



PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Survey on Government Reform - QUESTIONNAIRE - February 2020

Fielded by: Precision Sample, L2 Political
Field Dates: January 23 – February 19, 2020

Sample Size: 478 Adults from New Jersey's 7th Congressional District

[Influence of Campaign Donors – Importance]

[Note – Respondents did not see below content and headings that were presented in [brackets]]

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.

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.

Q1. How important is this goal to you?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Somewhat - Very important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Slightly - Not at all important	Refused / Don't know
National	60.0%	28.0%	88.0%	8.5%	3.3%	11.8%	0.2%
Republicans	48.8%	35.1%	83.9%	11.8%	4.0%	15.8%	0.1%
Democrats	72.4%	19.8%	92.2%	5.7%	1.9%	7.6%	0.2%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	43.4%	33.9%	77.3%	12.6%	10.1%	22.7%	0.0%
Republicans	25.8%	42.4%	68.2%	13.4%	18.4%	31.8%	0.0%
Democrats	64.4%	22.5%	86.9%	9.3%	3.9%	13.2%	0.0%

[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.

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.

[Disclosures]

One 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:

Q2. 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%
Republicans	42.2%	42.4%	84.6%	9.9%	5.4%	15.3%	0.1%
Democrats	52.3%	36.6%	88.9%	8.1%	2.8%	10.9%	0.2%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	37.2%	47.5%	84.7%	9.9%	4.8%	14.7%	0.6%
Republicans	31.4%	50.0%	81.4%	13.1%	5.6%	18.7%	0.0%
Democrats	40.6%	50.6%	91.2%	4.7%	2.6%	7.3%	1.5%

Q3. 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	Refused / Don't know
National	58.6%	31.2%	89.8%	7.0%	2.9%	9.9%	0.3%
Republicans	53.3%	34.0%	87.3%	8.6%	3.7%	12.3%	0.3%
Democrats	65.8%	27.1%	92.9%	5.3%	1.7%	7.0%	0.2%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	46.4%	40.1%	86.5%	7.9%	4.4%	12.3%	1.3%
Republicans	36.3%	50.5%	86.8%	7.8%	4.5%	12.3%	1.0%
Democrats	56.9%	33.0%	89.9%	7.0%	2.1%	9.1%	1.0%

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

Q4. 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%
Republicans	13.0%	33.7%	46.7%	30.5%	22.0%	52.5%	0.8%
Democrats	7.4%	24.0%	31.4%	35.0%	33.4%	68.4%	0.2%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	19.6%	38.8%	58.4%	27.0%	14.5%	41.5%	0.2%
Republicans	25.1%	47.0%	72.1%	22.2%	5.7%	27.9%	0.0%
Democrats	12.1%	31.8%	43.9%	30.4%	25.4%	55.8%	0.4%

Q5. 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	Refused / Don't know
National	14.2%	39.2%	53.4%	28.4%	17.6%	46.0%	0.7%
Republicans	16.3%	43.3%	59.6%	25.8%	13.5%	39.3%	1.1%
Democrats	11.3%	35.9%	47.2%	30.7%	21.5%	52.2%	0.6%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	17.7%	46.3%	64.0%	25.1%	10.7%	35.8%	0.3%
Republicans	23.7%	46.0%	69.7%	23.9%	6.4%	30.3%	0.0%
Democrats	11.0%	46.7%	57.7%	24.6%	17.7%	42.3%	0.0%

[Proposal 1 – Reporting names of significant donations to campaigns]

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.

Q6. 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)	Refused / Don't know
National	7.5	10.7%	13.4%	75.7%	0.2%
Republicans	7.1	13.2%	15.0%	71.4%	0.4%
Democrats	8.0	7.2%	11.0%	81.8%	0.1%
New Jersey’s 7th Congressional District					
Overall	6.2	26.6%	13.4%	59.5%	0.5%
Republicans	5.9	29.6%	12.6%	57.8%	0.0%
Democrats	7.1	18.4%	8.6%	72.4%	0.6%

[Final Recommendation]

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

	In Favor of	Against	Refused / Don't know
National	81.8%	17.5%	0.7%
Republicans	76.5%	23.2%	0.3%
Democrats	88.4%	10.9%	0.8%
New Jersey’s 7th Congressional District			
Overall	77.5%	22.2%	0.3%
Republicans	75.3%	23.9%	0.8%
Democrats	85.0%	15.0%	0.0%

[Proposal 2 – Public disclosure and transparency to shareholders and members of organizations]

Q8. 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)	Refused / Don't know
National	7.8	8.7%	10.4%	80.7%	0.2%
Republicans	7.7	9.4%	11.2%	79.3%	0.2%
Democrats	8.0	7.4%	9.5%	82.8%	0.2%
New Jersey’s 7th Congressional District					
Overall	6.4	22.5%	13.8%	62.5%	1.2%
Republicans	6.2	23.0%	15.7%	59.6%	1.6%
Democrats	7.1	18.0%	9.2%	71.8%	0.9%

[Final Recommendation]

Q9. So, would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	In Favor of	Against	Refused / Don't know
National	85.3%	14.3%	0.5%
Republicans	82.7%	17.0%	0.3%
Democrats	87.9%	11.4%	0.7%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District			
Overall	73.2%	26.8%	0.0%
Republicans	72.5%	27.5%	0.0%
Democrats	82.1%	17.9%	0.0%

[Proposal 3 – Reporting names of significant donors when paying for radio or TV ads]

Q10. Here is another 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.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know
National	7.5	11.2%	12.6%	75.7%	0.5%
Republicans	7.0	13.5%	16.3%	69.6%	0.6%
Democrats	8.1	8.0%	8.2%	83.3%	0.5%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	6.5	24.2%	13.8%	61.2%	0.8%
Republicans	6.2	24.6%	15.8%	59.3%	0.4%
Democrats	7.1	18.9%	11.6%	68.4%	1.1%

[Final Recommendation]

Q11. So, would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	In Favor of	Against	Refused / Don't know
National	81.1%	17.5%	1.4%
Republicans	74.1%	24.6%	1.3%
Democrats	88.5%	10.7%	0.8%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District			
Overall	73.5%	26.0%	0.5%
Republicans	68.6%	30.4%	0.9%
Democrats	81.0%	19.0%	0.0%

[Proposal 4 – Disclosures of campaign donations by Federal Contractors]

Q12. Let's suppose Congress does not pass the previous proposal.

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)	Refused / Don't know
National	7.6	9.5%	11.7%	78.3%	0.4%
Republicans	7.5	9.3%	11.6%	78.7%	0.4%
Democrats	7.9	8.0%	10.4%	81.3%	0.3%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	6.4	22.0%	18.9%	58.6%	0.5%
Republicans	6.1	24.4%	19.0%	55.8%	0.8%
Democrats	7.1	17.1%	14.8%	67.5%	0.5%

[Final Recommendation]

Q13. 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	Refused / Don't know
National	85.2%	13.8%	0.9%
Republicans	84.0%	15.4%	0.7%
Democrats	88.8%	10.3%	0.9%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District			
Overall	75.9%	24.1%	0.0%
Republicans	77.1%	22.9%	0.0%
Democrats	83.4%	16.6%	0.0%

[Requirements for Online Donations]

There is another proposal 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:

Q14. 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.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	36.4%	45.3%	81.7%	12.7%	5.3%	18.0%	0.3%
Republicans	37.0%	46.3%	83.3%	11.9%	4.7%	16.6%	0.1%
Democrats	37.1%	44.0%	81.1%	13.3%	5.2%	18.5%	0.4%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	37.3%	41.1%	78.4%	15.9%	5.6%	21.5%	0.0%
Republicans	34.6%	46.3%	80.9%	12.8%	6.3%	19.1%	0.0%
Democrats	44.9%	37.1%	82.0%	14.4%	3.7%	18.1%	0.0%

Here is an argument against the proposal:

Q15. 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.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	11.7%	31.6%	43.3%	31.6%	24.3%	55.9%	0.7%
Republicans	9.6%	28.8%	38.4%	32.6%	28.4%	61.0%	0.7%
Democrats	13.1%	33.9%	47.0%	31.5%	20.7%	52.2%	0.8%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	18.5%	41.5%	60.0%	23.7%	16.2%	39.9%	0.2%
Republicans	16.1%	44.4%	60.5%	20.5%	18.5%	39.0%	0.5%
Democrats	19.8%	39.7%	59.5%	24.1%	16.4%	40.5%	0.0%

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.

[Assessment of Online Donor Requirements]

Q16. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know
National	7.3	14.1%	12.3%	73.4%	0.2%
Republicans	7.7	12.1%	9.7%	78.1%	0.1%
Democrats	7.2	13.4%	14.2%	71.9%	0.4%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	6.7	19.0%	14.8%	65.5%	0.7%
Republicans	6.7	21.9%	10.2%	67.3%	0.6%
Democrats	7.0	15.7%	15.8%	68.4%	0.0%

[Small Donors]

Now we are going to explore proposals to encourage campaign contributions by small donors. 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.

[Small Donor - Tax Credit]

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 proposal:

Q17. 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.

	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%
Republicans	21.2%	45.7%	66.9%	19.7%	12.9%	32.6%	0.4%
Democrats	23.0%	51.0%	74.0%	18.1%	7.6%	25.7%	0.2%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	23.9%	46.8%	70.7%	19.4%	9.4%	28.8%	0.5%
Republicans	18.6%	47.7%	66.3%	21.6%	11.4%	33.0%	0.8%
Democrats	32.4%	46.6%	79.0%	14.3%	6.2%	20.5%	0.4%

Here is an argument against this proposal:

Q18. 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.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	27.5%	40.8%	68.3%	22.5%	8.5%	31.0%	0.8%
Republicans	31.5%	38.8%	70.3%	22.0%	7.0%	29.0%	0.8%
Democrats	23.3%	42.3%	65.6%	23.8%	9.6%	33.4%	1.1%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	27.8%	37.2%	65.0%	24.2%	10.3%	34.5%	0.6%
Republicans	34.0%	34.6%	68.6%	21.9%	9.4%	31.3%	0.0%
Democrats	23.4%	40.6%	64.0%	22.6%	13.0%	35.6%	0.4%

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.

Q19. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you:

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know
National	5.6	29.2%	20.5%	50.0%	0.3%
Republicans	5.2	35.0%	17.8%	47.0%	0.2%
Democrats	6.0	23.1%	20.6%	55.7%	0.5%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	5.6	31.7%	16.8%	51.4%	0.1%
Republicans	5.3	36.3%	12.9%	50.4%	0.4%
Democrats	6.2	25.6%	16.0%	58.4%	0.0%

[Final Recommendation]

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

	In Favor of	Against	Refused / Don't know
National	59.5%	40.0%	0.6%
Republicans	53.4%	46.3%	0.4%
Democrats	66.6%	33.0%	0.4%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District			
Overall	59.1%	40.5%	0.4%
Republicans	56.6%	42.3%	1.1%
Democrats	69.9%	30.1%	0.0%

[Small Donors – Matching 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.

Q21. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you:

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know
National	3.1	62.5%	15.1%	22.2%	0.2%
Republicans	2.3	74.2%	11.1%	14.5%	0.1%
Democrats	3.9	51.4%	18.3%	30.1%	0.2%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	4.4	43.5%	20.9%	35.6%	0.0%
Republicans	3.7	51.0%	18.8%	30.2%	0.0%
Democrats	5.1	37.8%	21.1%	41.1%	0.0%

[Final Recommendation]

Q22. So, would you recommend that your Member of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal?

	In Favor of	Against	Refused / Don't know
National	27.8%	71.9%	0.4%
Republicans	17.9%	82.0%	0.1%
Democrats	37.1%	62.6%	0.3%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District			
Overall	41.1%	58.0%	0.8%
Republicans	39.4%	60.0%	0.5%
Democrats	43.7%	55.7%	0.6%

[Constitutional Amendment]

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:

Q23. 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%
Republicans	35.5%	39.9%	75.4%	12.0%	11.2%	23.2%	1.3%
Democrats	53.6%	33.7%	87.3%	8.3%	3.9%	12.2%	0.6%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	42.5%	31.3%	73.8%	14.8%	6.8%	21.6%	4.7%
Republicans	32.4%	36.2%	68.6%	18.2%	8.2%	26.4%	4.9%
Democrats	56.9%	27.4%	84.3%	8.7%	3.1%	11.8%	3.9%

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

Q24. 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	Refused / Don't know
National	16.2%	30.9%	47.1%	27.5%	24.5%	52.0%	0.9%
Republicans	22.1%	33.4%	55.5%	24.7%	19.1%	43.8%	0.8%
Democrats	10.3%	28.0%	38.3%	29.9%	31.1%	61.0%	0.6%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	22.0%	34.0%	56.0%	27.4%	15.5%	42.9%	1.2%
Republicans	28.0%	42.3%	70.3%	22.7%	6.7%	29.4%	0.4%
Democrats	17.0%	25.8%	42.8%	28.7%	27.3%	56.0%	1.3%

[Assessment of Part 1 of Constitutional Amendment]

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

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)	Refused / Don't know
National	6.6	20.4%	14.6%	64.3%	0.7%
Republicans	5.9	27.6%	14.3%	57.2%	0.9%
Democrats	7.3	12.5%	13.7%	73.6%	0.2%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	5.4	34.6%	16.6%	46.8%	2.0%
Republicans	4.7	43.0%	17.5%	38.0%	1.5%
Democrats	6.8	21.3%	13.9%	63.8%	1.0%

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:

Q26. 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%
Republicans	35.2%	36.3%	71.5%	15.0%	12.1%	27.1%	1.3%
Democrats	53.1%	29.5%	82.6%	11.4%	5.2%	16.6%	0.8%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	41.4%	35.1%	76.5%	16.3%	5.6%	21.9%	1.5%
Republicans	33.8%	42.9%	76.7%	18.0%	4.5%	22.5%	0.8%
Democrats	55.4%	31.5%	86.9%	8.1%	3.3%	11.4%	1.7%

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

Q27. 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	Refused / Don't know
National	8.5%	28.3%	36.8%	30.7%	31.0%	61.7%	1.6%
Republicans	11.2%	33.3%	44.5%	31.7%	22.1%	53.8%	1.8%
Democrats	6.8%	22.6%	29.4%	29.7%	39.8%	69.5%	1.1%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	15.7%	31.8%	47.5%	30.5%	18.6%	49.1%	3.4%
Republicans	15.7%	37.4%	53.1%	31.2%	9.9%	41.1%	5.8%
Democrats	10.9%	27.5%	38.4%	31.5%	28.6%	60.1%	1.5%

[Assessment of Part 2 of Constitutional Amendment]

Q28. 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)	Refused / Don't know
National	6.8	19.7%	13.3%	66.0%	1.0%
Republicans	6.1	26.1%	13.7%	59.1%	1.0%
Democrats	7.5	13.4%	11.9%	74.2%	0.5%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	6.0	29.5%	15.7%	52.9%	1.9%
Republicans	5.1	38.9%	16.3%	43.2%	1.6%
Democrats	7.3	15.9%	10.9%	72.2%	0.9%

[Final Recommendation – Includes both Part 1 and 2]

Q29. 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?

	In Favor of	Against	Refused / Don't know
National	75.0%	23.5%	1.6%
Republicans	65.9%	32.6%	1.5%
Democrats	84.9%	14.1%	0.9%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District			
Overall	65.7%	29.4%	4.9%
Republicans	57.5%	37.9%	4.6%
Democrats	82.5%	13.8%	3.8%

[Elections]

[Redistricting]

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.

Q30. 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%
Republicans	33.9%	42.9%	76.8%	14.2%	7.4%	21.6%	1.6%
Democrats	52.2%	33.0%	85.2%	10.9%	2.4%	13.3%	1.5%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	36.5%	42.2%	78.7%	15.8%	4.0%	19.8%	1.5%
Republicans	27.2%	54.2%	81.4%	14.2%	4.3%	18.5%	0.0%
Democrats	51.7%	32.9%	84.6%	11.8%	3.1%	14.9%	0.6%

Q31. 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	Refused / Don't know
National	34.4%	40.4%	74.8%	18.1%	5.9%	24.0%	1.3%
Republicans	28.6%	40.6%	69.2%	21.3%	8.1%	29.4%	1.4%
Democrats	43.1%	39.3%	82.4%	13.3%	2.9%	16.2%	1.4%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	31.1%	44.1%	75.2%	17.3%	5.5%	22.8%	2.0%
Republicans	21.9%	52.3%	74.2%	16.3%	7.7%	24.0%	1.7%
Democrats	42.6%	38.4%	81.0%	14.6%	2.3%	16.9%	2.1%

Here are two arguments against this proposal for a citizen commission:

Q32. 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%
Republicans	31.7%	36.0%	67.7%	21.5%	9.7%	31.2%	1.2%
Democrats	11.8%	26.2%	38.0%	25.4%	35.5%	60.9%	1.2%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	22.8%	37.7%	60.5%	23.9%	15.0%	38.9%	0.6%
Republicans	28.0%	40.0%	68.0%	24.0%	7.2%	31.2%	0.8%
Democrats	16.4%	36.3%	52.7%	21.4%	25.2%	46.6%	0.8%

Q33. 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	Refused / Don't know
National	10.4%	34.0%	44.4%	30.6%	23.7%	54.3%	1.3%
Republicans	16.1%	40.2%	56.3%	28.0%	14.1%	42.1%	1.6%
Democrats	5.8%	28.1%	33.9%	32.1%	32.7%	64.8%	1.4%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	14.1%	36.4%	50.5%	33.2%	14.9%	48.1%	1.5%
Republicans	15.6%	41.6%	57.2%	27.6%	13.9%	41.5%	1.4%
Democrats	13.8%	31.3%	45.1%	36.7%	17.9%	54.6%	0.3%

Q34. 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)	Refused / Don't know
National	6.5	19.2%	17.5%	62.0%	1.3%
Republicans	5.6	28.8%	17.0%	52.6%	1.6%
Democrats	7.4	10.2%	17.5%	71.2%	1.1%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	6.0	23.2%	18.2%	53.3%	5.3%
Republicans	5.7	26.5%	15.4%	51.9%	6.2%
Democrats	6.8	17.6%	15.2%	63.3%	3.8%

[Final Recommendation]

Q35. Would you recommend that your Members of Congress:

	vote in favor of the proposal for having such a citizen commission set the shape of Congressional districts	vote against the proposal, thus preserving the current situation in which state legislatures mostly set the shape of Congressional districts	Refused / Don't know
National	66.2%	31.7%	2.0%
Republicans	52.9%	45.4%	1.8%
Democrats	80.3%	17.5%	2.3%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District			
Overall	65.6%	33.2%	1.3%
Republicans	59.9%	40.1%	0.0%
Democrats	75.4%	24.5%	0.1%

[Lobbying]

Now, let's consider some new proposed Congressional bills related to lobbying.

Because former Members of Congress and Executive Branch officials (such as those in the Department of Defense or the US Treasury) are very familiar with how government works and have strong personal connections throughout government, they can often work as lobbyists after they leave office. Currently, there are some limits on how soon a former government official can lobby the government after leaving office.

A set of proposed bills in Congress extends the period former Members of Congress and Executive Branch officials must wait after they leave office before they can work as lobbyists.

Under current law, before they can lobby Congress:

- former House members must wait one year
- former Senators must wait two years
- senior Congressional staffers in both houses must wait one year

In addition, senior Executive Branch officials are prohibited from lobbying the agency they were part of for 1-2 years, depending on how senior they were.

Here is an argument in favor of extending the time periods during which former government officials are prohibited from lobbying:

Q36. Members of Congress and senior staff who have recently left have unique personal relationships, access and insider knowledge, so the special interests that hire them get an unfair advantage in working the system. It is fine for special interests to communicate their views to Congress and the administration, just like regular citizens, but they should not be able to buy greater influence by hiring what are essentially super-lobbyists.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	57.7%	28.2%	85.9%	8.6%	5.0%	13.6%	0.5%
Republicans	59.1%	27.7%	86.8%	8.0%	5.0%	13.0%	0.3%
Democrats	58.8%	27.6%	86.4%	8.2%	4.6%	12.8%	0.8%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	38.0%	39.1%	77.1%	16.2%	5.4%	21.6%	1.3%
Republicans	31.1%	46.0%	77.1%	18.6%	3.9%	22.5%	0.4%
Democrats	48.1%	35.7%	83.8%	8.9%	5.6%	14.5%	1.7%

Here is an argument against the proposal:

Q37. Telling former government officials they cannot lobby in favor of a cause they believe in violates their First Amendment right to freedom of speech. They should have the right to speak with current government officials and share their views or expertise that sheds light on various policy options. This rule also limits the freedom of expression for people who want to hire a former official to help get their voice heard in government. We should enhance the people's ability to petition their government, not put greater limits on it.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	9.2%	23.9%	33.1%	28.1%	38.4%	66.5%	0.5%
Republicans	8.0%	25.0%	33.0%	28.2%	38.2%	66.4%	0.6%
Democrats	10.7%	22.0%	32.7%	29.4%	37.4%	66.8%	0.4%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	17.2%	37.0%	54.2%	28.1%	16.8%	44.9%	0.9%
Republicans	22.3%	43.8%	66.1%	22.4%	11.6%	34.0%	0.0%
Democrats	14.7%	32.3%	47.0%	29.8%	21.7%	51.5%	1.6%

Here is another pair of arguments for and against the proposal to extend the time periods during which former government officials are prohibited from lobbying.

Q38. Working for the government should be something that people do as public service, not as a stepping-stone for getting a high-paying lobbying job. It is also not right that people who have just come out of government get an unfair advantage over others. Furthermore, when people in government are enticed by high-paying lobbying jobs it creates constant turnover and an ongoing brain drain.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	52.1%	31.7%	83.8%	11.0%	4.7%	15.7%	0.5%
Republicans	52.1%	33.4%	85.5%	9.6%	4.4%	14.0%	0.6%
Democrats	53.2%	30.9%	84.1%	10.9%	4.4%	15.3%	0.6%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	35.9%	37.7%	73.6%	19.9%	5.4%	25.3%	1.0%
Republicans	34.2%	34.9%	69.1%	24.5%	5.9%	30.4%	0.6%
Democrats	43.0%	38.0%	81.0%	13.1%	3.9%	17.0%	2.0%

Q39. What if a former government official wants to lobby in support of legislation to help poor children or to seek a cure for cancer? They may be uniquely knowledgeable or passionate about a particular issue. Should they be prohibited from helping further good causes? Knowing they would be prohibited from this kind of advocacy, perhaps indefinitely, could also have a chilling effect on talented people serving in government in the first place.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	11.4%	29.9%	41.3%	29.7%	28.3%	58.0%	0.7%
Republicans	10.8%	27.3%	38.1%	29.9%	30.9%	60.8%	1.1%
Democrats	11.9%	33.2%	45.1%	29.4%	25.0%	54.4%	0.5%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	18.0%	40.4%	58.4%	27.8%	10.8%	38.6%	3.0%
Republicans	21.9%	45.0%	66.9%	21.4%	7.9%	29.3%	3.8%
Democrats	15.2%	39.9%	55.1%	29.1%	12.7%	41.8%	3.1%

Here is another pair of arguments for and against the proposal:

Q40. When people who work in government are thinking about leaving government or are concerned, they might be voted out of office, they sometimes start thinking about the possibility of becoming a lobbyist because it can pay very well. This can lead them to use their remaining time in office to do things beneficial to the interests that might hire them in the future. By removing the allure of high-paying lobbying jobs shortly after, government officials will not be tempted to do favors for future employers.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	53.5%	32.6%	86.1%	9.2%	3.6%	12.8%	1.1%
Republicans	56.7%	32.9%	89.6%	6.6%	3.2%	9.8%	0.6%
Democrats	50.7%	33.8%	84.5%	10.6%	3.8%	14.4%	1.1%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	36.5%	41.7%	78.2%	16.6%	4.2%	20.8%	1.1%
Republicans	33.8%	47.3%	81.1%	12.6%	5.8%	18.4%	0.6%
Democrats	45.8%	39.8%	85.6%	10.2%	2.6%	12.8%	1.6%

Q41. Working for the government is risky. An elected official may be voted out of office, or, in the case of a staffer, the elected official they work for may be voted out. There is nothing wrong with former government officials having lobbying as a fallback career option. If we cut off this option, it will discourage people from going into government for fear they may end up with highly limited career options.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	7.5%	18.8%	26.3%	28.1%	44.1%	72.2%	1.5%
Republicans	6.9%	18.3%	25.2%	28.3%	45.1%	73.4%	1.3%
Democrats	8.6%	19.0%	27.6%	29.0%	41.9%	70.9%	1.5%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	12.7%	32.3%	45.0%	34.0%	19.1%	53.1%	1.9%
Republicans	12.8%	33.5%	46.3%	37.8%	15.0%	52.8%	1.0%
Democrats	13.2%	29.3%	42.5%	29.9%	25.6%	55.5%	2.1%

[Proposal 1 – lobbying by former Members of Congress]

Q42. So, on the scale below, please select how acceptable it would be to you to extend the period former Members of Congress must wait before working as a lobbyist from 1-2 years to five years.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know
National	7.6	14.4%	12.6%	72.5%	0.4%
Republicans	7.8	12.1%	11.2%	76.5%	0.2%
Democrats	7.3	15.6%	14.9%	69.0%	0.5%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	6.3	27.6%	15.4%	56.2%	0.8%
Republicans	6.5	27.9%	14.6%	57.0%	0.6%
Democrats	6.7	24.2%	13.2%	61.3%	1.3%

Q43. Please select how acceptable it would be for you to go further and prohibit former Members of Congress from working as a lobbyist for the rest of their life.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know
National	5.7	35.0%	16.2%	48.5%	0.3%
Republicans	5.9	33.6%	14.7%	51.5%	0.2%
Democrats	5.5	37.0%	17.5%	45.1%	0.4%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	5.0	37.8%	22.3%	37.4%	2.5%
Republicans	5.3	35.4%	19.0%	40.9%	4.7%
Democrats	5.0	39.7%	23.1%	36.1%	1.1%

[Final Recommendation]

Q44. So, which would you recommend the most when it comes to former Members of Congress working as a lobbyist?

	No waiting period	Keep current requirement that former House Members wait 1 year and former Senators wait 2 years before lobbying	Adopt proposal to extend waiting period to 5 years before lobbying for all former Members of Congress	Adopt proposal to prohibit former Members of Congress from lobbying for life	Refused / Don't know
National	3.6%	19.2%	47.6%	29.0%	0.7%
Republicans	3.5%	16.2%	46.6%	33.1%	0.6%
Democrats	3.3%	23.2%	48.9%	23.6%	1.0%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	8.6%	27.3%	41.5%	19.7%	2.8%
Republicans	7.2%	27.1%	40.8%	22.1%	2.8%
Democrats	7.4%	24.4%	47.6%	19.6%	1.0%

[Proposal 2 – lobbying by former senior Congressional staffers]

Now, let's consider extending the limits on lobbying by senior Congressional staffers.

Q45. Please select how acceptable it would be to you to extend the period a senior Congressional staffer would have to wait before working as a lobbyist from the current one year to two years.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know
National	7.3	15.7%	14.3%	69.8%	0.1%
Republicans	7.6	14.0%	12.6%	73.0%	0.3%
Democrats	7.2	15.5%	16.3%	68.2%	0.0%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	6.4	20.7%	22.0%	57.4%	0.0%
Republicans	6.4	21.0%	20.5%	58.5%	0.0%
Democrats	6.8	18.2%	18.6%	63.2%	0.0%

[Final Recommendation]

Q46. So, which would you recommend the most when it comes to former senior Congressional staffers on working as a lobbyist:

	Not having any limits	Keep current requirement	Adopt proposal to extend waiting period	Refused / Don't know
National	4.4%	17.8%	76.7%	1.2%
Republicans	3.9%	15.3%	79.3%	1.5%
Democrats	4.4%	21.2%	73.7%	0.8%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District				
Overall	6.8%	32.6%	59.2%	1.4%
Republicans	11.7%	28.4%	58.1%	1.8%
Democrats	2.7%	30.6%	65.0%	1.7%

[Proposal 3 – senior Executive Branch officials lobbying the agencies they worked for]

Now, let's consider limits on lobbying by senior Executive Branch officials.

Q47. Please select how acceptable it would be to you to extend the period a senior Executive Branch official would have to wait before lobbying the agency they worked for from 1-2 years to five years.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know
National	7.7	13.7%	11.2%	74.9%	0.2%
Republicans	7.9	12.5%	8.7%	78.3%	0.4%
Democrats	7.5	12.8%	15.0%	72.3%	0.0%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	6.5	22.5%	19.6%	57.1%	0.9%
Republicans	6.7	20.1%	19.7%	60.2%	0.0%
Democrats	6.9	20.5%	15.5%	63.0%	0.9%

[Final Recommendation]

Q48. So, which would you recommend the most when it comes to senior Executive Branch officials lobbying the agency they worked for?

	Not having any limits	Keep current requirement	Adopt proposal to extend waiting period	Refused / Don't know
National	3.5%	20.9%	74.5%	1.1%
Republicans	3.7%	17.8%	77.0%	1.5%
Democrats	3.4%	24.6%	71.0%	1.0%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District				
Overall	8.9%	34.5%	54.8%	1.9%
Republicans	10.1%	34.4%	54.7%	0.8%
Democrats	4.3%	31.8%	63.7%	0.2%

[Proposal 4 – Executive Branch officials lobbying for foreign governments]

Another debate is about former senior Executive Branch officials lobbying on behalf of a foreign government.

Here is the current situation:

- Americans can act as lobbyists for foreign governments, provided they register and report their activities to the US government.
- Former senior Executive Branch officials are prohibited from lobbying their former agency for 1-2 years after they leave office, whether for a foreign or domestic client, but face no restrictions after that time period.
- The Trump administration has required that to be part of the current administration Executive Branch officials must pledge never to lobby for a foreign government after they leave office, but no law prohibits them from doing so and this would not necessarily apply to future administrations.

There is a proposed bill in Congress that would prohibit former senior Executive Branch officials from any lobbying on behalf of a foreign government for the rest of their life.

Here is an argument in favor of this proposed ban:

Q49. Foreign governments should not be allowed to hire former senior Executive Branch officials who have unique knowledge, connections, and influence to advance the interests of the foreign power. Those foreign entities may have interests that are at odds with the interests of the US government and they should not have inside access.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	63.3%	24.7%	88.0%	7.4%	4.4%	11.8%	0.2%
Republicans	68.4%	22.1%	90.5%	5.4%	3.9%	9.3%	0.2%
Democrats	59.3%	27.9%	87.2%	8.3%	4.3%	12.6%	0.2%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	41.6%	37.0%	78.6%	14.7%	6.2%	20.9%	0.5%
Republicans	45.1%	38.5%	83.6%	9.5%	7.0%	16.5%	0.0%
Democrats	45.2%	35.8%	81.0%	13.6%	5.4%	19.0%	0.0%

Here is an argument against this proposed ban:

Q50. Singling out and permanently prohibiting former senior Executive Branch officials from lobbying for foreign governments is discriminatory and violates the principles of free speech. It won't protect against a foreign government's bad intentions because it can always hire another lobbyist. And it is also not necessary, our government is not going to do something that is contrary to our interests because a former Executive Branch official makes a case.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	7.5%	23.6%	31.1%	28.1%	40.5%	68.6%	0.3%
Republicans	5.1%	20.2%	25.3%	26.9%	47.7%	74.6%	0.2%
Democrats	9.6%	27.1%	36.7%	30.0%	32.9%	62.9%	0.4%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District							
Overall	13.2%	36.4%	49.6%	28.5%	21.0%	49.5%	1.0%
Republicans	13.0%	35.5%	48.5%	32.2%	18.5%	50.7%	0.8%
Democrats	12.4%	34.7%	47.1%	25.6%	26.6%	52.2%	0.6%

Q51. How acceptable would it be to you if former senior Executive Branch officials were prohibited from any lobbying on behalf of a foreign government for the rest of their life.

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know
National	7.4	17.1%	12.0%	70.8%	0.1%
Republicans	7.9	12.7%	8.8%	78.5%	0.0%
Democrats	7.0	21.0%	14.6%	64.3%	0.0%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District					
Overall	6.2	26.1%	21.2%	51.2%	1.5%
Republicans	6.6	23.6%	19.8%	54.5%	2.0%
Democrats	6.4	26.4%	17.7%	55.2%	0.7%

[Final Recommendation]

Q52. So, would you recommend your Member of Congress vote in favor of or against a proposal to prohibit former senior Executive Branch officials from lobbying on behalf of a foreign government, for the rest of their life?

	In Favor of	Against	Refused / Don't know
National	74.9%	24.1%	1.0%
Republicans	81.2%	17.9%	0.9%
Democrats	69.7%	29.3%	1.0%
New Jersey's 7th Congressional District			
Overall	65.9%	33.2%	0.8%
Republicans	69.8%	29.6%	0.6%
Democrats	69.3%	30.4%	0.3%