4%	23.6%	<b>53.0%</b>	0.8%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	10.8%	25.4%	<b>36.2%</b>	34.9%	28.2%	<b>63.1%</b>	0.7%
Red	8.3%	34.1%	<b>42.4%</b>	36.0%	21.4%	<b>57.4%</b>	0.3%
Lean red	13.7%	29.4%	<b>43.1%</b>	30.8%	25.6%	<b>56.4%</b>	0.5%
Lean blue	10.3%	31.3%	<b>41.6%</b>	31.6%	25.0%	<b>56.6%</b>	1.7%
Blue	15.5%	31.1%	<b>46.6%</b>	27.0%	25.4%	<b>52.4%</b>	1.0%
Very blue	12.4%	38.9%	<b>51.3%</b>	28.4%	20.0%	<b>48.4%</b>	0.4%

So again, the bill would:

- require that donors to Federal campaigns who make online credit card donations from abroad are not only US citizens, but also registered voters and that they provide their US voting address.

Q4. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you on the scale below.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable
0					5					10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	7.3	14.1%	12.3%	73.4%	0.2%
<b>  </b> GOP	7.7	12.1%	9.7%	78.1%	0.1%
Dem.	7.2	13.4%	14.2%	71.9%	0.4%
Indep.	6.7	20.6%	13.6%	65.8%	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	7.6	11.7%	13.3%	74.9%	0.2%
Red	7.3	14.3%	13.1%	72.4%	0.2%
Lean red	7.5	13.6%	9.2%	77.2%	0.0%
Lean blue	7.3	15.6%	13.1%	71.1%	0.2%
Blue	7.5	12.9%	8.9%	78.2%	0.0%
Very blue	7.0	16.3%	16.9%	66.0%	0.8%

Here are some other provisions of the bill. Currently, when campaigns receive donations, of \$50 or more, they are required to get the donor's address, but this is not required if donations are under \$50. The proposed bill that would require that when campaigns get online credit card donations:

- in all cases, including those under \$50, they must get and report the donor's address,
- they must also always get the CVV code on the credit card.

Here is an argument in **favor** of the proposal:

Q5. This proposal will help prevent campaign donors from evading federal election laws that limit how much an individual can give to a campaign. By making numerous campaign donations under \$50 an individual can exceed those limits without being detected. By requiring all online credit card donors to give their address, it will make it easier to detect when someone exceeds legal campaign limits.



	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused/ Don't know
<b>National</b>	41.3%	38.0%	<b>79.3%</b>	13.2%	7.0%	<b>20.2%</b>	0.4%
<b>GOP</b>	41.1%	38.9%	<b>80.0%</b>	12.6%	7.0%	<b>19.6%</b>	0.3%
<b>Dem.</b>	41.3%	38.0%	<b>79.3%</b>	14.2%	5.9%	<b>20.1%</b>	0.6%
<b>Indep.</b>	41.8%	35.6%	<b>77.4%</b>	12.3%	10.0%	<b>22.3%</b>	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
<b>Very red</b>	40.3%	41.5%	<b>81.8%</b>	11.3%	6.7%	<b>18.0%</b>	0.2%
<b>Red</b>	43.6%	37.9%	<b>81.5%</b>	13.2%	5.2%	<b>18.4%</b>	0.2%
<b>Lean red</b>	44.0%	36.2%	<b>80.2%</b>	12.3%	6.9%	<b>19.2%</b>	0.7%
<b>Lean blue</b>	40.8%	36.6%	<b>77.4%</b>	14.2%	7.8%	<b>22.0%</b>	0.5%
<b>Blue</b>	42.8%	35.3%	<b>78.1%</b>	11.5%	10.0%	<b>21.5%</b>	0.4%
<b>Very blue</b>	36.5%	39.6%	<b>76.1%</b>	17.3%	6.0%	<b>23.3%</b>	0.6%

Here is an argument **against** this proposal:

Q6. There is no evidence that people are making numerous small online credit card donations to get around limits. Campaign donors making credit card donations already have to provide the name on the credit card and these donations are processed by campaign staff, who track and ensure donations are consistent with the laws. This proposed law simply discourages donations by small donors who don't like giving out personal information for fear that it might be stolen or misused.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	12.8%	31.4%	<b>44.2%</b>	29.8%	25.3%	<b>55.1%</b>	0.7%
<b>GOP</b>	11.9%	28.7%	<b>40.6%</b>	30.2%	28.4%	<b>58.6%</b>	0.8%
<b>Dem.</b>	13.4%	34.1%	<b>47.5%</b>	30.0%	21.9%	<b>51.9%</b>	0.6%
<b>Indep.</b>	13.6%	30.9%	<b>44.5%</b>	28.4%	26.7%	<b>55.1%</b>	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
<b>Very red</b>	9.8%	34.7%	<b>44.5%</b>	31.0%	23.6%	<b>54.6%</b>	0.9%
<b>Red</b>	12.9%	33.6%	<b>46.5%</b>	32.6%	20.8%	<b>53.4%</b>	0.1%
<b>Lean red</b>	13.1%	27.6%	<b>40.7%</b>	32.5%	25.7%	<b>58.2%</b>	1.1%
<b>Lean blue</b>	14.8%	28.3%	<b>43.1%</b>	26.1%	29.7%	<b>55.8%</b>	1.0%
<b>Blue</b>	15.3%	26.4%	<b>41.7%</b>	29.7%	28.1%	<b>57.8%</b>	0.5%
<b>Very blue</b>	11.1%	37.2%	<b>48.3%</b>	27.1%	24.3%	<b>51.4%</b>	0.3%

Here is another argument **in favor** of the proposal.

Q7. By requiring that people give the CVV code on the card, it makes it harder for people to use a stolen credit card. Hackers can often get credit card numbers that can then be used to make credit card donations, but if the CVV code is required, then that won't work because they would have to have the card itself. This creates greater protection.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	46.8%	38.8%	<b>85.6%</b>	8.0%	5.7%	<b>13.7%</b>	0.7%
<b>GOP</b>	47.0%	39.2%	<b>86.2%</b>	6.8%	6.2%	<b>13.0%</b>	0.8%
<b>Dem.</b>	46.6%	39.6%	<b>86.2%</b>	8.4%	4.7%	<b>13.1%</b>	0.7%
<b>Indep.</b>	46.7%	35.7%	<b>82.4%</b>	9.8%	7.3%	<b>17.1%</b>	0.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
<b>Very red</b>	46.9%	43.6%	<b>90.5%</b>	4.7%	4.2%	<b>8.9%</b>	0.6%
<b>Red</b>	49.3%	38.9%	<b>88.2%</b>	5.6%	5.7%	<b>11.3%</b>	0.5%
<b>Lean red</b>	48.0%	34.3%	<b>82.3%</b>	9.6%	6.9%	<b>16.5%</b>	1.3%
<b>Lean blue</b>	45.7%	39.0%	<b>84.7%</b>	8.8%	5.5%	<b>14.3%</b>	0.9%
<b>Blue</b>	49.2%	36.5%	<b>85.7%</b>	8.4%	5.4%	<b>13.8%</b>	0.5%
<b>Very blue</b>	42.1%	40.5%	<b>82.6%</b>	10.6%	6.3%	<b>16.9%</b>	0.5%

Here is another argument **against** the proposal.

Q8. In fact, the Federal Election Commission (FEC) has reported few cases of people using stolen credit cards for making campaign donations. That's because it would not make sense to do so. If a stolen credit card number is used, banks will find out and the campaign will have to return the funds.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	19.9%	32.2%	<b>52.1%</b>	28.2%	18.6%	<b>46.8%</b>	1.1%
<b>GOP</b>	17.5%	30.5%	<b>48.0%</b>	29.3%	21.4%	<b>50.7%</b>	1.3%
<b>Dem.</b>	22.0%	34.2%	<b>56.2%</b>	26.8%	15.9%	<b>42.7%</b>	1.1%
<b>Indep.</b>	20.1%	31.2%	<b>51.3%</b>	29.2%	18.9%	<b>48.1%</b>	0.6%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
<b>Very red</b>	18.9%	33.6%	<b>52.5%</b>	30.5%	16.3%	<b>46.8%</b>	0.8%
<b>Red</b>	17.2%	33.4%	<b>50.6%</b>	29.5%	19.4%	<b>48.9%</b>	0.5%
<b>Lean red</b>	20.4%	32.3%	<b>52.7%</b>	28.6%	16.9%	<b>45.5%</b>	1.7%
<b>Lean blue</b>	24.1%	27.3%	<b>51.4%</b>	29.9%	17.3%	<b>47.2%</b>	1.4%
<b>Blue</b>	17.9%	29.3%	<b>47.2%</b>	28.6%	22.9%	<b>51.5%</b>	1.4%
<b>Very blue</b>	22.2%	36.4%	<b>58.6%</b>	21.7%	18.9%	<b>40.6%</b>	0.8%

So again, the bill would require that when campaigns get online credit card donations:

- in all cases, including those under \$50, they must get and report the donor's address,
- they must always get the CVV code on the credit card.

Q9. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable
0					5					10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	7.3	15.4%	12.0%	72.2%	0.4%
<b>GOP</b>	7.5	13.4%	11.1%	75.1%	0.3%
<b>Dem.</b>	7.2	15.8%	12.6%	71.0%	0.6%
<b>Indep.</b>	6.9	19.0%	12.7%	67.9%	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
<b>Very red</b>	7.5	11.6%	11.5%	76.4%	0.4%
<b>Red</b>	7.4	15.1%	11.2%	73.4%	0.3%
<b>Lean red</b>	7.5	13.9%	11.0%	74.4%	0.7%
<b>Lean blue</b>	7.3	15.6%	11.2%	72.8%	0.3%
<b>Blue</b>	7.1	19.7%	9.6%	70.5%	0.2%
<b>Very blue</b>	6.9	16.2%	18.2%	64.8%	0.8%

Now, here is a broader argument against the bill:

Q10. What this bill really does is impose costly and burdensome reporting requirements on campaigns, especially ones that rely on small donors. It discourages people from donating because giving their address and CVV code increases the likelihood that this information will be hacked and used to steal their identity. It also makes it more complicated for Americans living abroad to make donations, because they have to be registered to vote and have a US address they can provide.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	17.3%	33.0%	<b>50.3%</b>	29.4%	19.2%	<b>48.6%</b>	1.1%
GOP	14.1%	33.5%	<b>47.6%</b>	30.1%	21.6%	<b>51.7%</b>	0.7%
Dem.	19.1%	34.1%	<b>53.2%</b>	28.1%	16.9%	<b>45.0%</b>	1.7%
Indep.	20.2%	28.6%	<b>48.8%</b>	30.8%	19.8%	<b>50.6%</b>	0.6%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	13.4%	33.8%	<b>47.2%</b>	36.8%	15.7%	<b>52.5%</b>	0.4%
Red	14.8%	38.9%	<b>53.7%</b>	25.7%	20.0%	<b>45.7%</b>	0.7%
Lean red	17.8%	32.1%	<b>49.9%</b>	28.6%	19.5%	<b>48.1%</b>	2.0%
Lean blue	21.5%	27.1%	<b>48.6%</b>	28.4%	20.9%	<b>49.3%</b>	2.2%
Blue	17.5%	32.5%	<b>50.0%</b>	29.2%	20.1%	<b>49.3%</b>	0.7%
Very blue	18.1%	33.8%	<b>51.9%</b>	27.6%	19.7%	<b>47.3%</b>	0.8%

Now, here is a broader argument in favor of the proposal:

Q11. It is reasonable to require that people provide their address and their CVV code: people do it all the time when they are making an online purchase, so they should be willing to do it when making a campaign contribution. It may not be the perfect solution to all the possible misuses of credit cards, but it does provide greater protection.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	43.8%	37.9%	<b>81.7%</b>	10.7%	6.7%	<b>17.4%</b>	0.8%
GOP	45.8%	40.1%	<b>85.9%</b>	7.6%	6.0%	<b>13.6%</b>	0.6%
Dem.	43.6%	36.2%	<b>79.8%</b>	13.0%	6.0%	<b>19.0%</b>	1.3%
Indep.	39.8%	37.3%	<b>77.1%</b>	12.5%	10.1%	<b>22.6%</b>	0.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	40.2%	45.3%	<b>85.5%</b>	8.8%	5.1%	<b>13.9%</b>	0.5%
Red	44.3%	39.0%	<b>83.3%</b>	8.8%	7.3%	<b>16.1%</b>	0.7%
Lean red	50.1%	34.0%	<b>84.1%</b>	9.8%	5.2%	<b>15.0%</b>	0.9%
Lean blue	43.2%	35.8%	<b>79.0%</b>	11.3%	8.1%	<b>19.4%</b>	1.5%
Blue	43.0%	37.7%	<b>80.7%</b>	11.5%	7.4%	<b>18.9%</b>	0.4%
Very blue	41.4%	35.9%	<b>77.3%</b>	15.1%	6.5%	<b>21.6%</b>	1.1%

Here again are the provisions of the proposed bill. It would:

- require that when campaigns get online credit card donations, in all cases, including those under \$50, they must get and report the donor's address,
- require that campaigns also get the CVV code on the credit card.
- require that donors who make online credit card donations from abroad be a registered voter in the US and provide their US voting address.

Q12. So, would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor or against this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused/ Don't know
<b>National</b>	79.3%	20.2%	0.4%
GOP	84.5%	15.3%	0.3%
Dem.	76.7%	22.6%	0.7%
Indep.	73.9%	26.0%	0.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	84.4%	15.4%	0.2%
Red	80.8%	18.9%	0.3%
Lean red	81.9%	18.0%	0.2%
Lean blue	78.8%	20.8%	0.3%
Blue	77.2%	22.0%	0.8%
Very blue	71.3%	27.8%	0.9%

Q13-16. Questions released previously

We are now going to consider a proposed bill in the U.S. Congress that has the goal of reducing the influence of big campaign donors—including special interests, corporations and wealthy people—on the Federal Government.

Q27. How important is this goal to you?

	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Ref. / Don't know
<b>National</b>	65.5%	23.8%	7.5%	2.7%	0.4%
GOP	57.6%	29.7%	9.1%	3.4%	0.2%
Dem.	74.5%	18.5%	5.4%	0.8%	0.7%
Indep.	61.4%	23.4%	9.0%	6.2%	0.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	64.6%	24.3%	9.0%	1.9%	0.2%
Red	63.7%	25.4%	7.2%	3.4%	0.3%
Lean red	67.5%	23.9%	5.5%	2.2%	0.9%
Lean blue	65.8%	21.5%	8.7%	2.9%	1.0%
Blue	65.3%	25.5%	7.3%	1.9%	0.0%
Very blue	67.6%	21.6%	7.0%	3.6%	0.1%

This proposal seeks to reduce the influence of big donors by making it more possible for candidates for U.S. Senate to rely entirely on small donors.

The idea is to create a program that provides financial support to US Senate candidates who agree to limit their fundraising to small donors. Here is how it would work:

- A candidate who chooses to participate must:
  - agree not to take donations of more than \$150 from any donor for an election.
  - demonstrate their viability as a candidate by raising a substantial number of small donations from in-state donors.
- The candidate would then receive additional funds as follows:
  - a six-to-one match of each small donation (e.g. if someone were to make a donation of \$100, the candidate would receive an additional \$600)

- a grant and credits for media ads, totaling approximately \$1-\$14 million, depending on the population of their state

The program would be funded by a new fee paid by companies who do large contract work for the federal government. They would be charged a fee of 0.5% on the amount of each contract over \$10 million.

Here is an argument **in favor of** this proposal:

Q28. By limiting Senate candidates to small donors, big donors will have less influence on the Senators once they are in office. Rather than spending much of their time trying to woo big donors they will spend more time getting to know a wider range of people in their state. Senators will then be more likely to be responsive to their constituents, as a whole, not just well-financed special interests. Candidates who do not want to be beholden to big donors will be more able to run for office and succeed. This program won't add to the deficit and will improve the quality of American democracy.

Here is an argument **against** this proposal:

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	42.9%	36.7%	<b>79.6%</b>	12.5%	6.9%	<b>19.4%</b>	1.0%
GOP	36.3%	38.9%	<b>75.2%</b>	14.3%	9.3%	<b>23.6%</b>	1.1%
Dem.	50.3%	34.3%	<b>84.6%</b>	9.6%	4.8%	<b>14.4%</b>	1.0%
Indep.	39.7%	37.4%	<b>77.1%</b>	15.5%	6.9%	<b>22.4%</b>	0.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	42.5%	40.8%	<b>83.3%</b>	9.9%	5.9%	<b>15.8%</b>	1.0%
Red	42.1%	34.7%	<b>76.8%</b>	13.4%	8.5%	<b>21.9%</b>	1.4%
Lean red	43.5%	37.8%	<b>81.3%</b>	10.8%	6.5%	<b>17.3%</b>	1.3%
Lean blue	43.9%	34.9%	<b>78.8%</b>	15.2%	5.6%	<b>20.8%</b>	0.4%
Blue	42.3%	35.3%	<b>77.6%</b>	13.4%	8.0%	<b>21.4%</b>	1.0%
Very blue	44.3%	36.2%	<b>80.5%</b>	12.0%	6.7%	<b>18.7%</b>	0.8%

Q29. While the program would be funded by charging a fee to federal contractors, they would simply add that cost to their contract; so taxpayers would still end up paying for it. Giving money to any Senate candidate—just because they have a substantial following of small donors—won't necessarily produce good candidates. This will give fringe candidates who are not electable a government-funded platform for furthering their extreme ideas. Finally, ideas like this have been tried in some states and there's no clear evidence they have diminished the influence of special interests.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	13.0%	39.2%	<b>52.2%</b>	29.7%	17.2%	<b>46.9%</b>	1.0%
GOP	17.1%	40.9%	<b>58.0%</b>	28.5%	12.6%	<b>41.1%</b>	1.0%
Dem.	9.6%	37.9%	<b>47.5%</b>	32.3%	19.0%	<b>51.3%</b>	1.1%
Indep.	11.6%	38.6%	<b>50.2%</b>	25.7%	23.7%	<b>49.4%</b>	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	14.6%	41.1%	<b>55.7%</b>	29.3%	14.2%	<b>43.5%</b>	0.7%
Red	14.1%	42.0%	<b>56.1%</b>	29.1%	13.8%	<b>42.9%</b>	0.9%
Lean red	9.9%	40.1%	<b>50.0%</b>	28.2%	20.6%	<b>48.8%</b>	1.2%
Lean blue	11.9%	38.3%	<b>50.2%</b>	29.9%	18.6%	<b>48.5%</b>	1.3%
Blue	11.7%	39.0%	<b>50.7%</b>	33.2%	15.0%	<b>48.2%</b>	1.2%
Very blue	14.6%	34.9%	<b>49.5%</b>	28.8%	21.3%	<b>50.1%</b>	0.5%

## CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITS (GOVERNMENT REFORM -WAVE 1)

**Fielding Dates:** Aug 3-16, 2017

**Sample Size:** 3045 registered voters

**Margin of Error:** 1.8%

So, here, again is the proposal:

Create a program that provides financial support to US Senate candidates who agree to limit their fundraising to small donors.

- A candidate who chooses to participate must:
  - agree not to take donations of more than \$150 from any donor for an election.
  - demonstrate their viability as a candidate by raising a substantial number of small donations from in-state donors.
- The candidate would then receive additional funds as follows:
  - a six-to-one match of each small donation
  - a grant and credits for media ads that would vary depending on the population of their state

The program would be funded by a new fee paid by companies who do large contract work for the federal government. They would be charged a fee of 0.5% on the amount of each contract over \$10 million.

Q30. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	6.1	21.7%	21.6%	56.2%	0.5%
GOP	5.5	28.7%	21.5%	49.2%	0.6%
Dem.	6.6	16.0%	19.3%	64.3%	0.5%
Indep.	6.0	19.9%	27.9%	51.8%	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	5.9	18.2%	29.2%	52.3%	0.3%
Red	5.8	28.3%	19.5%	51.5%	0.8%
Lean red	6.1	21.8%	19.3%	58.6%	0.3%
Lean blue	6.3	19.3%	20.4%	59.7%	0.6%
Blue	6.0	24.1%	21.5%	53.5%	0.9%
Very blue	6.4	17.7%	20.3%	61.7%	0.3%

Q31. So, would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor or against this proposal?

	Favor	Against	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	66.0%	31.9%	2.1%
GOP	58.1%	40.4%	1.5%
Dem.	73.3%	24.1%	2.6%
Indep.	65.9%	31.8%	2.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	64.1%	34.1%	1.8%
Red	58.2%	38.2%	3.6%
Lean red	69.1%	29.3%	1.5%
Lean blue	70.6%	27.8%	1.5%
Blue	65.6%	32.3%	2.1%
Very blue	69.3%	28.6%	2.2%

[ALL OF THESE SPECIFY 2 TERMS FOR SENATE. VARIES 3-6 FOR HOUSE. 6 MOST POPULAR]

One proposal is to have term limits for Members of Congress.

The rationale is that once a Representative or Senator is in office, they tend to be re-elected. Incumbents win re-election races more than 90 percent of the time. Some people say that this makes it easier for long-standing Members of Congress not to pay close attention to the needs and views of their constituents.

The proposal is to pass a Constitutional amendment to **limit how many terms** a member of the House or Senate may stay in office, similar to the term limits placed on the President.

Here is an argument **in favor of** Congressional term limits:

Q40. When a Member of Congress remains in office for a few terms, they accumulate advantages over any challenger--they have more name recognition and are able to raise much more money, partly because donors hope incumbents will do favors for them. Because incumbents are so secure, they no longer need to be attentive to their constituents and increasingly lose touch with the people back home. If we were to have term limits, we would have more open-seat races in which both candidates would really have to earn the votes of the people, including by paying attention to their views.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	53.8%	31.9%	<b>85.7%</b>	9.3%	4.2%	<b>13.5%</b>	0.9%
GOP	63.2%	27.0%	<b>90.2%</b>	5.9%	3.1%	<b>9.0%</b>	0.8%
Dem.	47.3%	34.5%	<b>81.8%</b>	12.0%	5.5%	<b>17.5%</b>	0.7%
Indep.	48.5%	36.6%	<b>85.1%</b>	9.9%	3.5%	<b>13.4%</b>	1.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	56.7%	30.8%	<b>87.5%</b>	8.4%	3.5%	<b>11.9%</b>	0.6%
Red	54.0%	33.2%	<b>87.2%</b>	7.1%	4.6%	<b>11.7%</b>	1.1%
Lean red	57.4%	27.2%	<b>84.6%</b>	9.4%	5.1%	<b>14.5%</b>	0.9%
Lean blue	53.8%	32.8%	<b>86.6%</b>	9.1%	3.4%	<b>12.5%</b>	0.8%
Blue	51.3%	33.2%	<b>84.5%</b>	10.1%	4.5%	<b>14.6%</b>	0.8%
Very blue	44.6%	35.3%	<b>79.9%</b>	13.4%	6.3%	<b>19.7%</b>	0.4%

Here is an argument **against** Congressional term limits:

Q41. Term limits would drastically reduce the number of Members of Congress who have deep experience and knowledge of the issues, as well as well-developed relationships that make it more possible to negotiate deals. New Members of Congress are often unrealistic and less able to compromise, while also being more vulnerable to special interests who can take advantage of their inexperience. Tampering with the Constitution in this way is a risky idea and takes away from the people the freedom to elect the representative they think is best qualified.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	13.3%	34.5%	<b>47.8%</b>	26.9%	24.4%	<b>51.3%</b>	0.9%
GOP	10.9%	29.7%	<b>40.6%</b>	27.2%	31.7%	<b>58.9%</b>	0.5%
Dem.	16.0%	38.6%	<b>54.6%</b>	26.8%	17.5%	<b>44.3%</b>	1.1%
Indep.	11.5%	34.7%	<b>46.2%</b>	26.6%	25.6%	<b>52.2%</b>	1.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	14.1%	29.6%	<b>43.7%</b>	29.0%	26.9%	<b>55.9%</b>	0.4%
Red	10.9%	33.3%	<b>44.2%</b>	26.9%	27.8%	<b>54.7%</b>	1.1%
Lean red	11.7%	31.9%	<b>43.6%</b>	27.2%	28.3%	<b>55.5%</b>	0.9%
Lean blue	11.2%	40.3%	<b>51.5%</b>	23.7%	23.7%	<b>47.4%</b>	1.1%
Blue	15.9%	32.8%	<b>48.7%</b>	30.5%	20.4%	<b>50.9%</b>	0.4%
Very blue	14.5%	40.8%	<b>55.3%</b>	23.9%	19.6%	<b>43.5%</b>	1.1%

So, here again, is the proposal:

Q42. Pass a Constitutional amendment to limit how many terms a member of the House or Senate may stay in office, similar to the term limits placed on the President.

Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	7.5	14.9%	9.9%	74.4%	0.8%
GOP	8.3	7.7%	7.0%	84.4%	0.9%
Dem.	6.9	21.0%	11.0%	67.5%	0.5%
Indep.	7.3	16.1%	13.7%	68.7%	1.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	7.8	12.7%	8.6%	77.8%	1.0%
Red	7.8	11.8%	8.2%	79.5%	0.5%
Lean red	7.7	12.8%	9.0%	77.2%	0.9%
Lean blue	7.4	16.9%	10.2%	71.6%	1.3%
Blue	7.2	17.5%	9.7%	72.4%	0.4%
Very blue	6.8	21.4%	13.2%	65.0%	0.4%

Q43. Do you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor or against a Constitutional amendment to limit the number of terms that a Member of Congress can serve?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	79.7%	19.0%	1.3%
GOP	87.5%	11.7%	0.7%
Dem.	73.2%	25.5%	1.3%
Indep.	78.2%	19.0%	2.8%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	82.2%	16.7%	1.0%
Red	81.8%	16.4%	1.8%
Lean red	80.2%	18.9%	0.9%
Lean blue	80.1%	18.4%	1.5%
Blue	78.4%	20.6%	1.0%
Very blue	71.2%	27.2%	1.6%

Please enter how many terms each of the following should be limited to:

Q43a. House Members should be limited to \_\_\_\_ two-year terms

	Median	Against Term Limits	1 term	2 terms	3 terms	4 terms	5 or more terms	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	3.0	19.0%	2.2%	22.3%	16.3%	18.3%	19.3%	2.6%
GOP	3.0	11.7%	1.6%	23.8%	19.9%	19.9%	21.5%	1.6%
Dem.	3.0	25.5%	2.6%	20.2%	13.7%	17.2%	18.0%	2.8%
Indep.	3.0	19.0%	3.0%	24.2%	14.6%	17.2%	17.6%	4.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>								
Very red	3.0	16.7%	1.6%	23.9%	15.9%	21.2%	18.2%	2.4%
Red	3.0	16.4%	1.2%	21.6%	18.0%	19.3%	21.0%	2.5%
Lean red	3.0	18.9%	1.8%	21.8%	18.0%	19.1%	18.5%	1.8%
Lean blue	3.0	18.4%	2.8%	21.4%	17.2%	17.8%	18.9%	3.6%
Blue	4.0	20.6%	2.7%	21.9%	13.6%	17.7%	21.0%	2.5%
Very blue	3.0	27.2%	2.7%	20.1%	14.5%	16.3%	17.0%	2.2%



Q43b. Senators should be limited to \_\_\_ six-year terms

	Median	Against Term Limits	1 term	2 terms	3 terms	4 terms	5 or more terms	Ref./ Don't know
<b>National</b>	2.0	19.0%	13.0%	44.0%	11.0%	6.7%	3.5%	2.9%
<b>GOP</b>	2.0	11.7%	15.9%	51.8%	10.8%	5.5%	2.4%	1.9%
<b>Dem.</b>	2.0	25.5%	9.9%	38.3%	11.4%	8.0%	3.9%	3.1%
<b>Indep.</b>	2.0	19.0%	14.7%	40.5%	10.1%	6.2%	5.0%	4.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>								
<b>Very red</b>	2.0	16.7%	11.8%	48.4%	11.2%	5.9%	2.7%	3.3%
<b>Red</b>	2.0	16.4%	12.5%	47.1%	11.9%	6.8%	2.5%	2.9%
<b>Lean red</b>	2.0	18.9%	12.8%	47.9%	10.3%	5.1%	2.9%	2.0%
<b>Lean blue</b>	2.0	18.4%	16.1%	38.6%	10.6%	7.0%	5.9%	3.4%
<b>Blue</b>	2.0	20.6%	13.2%	40.8%	11.3%	7.2%	4.1%	2.7%
<b>Very blue</b>	2.0	27.2%	11.4%	40.2%	10.0%	6.7%	2.0%	2.5%

[ONE THIRD SAMPLE A]

Q44A. Suppose the proposed amendment would call for: House Members being limited to **3 terms** and Senate Members being limited to 2 terms (emphasis added)

Would you then recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor or against such a proposal for a Constitutional amendment?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	70.6%	28.5%	0.9%
<b>GOP</b>	76.4%	22.7%	0.9%
<b>Dem.</b>	65.7%	34.1%	0.2%
<b>Indep.</b>	70.0%	27.3%	2.7%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
<b>Very red</b>	72.0%	28.0%	0.0%
<b>Red</b>	71.1%	28.5%	0.3%
<b>Lean red</b>	68.8%	30.2%	1.0%
<b>Lean blue</b>	72.9%	26.6%	0.6%
<b>Blue</b>	66.3%	31.9%	1.8%
<b>Very blue</b>	73.6%	24.8%	1.6%

[ONE THIRD SAMPLE B]

Q44B. Suppose the proposed amendment would call for: House Members being limited to **4 terms** and Senate Members being limited to 2 terms (emphasis added)

Would you then recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor or against such a proposal for a Constitutional amendment?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	72.7%	26.3%	1.1%
<b>GOP</b>	79.1%	19.1%	1.8%
<b>Dem.</b>	66.4%	33.3%	0.4%
<b>Indep.</b>	73.0%	25.9%	1.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
<b>Very red</b>	74.3%	25.7%	0.0%
<b>Red</b>	72.3%	27.3%	0.3%
<b>Lean red</b>	82.2%	17.2%	0.6%
<b>Lean blue</b>	68.7%	27.2%	4.1%
<b>Blue</b>	69.5%	29.8%	0.7%
<b>Very blue</b>	68.4%	30.4%	1.2%

[ONE THIRD SAMPLE C]

Q44C. Suppose the proposed amendment would call for: House Members being limited to **6 terms** and Senate Members being limited to 2 terms (emphasis added)

Would you then recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor or against such a proposal for a Constitutional amendment?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
<b>National</b>	71.9%	26.8%	1.2%
GOP	79.7%	20.0%	0.3%
Dem.	66.2%	32.2%	1.6%
Indep.	69.7%	27.9%	2.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	73.2%	25.9%	0.9%
Red	72.2%	26.1%	1.7%
Lean red	74.0%	25.5%	0.5%
Lean blue	72.2%	27.2%	0.7%
Blue	74.3%	24.8%	0.9%
Very blue	64.4%	32.7%	3.0%

###