



PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

GOVERNMENT REFORM SURVEY Maryland's 8th Congressional District July 2019

Field Dates: July 6 – 18, 2019

Margin of Error: Democrats +/- 5.1%; Republicans +/- 7.7%

Sample Size: 600 Residents of Maryland's 8th Congressional District

Methodology: Conducted by the Program for Public Consultation. The sample was recruited using a random sample of Households in the district with assistance from Precision Sample panel of respondents, L2 Political database of verified emails and the University of Maryland. The sample was weighted by age, education, gender and ethnicity using benchmarks for Maryland's 8th Congressional District that were obtained from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey.

Today we are going to do a survey on an important public policy issue. 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.

Now 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.

Q1-RG1.1. How important is this goal to you?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Total convincing	Slightly important	Not at all important	Total unconvincing	Refused/ Don't know
National	60.0%	28.0%	88.0%	8.5%	3.3%	11.8%	0.2%
GOP	48.8%	35.1%	83.9%	11.8%	4.0%	15.8%	0.1%
Dem.	72.4%	19.8%	92.2%	5.7%	1.9%	7.6%	0.2%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	60.4%	27.3%	87.7%	9.1%	3.3%	12.4%	0.0%
GOP	41.0%	36.2%	77.2%	16.6%	6.3%	22.9%	0.0%
Dem.	71.6%	23.5%	95.1%	4.5%	0.4%	4.9%	0.0%

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.

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 counterbalance 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-RG1.2. 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	Refused/ Don't know
National	21.9%	48.2%	70.1%	19.0%	10.5%	29.5%	0.3%
GOP	21.2%	45.7%	66.9%	19.7%	12.9%	32.6%	0.4%
Dem.	23.0%	51.0%	74.0%	18.1%	7.6%	25.7%	0.2%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	25.8%	46.2%	72.0%	19.4%	8.3%	27.7%	0.4%
GOP	20.7%	43.1%	63.8%	22.2%	13.8%	36.0%	0.2%
Dems	29.8%	48.9%	78.7%	15.9%	4.9%	20.8%	0.5%

Here is an argument against this tax credit proposal:

Q3-RG1.3. 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
National	27.5%	40.8%	68.3%	22.5%	8.5%	31.0%	0.8%
GOP	31.5%	38.8%	70.3%	22.0%	7.0%	29.0%	0.8%
Dem.	23.3%	42.3%	65.6%	23.8%	9.6%	33.4%	1.1%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	28.5%	40.3%	68.8%	21.6%	9.4%	31.0%	0.2%
GOP	33.9%	46.2%	80.1%	14.0%	5.9%	19.9%	0.0%
Dems	27.1%	36.9%	64.0%	25.5%	10.3%	35.8%	0.3%

Q4-RG1.4. 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.

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

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./ Don't know
National	5.6	29.2%	20.5%	50.0%	0.3%
GOP	5.2	35.0%	17.8%	47.0%	0.2%
Dem.	6.0	23.1%	20.6%	55.7%	0.5%
Maryland					
Cong. Dist. 8	5.4	33.9%	13.8%	51.1%	1.2%
GOP	4.8	43.1%	13.0%	43.3%	0.6%
Dems	5.8	29.2%	14.6%	55.7%	0.5%

Q5-RG1.5. So, would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
National	59.5%	40.0%	0.6%
GOP	53.4%	46.3%	0.4%
Dem.	66.6%	33.0%	0.4%
Maryland			
Cong. Dist. 8	62.1%	37.5%	0.3%
GOP	56.8%	42.9%	0.3%
Dems	67.8%	32.0%	0.2%

Q6-RG1.7. 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.



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

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref. / Don't know
National	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%
Maryland					
Cong. Dist. 8	4.5	46.5%	16.6%	35.7%	1.1%
GOP	3.5	60.9%	10.1%	29.0%	0.0%
Dems	5.1	37.9%	19.8%	41.2%	1.0%

Q7-RG1.8. So, would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
National	27.8%	71.9%	0.4%
GOP	17.9%	82.0%	0.1%
Dem.	37.1%	62.6%	0.3%
Maryland			
Cong. Dist. 8	49.7%	50.0%	0.3%
GOP	40.9%	59.1%	0.0%
Dems	56.7%	42.9%	0.4%

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:

Q8-RG1.15. 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	Refused/ Don't know
National	46.5%	39.9%	86.4%	9.2%	4.1%	13.3%	0.3%
GOP	42.2%	42.4%	84.6%	9.9%	5.4%	15.3%	0.1%
Dem.	52.3%	36.6%	88.9%	8.1%	2.8%	10.9%	0.2%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	42.6%	40.1%	82.7%	11.9%	5.1%	17.0%	0.2%
GOP	26.5%	48.0%	74.5%	18.7%	6.8%	25.5%	0.0%
Dems	52.9%	35.2%	88.1%	7.7%	3.9%	11.6%	0.3%

Q9-RG1.16. 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
National	58.6%	31.2%	89.8%	7.0%	2.9%	9.9%	0.3%
GOP	53.3%	34.0%	87.3%	8.6%	3.7%	12.3%	0.3%
Dem.	65.8%	27.1%	92.9%	5.3%	1.7%	7.0%	0.2%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	54.8%	30.6%	85.4%	11.2%	3.3%	14.5%	0.2%
GOP	41.3%	42.4%	83.7%	13.2%	3.2%	16.4%	0.0%
Dems	63.1%	25.1%	88.2%	8.9%	2.8%	11.7%	0.1%

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

Q10-RG1.17. 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	Refused/ Don't know
National	10.0%	28.8%	38.8%	33.2%	27.5%	60.7%	0.5%
GOP	13.0%	33.7%	46.7%	30.5%	22.0%	52.5%	0.8%
Dem.	7.4%	24.0%	31.4%	35.0%	33.4%	68.4%	0.2%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	13.6%	30.2%	43.8%	33.9%	22.4%	56.3%	0.0%
GOP	20.7%	37.0%	57.7%	31.1%	11.3%	42.4%	0.0%
Dems	11.3%	27.2%	38.5%	34.0%	27.5%	61.5%	0.0%

Q11-RG1.18. 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
National	14.2%	39.2%	53.4%	28.4%	17.6%	46.0%	0.7%
GOP	16.3%	43.3%	59.6%	25.8%	13.5%	39.3%	1.1%
Dem.	11.3%	35.9%	47.2%	30.7%	21.5%	52.2%	0.6%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	21.0%	35.8%	56.8%	25.9%	16.3%	42.2%	1.0%
GOP	32.0%	37.2%	69.2%	24.3%	5.1%	29.4%	1.4%
Dems	17.3%	32.5%	49.8%	27.9%	21.6%	49.5%	0.7%

Q12-RG1.19. 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.

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.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./ Don't know
National	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%
Maryland					
Cong. Dist. 8	6.6	22.8%	13.6%	62.7%	0.9%
GOP	5.7	31.6%	10.1%	57.8%	0.5%
Dems	7.2	18.4%	14.1%	66.4%	1.1%

Q13-RG1.20. So, would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
National	81.8%	17.5%	0.7%
GOP	76.5%	23.2%	0.3%
Dem.	88.4%	10.9%	0.8%
Maryland			
Cong. Dist. 8	76.9%	22.9%	0.2%
GOP	69.4%	30.6%	0.0%
Dems	82.3%	17.3%	0.4%

Q14-RG1.22. 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.

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.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./ Don't know
National	7.8	8.7%	10.4%	80.7%	0.2%
GOP	7.7	9.4%	11.2%	79.3%	0.2%
Dem.	8.0	7.4%	9.5%	82.8%	0.2%
Maryland					
Cong. Dist. 8	7.2	16.0%	11.1%	72.1%	0.8%
GOP	6.3	26.5%	5.4%	67.6%	0.5%
Dems	7.7	10.5%	14.0%	75.2%	0.3%

Q15-RG1.23. So, would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
National	85.3%	14.3%	0.5%
GOP	82.7%	17.0%	0.3%
Dem.	87.9%	11.4%	0.7%
Maryland			
Cong. Dist. 8	77.8%	21.0%	1.2%
GOP	74.4%	25.6%	0.0%
Dems	78.5%	19.9%	1.6%

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.

Q16-RG1.25. 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.

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.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./ Don't know
National	7.5	11.2%	12.6%	75.7%	0.5%
GOP	7.0	13.5%	16.3%	69.6%	0.6%
Dem.	8.1	8.0%	8.2%	83.3%	0.5%
Maryland					
Cong. Dist. 8	6.9	19.9%	11.6%	67.9%	0.7%
GOP	6.1	24.6%	12.6%	62.4%	0.4%
Dems	7.3	17.2%	10.5%	71.5%	0.8%

Q17-RG1.26. So, would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
National	81.1%	17.5%	1.4%
GOP	74.1%	24.6%	1.3%
Dem.	88.5%	10.7%	0.8%
Maryland			
Cong. Dist. 8	78.8%	20.8%	0.4%
GOP	69.5%	30.2%	0.3%
Dems	82.3%	17.3%	0.4%

Q18-RG1.28. Let's suppose Congress does not pass the proposal described above.

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.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./ Don't know
National	5.6	9.5%	11.7%	78.3%	0.4%
GOP	5.2	9.3%	11.6%	78.7%	0.4%
Dem.	6.0	8.0%	10.4%	81.3%	0.3%
Maryland					
Cong. Dist. 8	6.8	20.0%	13.1%	66.3%	0.6%
GOP	6.0	29.8%	10.2%	59.5%	0.4%
Dems	7.3	14.1%	14.9%	70.4%	0.5%



Q19-RG1.29. 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	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
National	85.2%	13.8%	0.9%
GOP	84.0%	15.4%	0.7%
Dem.	88.8%	10.3%	0.9%
Maryland			
Cong. Dist. 8	78.6%	20.9%	0.4%
GOP	78.5%	21.5%	0.0%
Dems	78.5%	20.9%	0.6%

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:

Q20-RG1.31. 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	Refused/ Don't know
National	44.4%	36.5%	80.9%	10.1%	7.6%	17.7%	1.3%
GOP	35.5%	39.9%	75.4%	12.0%	11.2%	23.2%	1.3%
Dem.	53.6%	33.7%	87.3%	8.3%	3.9%	12.2%	0.6%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	43.1%	36.7%	79.8%	12.8%	6.4%	19.2%	1.0%
GOP	27.5%	38.1%	65.6%	20.6%	11.6%	32.2%	2.2%
Dems	52.3%	34.5%	86.8%	9.0%	3.9%	12.9%	0.3%



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

Q21-RG1.32. 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
National	16.2%	30.9%	47.1%	27.5%	24.5%	52.0%	0.9%
GOP	22.1%	33.4%	55.5%	24.7%	19.1%	43.8%	0.8%
Dem.	10.3%	28.0%	38.3%	29.9%	31.1%	61.0%	0.6%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	20.2%	32.8%	53.0%	25.7%	21.0%	46.7%	0.2%
GOP	32.1%	40.9%	73.0%	20.7%	6.3%	27.0%	0.0%
Dems	14.4%	30.5%	44.9%	26.1%	28.9%	55.0%	0.2%

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

Q22-RG1.33. 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.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./ Don't know
National	6.6	20.4%	14.6%	64.3%	0.7%
GOP	5.9	27.6%	14.3%	57.2%	0.9%
Dem.	7.3	12.5%	13.7%	73.6%	0.2%
Maryland					
Cong. Dist. 8	6.2	26.0%	13.7%	59.9%	0.3%
GOP	5.0	43.1%	8.8%	47.7%	0.4%
Dems	6.9	15.5%	15.4%	69.0%	0.2%

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:

Q23-RG1.34. 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	Refused/ Don't know
National	44.0%	33.1%	77.1%	13.3%	8.3%	21.6%	1.2%
GOP	35.2%	36.3%	71.5%	15.0%	12.1%	27.1%	1.3%
Dem.	53.1%	29.5%	82.6%	11.4%	5.2%	16.6%	0.8%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	45.8%	34.3%	80.1%	10.1%	8.8%	18.9%	1.0%
GOP	29.0%	41.8%	70.8%	17.3%	9.3%	26.6%	2.6%
Dems	55.8%	29.0%	84.8%	6.4%	8.6%	15.0%	0.2%

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

Q24-RG1.35. 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
National	8.5%	28.3%	36.8%	30.7%	31.0%	61.7%	1.6%
GOP	11.2%	33.3%	44.5%	31.7%	22.1%	53.8%	1.8%
Dem.	6.8%	22.6%	29.4%	29.7%	39.8%	69.5%	1.1%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	17.5%	34.1%	51.6%	25.2%	22.5%	47.7%	0.7%
GOP	24.3%	40.9%	65.2%	24.8%	9.2%	34.0%	0.8%
Dems	15.4%	29.9%	45.3%	26.5%	27.9%	54.4%	0.3%

Q25-RG1.36. Now that you have reviewed these arguments, please select how acceptable this proposal would be:

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.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./ Don't know
National	6.8	19.7%	13.3%	66.0%	1.0%
GOP	6.1	26.1%	13.7%	59.1%	1.0%
Dem.	7.5	13.4%	11.9%	74.2%	0.5%
Maryland					
Cong. Dist. 8	6.3	26.3%	14.1%	57.8%	1.8%
GOP	5.2	43.3%	8.2%	48.1%	0.4%
Dems	7.0	16.4%	16.9%	64.3%	2.4%

Q26-RG1.37. 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

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

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
National	75.0%	23.5%	1.6%
GOP	65.9%	32.6%	1.5%
Dem.	84.9%	14.1%	0.9%
Maryland			
Cong. Dist. 8	72.7%	25.5%	1.8%
GOP	63.8%	34.5%	1.7%
Dems	77.5%	20.7%	1.8%

Now we are going to turn to proposals that deal with how Members of Congress are elected.

A debate in Congress is about how the districts for the House of Representatives of the US Congress are designed. As you may know, every 10 years, with the new US Census, these districts are redesigned by state governments to adjust for population shifts. Usually this is done by state legislatures.

Some Members of Congress are concerned that state legislatures, which are often dominated by one party or the other, try to design districts that favor their party. When legislatures do this, it is called gerrymandering.

There is a bill that sets federal regulations for redistricting that proponents say will reduce gerrymandering. Opponents say that the federal government should not step in and that it should be left to the states.

In Congress, there is a proposal to have the shape of Congressional districts set by a commission of citizens within each state. Such citizen commissions are already being used in a few states.

The proposal specifies that the commission of citizens would:

- be committed to designing districts in a way that is geographically natural and compact without creating a favorable distribution for either party
- be one third Republicans, one third Democrats, and one third independents,
- reflect the balance of the state according to gender, race, ethnicity and the geographic areas of the state

Decisions on the shape of districts would be made by a majority of the commission members that includes at least one member from both parties and an independent.

Here are two arguments in favor of this proposal for a citizen commission.

Q27-RG2.42. When one party has control of the redistricting process, they tend to make great efforts to ensure that their party wins more districts, often creating weirdly shaped districts. The representatives from a particular state can be completely or almost completely from one party, though this does not reflect the real partisan balance in the state.



This means that voters from the party not in control of the legislature get less representation in Congress, even though they may live in an area of the state where they are a majority.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused/ Don't know
National	42.7%	37.9%	80.6%	12.8%	5.2%	18.0%	1.4%
GOP	33.9%	42.9%	76.8%	14.2%	7.4%	21.6%	1.6%
Dem.	52.2%	33.0%	85.2%	10.9%	2.4%	13.3%	1.5%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	44.4%	31.7%	76.1%	17.4%	6.5%	23.9%	0.0%
GOP	36.8%	31.4%	68.2%	26.5%	5.3%	31.8%	0.0%
Dems	48.4%	32.0%	80.4%	12.4%	7.3%	19.7%	0.0%

Q28-RG2.43. When partisan politicians use gerrymandering to create safe districts for their party, the general election is not competitive, so the only really important election is the primary of the majority party in the district. Candidates who only need to appeal to the views of primary voters tend to be more ideologically extreme and, when in Congress, are less likely to find common ground with the other party. When nonpartisan commissions of citizens design districts, the districts are more likely to be competitive between the parties; candidates are more likely to appeal to and be responsive to the whole district and are less partisan in Congress.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref. / Don't know
National	34.4%	40.4%	74.8%	18.1%	5.9%	24.0%	1.3%
GOP	28.6%	40.6%	69.2%	21.3%	8.1%	29.4%	1.4%
Dem.	43.1%	39.3%	82.4%	13.3%	2.9%	16.2%	1.4%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	38.7%	40.7%	79.4%	14.6%	5.4%	20.0%	0.6%
GOP	36.6%	46.6%	83.2%	13.2%	3.2%	16.4%	0.4%
Dems	41.4%	35.9%	77.3%	15.8%	6.7%	22.5%	0.1%

Here are two arguments against this proposal for a citizen commission

Q29-RG2.44. The federal government should not step in and tell the states how to design their Congressional districts. Doing so overrides the state legislatures that have been elected by and are accountable to the people. Giving the authority to redistrict to unelected citizen commissioners actually takes power away from the people.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused/ Don't know
National	21.2%	30.5%	51.7%	24.3%	22.8%	47.1%	1.2%
GOP	31.7%	36.0%	67.7%	21.5%	9.7%	31.2%	1.2%
Dem.	11.8%	26.2%	38.0%	25.4%	35.5%	60.9%	1.2%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	15.3%	30.2%	45.5%	31.2%	23.1%	54.3%	0.2%
GOP	19.9%	35.3%	55.2%	30.1%	14.7%	44.8%	0.0%
Dems	13.5%	27.8%	41.3%	30.0%	28.7%	58.7%	0.0%

Q30-RG2.45. The way citizen commissions draw the lines will not necessarily lead to more competitive districts. People increasingly cluster in areas with others who are of the same party. So, whatever the citizen commission does, the districts are still likely to be dominated by one party. This will all be a lot of effort with no real gain.



	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref. / Don't know
National	10.4%	34.0%	44.4%	30.6%	23.7%	54.3%	1.3%
GOP	16.1%	40.2%	56.3%	28.0%	14.1%	42.1%	1.6%
Dem.	5.8%	28.1%	33.9%	32.1%	32.7%	64.8%	1.4%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	13.9%	35.2%	49.1%	29.2%	21.1%	50.3%	0.6%
GOP	22.8%	36.7%	59.5%	27.7%	12.7%	40.4%	0.0%
Dems	10.1%	34.7%	44.8%	29.0%	25.5%	54.5%	0.7%

Q31-RG2.46. So now, again, here is the proposal:

The shape of Congressional districts would be set by a commission of citizens within each state which would:

- be committed to designing districts in a way that is geographically natural and compact without creating a favorable distribution for either party
- be one third Republicans, one third Democrats, and one third independents,
- reflect the balance of the state according to gender, race, ethnicity and the geographic areas of the state.

Decisions on the shape of districts would be made by a majority of the commission members that includes at least one member from both parties and an independent.

Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./ Don't know
National	6.5	19.2%	17.5%	62.0%	1.3%
GOP	5.6	28.8%	17.0%	52.6%	1.6%
Dem.	7.4	10.2%	17.5%	71.2%	1.1%
Maryland					
Cong. Dist. 8	6.9	15.9%	14.4%	64.4%	5.3%
GOP	6.3	21.0%	9.9%	58.8%	10.4%
Dems	7.3	12.3%	16.2%	68.6%	2.9%

Q32-RG2.47. Would you recommend that your Members of Congress:

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
National	66.2%	31.7%	2.0%
GOP	52.9%	45.4%	1.8%
Dem.	80.3%	17.5%	2.3%
Maryland			
Cong. Dist. 8	68.1%	30.2%	1.6%
GOP	56.4%	43.1%	0.5%
Dems	76.0%	22.2%	1.8%

[Q33a ASKED ONLY IF RESPONDENT CHOSE "Vote in favor . . ." ON Q32]

Q33a-RG2.48a. How important do you think it is have a citizen commission set the shape of Congressional districts?



	Very important	Somewhat important	Total Important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Total Not important	Refused/ Don't know
National	33.6%	26.6%	60.2%	5.3%	0.5%	5.8%	0.3%
GOP	19.5%	26.4%	45.9%	6.1%	0.6%	6.7%	0.4%
Dem.	47.8%	27.5%	75.3%	4.4%	0.4%	4.8%	0.2%
Maryland							
CD-8	39.1%	22.9%	62.0%	6.0%	0.0%	6.0%	1.7%
GOP	29.2%	18.5%	47.7%	8.7%	0.0%	8.7%	0.5%
Dem.	47.3%	23.9%	71.2%	4.7%	0.0%	4.7%	1.8%

[Q33b ASKED ONLY IF RESPONDENT CHOSE “Vote against . . .” ON Q32]

Q33b-RG2.48b. How important do you think it is preserve the current system in which state legislatures mostly set the shape of Congressional districts?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Total Important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Total Not important	Refused/ Don't know
National	9.3%	14.1%	23.4%	6.6%	1.6%	8.2%	0.1%
GOP	16.6%	19.4%	36.0%	7.5%	1.8%	9.3%	0.1%
Dem.	3.0%	8.6%	11.6%	4.7%	0.9%	5.6%	0.2%
Maryland							
CD-8	5.1%	14.7%	19.8%	7.9%	2.4%	10.3%	1.8%
GOP	7.7%	21.5%	29.2%	12.0%	1.9%	13.9%	0.5%
Dem.	4.0%	11.1%	15.1%	5.2%	1.9%	7.1%	1.8%

A current bill in Congress proposes a new way of electing Members of Congress when there are more than two candidates. Proponents say this method addresses the following two issues with the current system:

- It is now difficult for independent and third-party candidates to get traction. While some voters might favor them, those voters often select other candidates from a major party out of concern they'd be throwing away their vote
- In an election with three or more candidates, the winner may not have anywhere near a majority of votes and might even be opposed by the majority of voters.

Opponents of the bill say these issues are not significant enough to warrant overhauling the way that Members of Congress are elected.

So, here is the proposal. It is called ranked choice voting or instant runoff voting.

In this proposed system, voters select not only their most preferred candidate, but also their second choice, third choice and so on. Here is how the winner is then selected:

- All the first-choice votes are counted and if any candidate gets the majority, he or she is the winner.
- If no candidate gets a majority based on voters' first choice, the candidate with the lowest number of votes is removed from the race. Those who gave that candidate their first-choice vote, then have their votes redirected to their second choice. This may result in a candidate getting a majority and being declared the winner.



- If there is still not a majority, the process of eliminating the lowest candidate and redirecting their votes is repeated until a candidate has a majority and is declared the winner.

This method is now used in elections in a number of U.S. cities and in some other countries, notably Australia. Here are two arguments in favor of this proposal:

Q34-RG2.35. In the current system, a candidate can win even without a majority of votes—in fact a majority might actually oppose that candidate. Candidates with a small following can become a spoiler, taking votes away from a popular candidate, and enabling a less popular candidate to win. Ranked choice voting would ensure that the candidate elected is, in fact, the most popular candidate.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused/ Don't know
National	27.4%	45.2%	72.6%	15.2%	11.1%	26.3%	1.0%
GOP	21.3%	45.9%	67.2%	16.6%	15.1%	31.7%	1.1%
Dem.	34.5%	44.4%	78.9%	13.4%	6.9%	20.3%	0.8%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	30.4%	44.3%	74.7%	16.4%	9.0%	25.4%	0.0%
GOP	12.9%	50.1%	63.0%	21.8%	15.2%	37.0%	0.0%
Dems	40.4%	40.4%	80.8%	13.4%	5.8%	19.2%	0.0%

Here are two arguments against this proposal.

Q35-RG2.37. This system makes it possible for voters to vote for the candidate they most support, including an independent or third-party candidate, without worrying they'll be throwing away their vote. They'll know that their second preference will be counted if their first choice is not popular enough to win.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref. / Don't know
National	32.1%	42.7%	74.8%	15.2%	9.1%	24.3%	1.0%
GOP	26.7%	44.3%	71.0%	15.6%	12.3%	27.9%	1.2%
Dem.	38.8%	41.3%	80.1%	13.5%	5.4%	18.9%	1.0%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	39.3%	37.8%	77.1%	15.9%	5.9%	21.8%	1.2%
GOP	26.9%	40.5%	67.4%	23.4%	9.0%	32.4%	0.2%
Dems	48.4%	35.7%	84.1%	10.1%	4.1%	14.2%	1.7%

Q36-RG2.37. Our system of elections has worked for more than two centuries. This new method is too complicated, will cost the taxpayers a lot of money, strain our vote counting system, and dramatically delay the final announcement of the winners. While in principle this system could help a third party or independent candidate, it is so unlikely that they could actually win that it is really not worth all the trouble.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused/ Don't know
National	18.1%	30.8%	48.9%	26.3%	23.8%	50.1%	0.9%
GOP	26.2%	34.8%	61.0%	23.3%	14.8%	38.1%	0.8%
Dem.	11.4%	27.7%	39.1%	29.6%	30.2%	59.8%	1.1%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	16.3%	30.9%	47.2%	27.6%	25.1%	52.7%	0.1%
GOP	22.9%	36.0%	58.9%	27.5%	13.2%	40.7%	0.4%
Dems	14.4%	29.0%	43.4%	26.0%	30.6%	56.6%	0.0%



Q37-RG2.38. Explaining this new method to voters will be very challenging. People may get confused and this might discourage them from voting. There will be more doubts about the accuracy of the outcomes, leading to more demands for recounts. People will end up having less confidence in the final results weakening the legitimacy of our democratic system.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref. / Don't know
National	20.1%	34.2%	54.3%	25.8%	19.2%	45.0%	0.7%
GOP	27.0%	34.3%	61.3%	23.1%	14.7%	37.8%	0.9%
Dem.	15.3%	34.3%	49.6%	28.2%	21.4%	49.6%	0.8%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	18.9%	37.8%	56.7%	24.2%	18.7%	42.9%	0.4%
GOP	26.6%	39.0%	65.6%	21.8%	11.7%	33.5%	0.9%
Dems	15.7%	38.0%	53.7%	24.0%	22.3%	46.3%	0.0%

Q38-RG2.39. So again, here is the proposal. Voters select not only their most preferred candidate, but also their second choice, third choice and so on. The winner is then selected as follows:

- All the first-choice votes are counted and if any candidate gets the majority, he or she is the winner.
- If no candidate gets a majority based on voters' first choice, the candidate with the lowest number of votes is removed from the race. Those who gave that candidate their first-choice vote, then have their votes redirected to their second choice. This may result in a candidate getting a majority and being declared the winner.
- If there is still not a majority, the process of eliminating the lowest candidate and redirecting their votes is repeated until a candidate has a majority and is declared the winner.

Please select how acceptable this proposal for ranked choice voting in federal elections would be to you.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./ Don't know
National	5.6	29.2%	18.3%	51.7%	0.8%
GOP	4.9	37.4%	18.1%	43.7%	0.7%
Dem.	6.2	21.4%	18.8%	58.9%	0.9%
Maryland					
Cong. Dist. 8	6.2	20.2%	14.0%	56.2%	9.6%
GOP	5.2	29.4%	12.0%	46.8%	11.7%
Dems	6.7	14.8%	15.5%	61.1%	8.6%

Q39-RG2.40. Would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal for ranked choice voting in federal elections?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
National	55.4%	42.9%	1.7%
GOP	46.2%	52.4%	1.4%
Dem.	64.3%	33.7%	2.1%
Maryland			
Cong. Dist. 8	66.2%	33.2%	0.6%
GOP	53.9%	45.5%	0.7%
Dems	72.6%	26.8%	0.6%



[Q40 ASKED ONLY IF RESPONDENT CHOSE “In favor of” ON Q39]

Q40-RG2.41. How important do you think it is to have this new system of ranked choice voting in federal elections?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Total Important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Total Not important	Refused/ Don't know
National	22.9%	25.2%	48.1%	6.4%	0.8%	7.2%	0.1%
GOP	15.0%	24.2%	39.2%	5.8%	1.0%	6.8%	0.1%
Dem.	28.7%	27.4%	56.1%	7.3%	0.8%	8.2%	0.0%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	25.7%	29.3%	55.0%	9.6%	1.7%	11.3%	0.6%
GOP	13.7%	28.6%	42.3%	10.3%	1.2%	11.5%	0.7%
Dem.	32.4%	29.8%	62.2%	8.5%	1.9%	10.4%	0.6%

A current bill in Congress proposes a new way of structuring districts in the US House of Representatives. Proponents say this proposal addresses two issues:

- In some states, all of their Members of Congress are from one party, even though a very large portion of the population identifies with the other party.
- Independents and third-party candidates have little chance of getting elected, even though a substantial number of voters might favor them.

As you know, under current law, a Congressional district is represented by one Member of Congress, and each state elects two Senators, who represent the entire state.

The idea of this proposal is one that is allowed by the Constitution. This proposal would make larger US House districts that would be represented by more than one Member of Congress. This would increase the likelihood Members of Congress would more accurately mirror the partisan mix of the population. Here is how it would work:

- In a state with five or fewer Congressional districts, the state would still have the same number of House Members, but they would be elected by all of the state's voters and represent the whole state.

For example, for a state with five Congressional districts, on the ballot there would be at least five Republicans and five Democrats, as well as possible independent and third-party candidates. Five U.S. House Members would be elected by all voters in the state.

Research has been done on what the likely effect would be: election results would more closely mirror the partisan balance of the state. For example, Connecticut is a state in which all five House seats are currently held by Democrats and Oklahoma is one in which all five House seats are currently held by Republicans. The proposed system would likely result in 1-2 Republicans being elected in Connecticut and 1-2 Democrats in Oklahoma.

- For states with more than five districts, the state would keep the same number of House Members, but the districts would be redesigned to be larger and have 3-5 Members each. The 3-5 House Members would be elected by all of the voters in these larger districts.

Here is an argument in favor of this proposal:

Q41-RG2.49. Right now, in some states, people who are part of the minority party have no representation in Congress, even though they are a substantial portion of the population. Using this new system would make it more likely that people from both parties would have at least one Member from their party representing their concerns. In many cases, independents are the swing voters and are likely to vote for candidates from more than one party. With



multiple choices, even partisan voters are more likely to choose someone from the other party, an independent or a third-party candidate. The elected Members from that state would more accurately mirror the partisan balance in their state, making Congress more accountable.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused/ Don't know
National	26.7%	46.1%	72.8%	16.5%	8.1%	24.6%	2.6%
GOP	21.3%	44.7%	66.0%	18.6%	13.1%	31.7%	2.3%
Dem.	33.2%	46.8%	80.0%	13.3%	3.8%	17.1%	2.9%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	26.1%	45.7%	71.8%	19.3%	8.5%	27.8%	0.4%
GOP	22.9%	42.2%	65.1%	23.8%	10.7%	34.5%	0.4%
Dems	28.8%	46.8%	75.6%	16.4%	7.6%	24.0%	0.4%

Here is an argument against this proposal:

Q42-RG1.50. This idea is too complicated and requires too much from voters. They would have to get to know many more candidates than they do now. That would probably discourage some people from even trying to vote. With so many candidates to choose from, more people would be making uninformed decisions. The people who would put in the time and effort to get to know so many candidates, are more likely to be highly partisan. It would just make districts too big. These members would be more distant and less accessible to the people, just like Senators. Overall, it could have all kinds of problems that people have not even considered.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref. / Don't know
National	14.5%	36.2%	50.7%	28.0%	18.7%	46.7%	2.5%
GOP	22.1%	38.4%	60.5%	24.8%	13.0%	37.8%	1.8%
Dem.	10.3%	34.2%	44.5%	28.9%	23.9%	52.8%	2.7%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	17.6%	39.2%	56.8%	31.2%	11.5%	42.7%	0.4%
GOP	21.6%	38.4%	60.0%	33.2%	6.4%	39.6%	0.4%
Dems	16.7%	39.7%	56.4%	30.2%	13.4%	43.6%	0.0%

Q43-RG2-51. So, here again is the proposal:

In a state with five or fewer Congressional districts, the state would still have the same number of House Members, but they would be elected by all of the state's voters and represent the whole state.



For states with more than five districts, the state would keep the same number of House Members, but the districts would be redesigned to be larger and have 3-5 Members each. The 3-5 House Members would be elected by all of the voters in these larger districts. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./ Don't know
National	5.6	27.0%	21.4%	49.5%	2.1%
GOP	5.0	34.2%	21.7%	42.6%	1.4%
Dem.	6.3	19.9%	21.9%	56.2%	2.0%
Maryland					
Cong. Dist. 8	5.4	29.8%	20.1%	47.2%	3.0%
GOP	4.8	44.1%	12.9%	39.6%	3.4%
Dems	5.8	23.0%	24.2%	50.6%	2.1%

Q44-RG2.52. Would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor or against this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./Don't know
National	55.0%	41.9%	3.1%
GOP	43.8%	53.1%	3.1%
Dem.	65.6%	31.7%	2.7%
Maryland			
Cong. Dist. 8	57.9%	41.4%	0.7%
GOP	52.3%	46.8%	0.9%
Dems	61.7%	37.7%	0.5%

[Q45a ASKED ONLY IF RESPONDENT CHOSE "In favor of" ON Q44]

Q45a-RG2.53a. How important do you think it is to have this new system for electing House Members?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Total Important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Total Not important	Refused/ Don't know
National	20.8%	25.3%	46.1%	7.8%	0.9%	8.7%	0.2%
GOP	13.9%	20.8%	34.7%	8.3%	0.6%	8.9%	0.2%
Dem.	27.8%	28.6%	56.4%	7.8%	1.3%	9.1%	0.1%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	16.6%	30.6%	47.2%	8.6%	1.9%	10.5%	0.8%
GOP	13.8%	28.8%	42.6%	7.4%	2.1%	9.5%	1.1%
Dems	19.1%	30.8%	49.9%	9.7%	2.1%	11.8%	0.5%



[Q45b ASKED ONLY IF RESPONDENT CHOSE “Against” ON Q44]

Q45b-RG2.53b. How important do you think it is to preserve the current system for electing House Members?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Total Important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Total Not important	Refused/ Don't know
National	13.4%	17.9%	31.3%	7.5%	2.3%	9.8%	0.8%
GOP	21.9%	21.9%	43.8%	6.3%	1.9%	8.2%	1.2%
Dem.	5.9%	14.5%	20.4%	8.1%	2.7%	10.8%	0.4%
Maryland							
Cong. Dist. 8	8.7%	14.7%	23.4%	14.1%	3.7%	17.8%	1.0%
GOP	16.5%	16.0%	32.5%	10.3%	4.0%	14.3%	0.9%
Dems	5.6%	14.2%	19.8%	15.7%	2.3%	18.0%	0.5%

