



# SURVEY ON PROPOSALS FOR LIMITING THE NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF CRIMINAL RECORDS - Questionnaire -

**Sample Provided by:** Nielsen Scarborough  
**Sample Size:** 2,487 Registered Voters

**Field Dates:** Feb 12-22, 2021  
**Margin of Error:** +/-2.0%

Today we are going to explore some issues related to the criminal justice system.

As you may know, when someone is arrested, this creates a criminal record for that person. This record remains in place if, after being arrested, the person is never charged with a crime, the charges are dropped, or if they are tried and not found guilty. The record also remains in place after someone serves their sentence.

Currently, there is a controversy about the negative consequences for people with criminal records on their ability to get employment, to get housing, and to vote. In some cases, these negative consequences are due to the actions of governments, public housing authorities, and licensing boards. In other cases, they are due to private employers discriminating against people with criminal records.

We will explore a number of proposals under consideration in Congress that seek to reduce or eliminate these negative consequences.

Currently, one in three American adults – about 78 million people – have a criminal record. Of these, about 14 million people have been convicted of a felony – that is a crime that can be serious and may include violence.

The remaining 64 million people include:

- People who were found guilty of a minor offense or a misdemeanor. With a few rare exceptions, these are nonviolent offenses. Examples are possession of drugs, shoplifting, public intoxication, trespassing, vandalism, and speeding.
- People who have not been convicted of any crime or offense. If someone is arrested but is not charged, or is charged but found not guilty, they also have a criminal record.

Members of Congress have introduced several proposals to reduce or eliminate the consequences faced by people with criminal records, and in some cases to eliminate a person’s criminal record.

Q1. Were you aware or not aware that people can have a criminal record when they are arrested but never charged with committing a crime?

	Aware	Not Aware	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	47.5%	52.3%	0.3%
Republicans	47.6%	52.2%	0.2%
Democrats	45.3%	54.2%	0.5%
Independents	52.2%	47.8%	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	46.6%	53.2%	0.2%
Somewhat red	50.3%	49.5%	0.1%
Lean red	44.9%	54.8%	0.3%
Lean blue	49.0%	50.4%	0.7%
Somewhat blue	42.7%	57.3%	0.0%
Very blue	47.6%	51.9%	0.5%

## **[Employment]**

The first set of proposals deals with employment. One of the biggest consequences that people with criminal records face is difficulty getting a job. Studies show that people with criminal records have a much higher unemployment rate than the general population.

There are local, state, and federal rules that disadvantage people with criminal records when applying for jobs or disqualify them from certain lines of work. Currently, there are at least 30,000 such rules across the country. They can also face disadvantages in the event that employers discriminate against them for having a criminal record. Some states have passed laws that seek to reduce employment discrimination against those with criminal records.

We will now look at proposals that have been put forward by Members of Congress that would reduce employment discrimination against those with criminal records throughout the country.

## **[Employment and Licensing Restrictions]**

One type of consequence that people with criminal records face is that they are sometimes disqualified from:

- getting licenses or certifications that are necessary to get certain jobs
- being considered for certain jobs

Also, if someone has a license or a job and they get arrested or convicted, they may lose their license or get fired from their job.

As you may know, in order to work in many jobs, a person needs a license or certification, which requires formal training and passing one or more tests. This ranges from a license to be a hair stylist to being an airline pilot. Currently, nearly one in four jobs in the US require a license. The organizations that create the rules for getting a license and oversee the whole process are created by states or in some cases the federal government.

There are about 15,000 state and federal rules that limit access to certain occupations based on a person's criminal record.

A common rule is that a person must have "good moral character" in order to get a license. A criminal record can be the basis for deciding that a person does not have "good moral character." Also, many employers are allowed to use a person's criminal record to disqualify them from being considered for a job, or to fire them.

This use of criminal records is of concern because some people who are discriminated against due to their criminal records

- were only arrested but not charged, or charged but found not guilty
- were convicted of a crime that is minor, non-violent, or unrelated to their work
- committed the crime well in the past, have been crime-free since, and are apparently well rehabilitated

Also, studies show employers are more likely to reject applicants who are racial minorities based on their criminal records. Members of Congress have introduced proposals to address these concerns.

## **[Arrest]**

One proposal is to prohibit licensing boards and employers from disqualifying a person because they were arrested but not charged, or charged with a crime but found not guilty.

Here is an argument in favor of this proposal.

Q2. An essential principle of our justice system is that people who are not proven to be guilty should not be punished. And yet millions of people carry the burden of an arrest or unproven charge their whole life: studies show that it is harder for them to get a job or a license. These harms are especially felt by minorities: studies show that police patrol minority neighborhoods more aggressively and are much more likely to make arrests, often on weak charges that are later dropped. Furthermore, unlike higher income people who can afford lawyers, those with lower incomes can rarely afford to get their arrest records wiped clean. Clearly, forcing people to carry the burden of an arrest or an unproven charge is unjust.

Please select how convincing or unconvincing you find this argument.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	50.3%	34.8%	<b>85.1%</b>	8.3%	6.0%	<b>14.3%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	33.7%	44.1%	<b>77.8%</b>	12.7%	8.7%	<b>21.4%</b>	0.7%
Democrats	66.8%	25.5%	<b>92.3%</b>	3.6%	3.3%	<b>6.9%</b>	0.8%
Independents	44.4%	37.9%	<b>82.3%</b>	10.5%	6.7%	<b>17.2%</b>	0.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	48.1%	36.9%	<b>85.0%</b>	9.5%	4.6%	<b>14.1%</b>	0.8%
Somewhat red	44.4%	33.9%	<b>78.3%</b>	11.1%	10.2%	<b>21.3%</b>	0.3%
Lean red	48.1%	38.2%	<b>86.3%</b>	7.7%	4.6%	<b>12.3%</b>	1.4%
Lean blue	52.5%	30.7%	<b>83.2%</b>	10.7%	5.9%	<b>16.6%</b>	0.2%
Somewhat blue	49.0%	39.3%	<b>88.3%</b>	6.4%	4.8%	<b>11.2%</b>	0.6%
Very blue	60.1%	30.0%	<b>90.1%</b>	3.4%	5.4%	<b>8.8%</b>	1.2%

Here is a counter argument.

Q3. It is perfectly reasonable to use an arrest record to make judgments about an applicant. Getting arrested can mean the person put themselves in a bad situation, such as associating with drug dealers and criminals. And just because a person was not convicted does not mean they did not actually commit a crime. It is very difficult to get convictions, especially in high-crime areas where witnesses are not cooperative or can even be afraid to testify. Thus, many people who did commit crimes end up walking free. If the arrest was really insignificant the person can explain this to the possible employer or licensing board. Employers and licensing boards should be free to decide to disqualify someone based on their criminal record even if they were found not guilty.

Please select how convincing or unconvincing you find this argument.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	11.1%	28.5%	<b>39.6%</b>	31.3%	28.9%	<b>60.2%</b>	0.2%
Republicans	17.0%	37.7%	<b>54.7%</b>	30.6%	14.2%	<b>44.8%</b>	0.4%
Democrats	5.6%	18.1%	<b>23.7%</b>	32.4%	43.8%	<b>76.2%</b>	0.1%
Independents	12.3%	34.6%	<b>46.9%</b>	29.9%	23.1%	<b>53.0%</b>	0.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	13.4%	33.8%	<b>47.2%</b>	28.7%	23.5%	<b>52.2%</b>	0.5%
Somewhat red	11.8%	24.3%	<b>36.1%</b>	35.4%	28.3%	<b>63.7%</b>	0.2%
Lean red	12.1%	30.0%	<b>42.1%</b>	32.1%	25.5%	<b>57.6%</b>	0.3%
Lean blue	10.0%	31.4%	<b>41.4%</b>	27.8%	30.6%	<b>58.4%</b>	0.1%
Somewhat blue	11.2%	28.9%	<b>40.1%</b>	34.1%	25.6%	<b>59.7%</b>	0.2%
Very blue	8.5%	21.6%	<b>30.1%</b>	29.5%	40.4%	<b>69.9%</b>	0.0%

Q4. Licensing boards and employers could not disqualify a person because they were **arrested but not charged** or **charged with a crime but found not guilty**.

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	7.6	13.8%	10.5%	75.5%	0.2%
Republicans	6.8	19.8%	11.8%	68.2%	0.2%
Democrats	8.3	8.7%	7.0%	84.1%	0.2%
Independents	7.5	13.8%	15.8%	69.9%	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	7.3	16.7%	10.0%	72.9%	0.4%
Somewhat red	7.3	17.9%	13.9%	68.1%	0.2%
Lean red	7.6	12.9%	7.2%	79.8%	0.0%
Lean blue	7.6	11.7%	9.4%	78.8%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	7.4	14.2%	13.3%	72.5%	0.0%
Very blue	8.6	8.6%	9.3%	81.4%	0.7%

Q5. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	81.4%	18.5%	0.1%
Republicans	72.3%	27.5%	0.3%
Democrats	89.7%	10.2%	0.1%
Independents	79.9%	20.1%	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	78.8%	21.1%	0.1%
Somewhat red	77.6%	22.4%	0.0%
Lean red	83.7%	15.9%	0.4%
Lean blue	81.5%	18.5%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	79.5%	20.1%	0.3%
Very blue	87.2%	12.7%	0.1%

### [Minor Offense]

Another proposal is to prohibit licensing boards and employers from disqualifying a person because they have been convicted of a petty, non-violent offense. This can include littering, jaywalking, failing to pay a parking ticket, or loitering. Here is an argument in favor of this proposal.

Q6. Disqualifying someone from getting a license or a job because of a minor crime in their past is unjust, disproportionate, and illogical. People already have to pay fines and court fees. They should not get additional punishment. These rules do not keep us safe, instead they increase unemployment and destabilize people's lives. Studies show they especially harm low-income people and minorities, who are more targeted by police and who have the most difficulty wiping their records clean.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	50.8%	31.0%	<b>81.8%</b>	11.1%	6.6%	<b>17.7%</b>	0.5%
Republicans	35.8%	38.6%	<b>74.4%</b>	15.7%	9.3%	<b>25.0%</b>	0.6%
Democrats	65.1%	23.8%	<b>88.9%</b>	6.7%	4.1%	<b>10.8%</b>	0.2%
Independents	46.5%	32.7%	<b>79.2%</b>	12.5%	7.3%	<b>19.8%</b>	1.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	46.3%	31.9%	<b>78.2%</b>	11.5%	9.5%	<b>21.0%</b>	0.8%
Somewhat red	47.1%	31.3%	<b>78.4%</b>	14.9%	6.4%	<b>21.3%</b>	0.2%
Lean red	49.3%	33.0%	<b>82.3%</b>	11.2%	5.6%	<b>16.8%</b>	0.9%
Lean blue	54.6%	28.3%	<b>82.9%</b>	10.1%	6.8%	<b>16.9%</b>	0.3%
Somewhat blue	47.0%	31.2%	<b>78.2%</b>	13.5%	7.8%	<b>21.3%</b>	0.6%
Very blue	61.2%	29.7%	<b>90.9%</b>	5.2%	3.5%	<b>8.7%</b>	0.4%

Here is an counter argument.

Q7. Employers and licensing boards should be able to disqualify a person because they committed a crime. First, even if the crime was minor, it shows that person's moral character. A person who committed a minor crime still knowingly violated the law, and is more likely to lack good judgment and be irresponsible. Second, if an employer hires someone with a criminal record and that person does something illegal that harms another employee or customer, the employer may be more liable for damages because they knowingly hired someone with a criminal record.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	9.2%	28.0%	<b>37.2%</b>	32.4%	29.8%	<b>62.2%</b>	0.5%
Republicans	13.0%	35.1%	<b>48.1%</b>	34.3%	16.8%	<b>51.1%</b>	0.8%
Democrats	4.4%	20.7%	<b>25.1%</b>	31.5%	42.9%	<b>74.4%</b>	0.4%
Independents	13.2%	31.0%	<b>44.2%</b>	30.7%	24.8%	<b>55.5%</b>	0.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	12.6%	27.6%	<b>40.2%</b>	34.7%	23.8%	<b>58.5%</b>	1.4%
Somewhat red	7.9%	32.7%	<b>40.6%</b>	28.7%	30.1%	<b>58.8%</b>	0.6%
Lean red	9.9%	25.0%	<b>34.9%</b>	36.5%	28.0%	<b>64.5%</b>	0.6%
Lean blue	8.9%	28.0%	<b>36.9%</b>	32.1%	30.8%	<b>62.9%</b>	0.3%
Somewhat blue	6.7%	31.5%	<b>38.2%</b>	31.6%	30.0%	<b>61.6%</b>	0.2%
Very blue	9.6%	22.0%	<b>31.6%</b>	31.3%	36.8%	<b>68.1%</b>	0.2%

So, here again is the proposal:

Q8. Licensing boards and employers could not disqualify a person because they have been convicted of a **petty, non-violent crime**.

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	7.6	15.8%	12.5%	71.2%	0.5%
Republicans	6.4	24.0%	15.6%	60.1%	0.2%
Democrats	8.7	7.7%	8.1%	83.6%	0.6%
Independents	7.3	18.6%	16.6%	64.2%	0.6%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	7.0	21.9%	7.2%	70.8%	0.1%
Somewhat red	7.2	19.8%	15.0%	64.7%	0.4%
Lean red	8.2	12.5%	11.0%	75.6%	0.9%
Lean blue	7.6	12.5%	15.4%	71.8%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	7.8	16.2%	15.9%	67.1%	0.8%
Very blue	8.0	11.3%	10.0%	78.4%	0.3%

Q9. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	79.2%	20.6%	0.3%
Republicans	68.1%	31.2%	0.6%
Democrats	88.6%	11.2%	0.1%
Independents	78.7%	21.3%	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	77.2%	22.8%	0.1%
Somewhat red	75.5%	24.5%	0.0%
Lean red	79.1%	20.1%	0.8%
Lean blue	82.2%	17.5%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	74.9%	24.5%	0.6%
Very blue	86.1%	13.8%	0.1%

## [Old Crimes]

We will now turn now to the role of more substantial crimes. These include:

- misdemeanors that are lesser crimes but can result in prison time of up to a year
- felonies which are more serious crimes that can result in prison time of more than a year

Currently, licensing boards and employers **in many states** can disqualify a person because they have been convicted of such a misdemeanor or felony, and some have a policy of doing so automatically, irrespective of when the crime was committed.

The proposal being considered in Congress is to limit the period of time during which licensing boards and employers can disqualify an applicant for certain convictions, provided that the person has not committed any other crimes during this period:

- For a misdemeanor the limit would be one year after the person completes their sentence
- For a felony it would be limited to five years after the person completes their sentence

Here are a pair of arguments in favor of and against this proposal:

Q10. Studies show that if a person does not commit a crime for a significant period, they are very unlikely to return to crime. It is also an essential principle of justice that punishment should not go on indefinitely. If they remain crime-free for a significant period, then surely, they deserve a second chance. People should be given the opportunity to become productive members of society without the burden of discrimination.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	42.1%	42.2%	<b>84.3%</b>	9.6%	5.3%	<b>14.9%</b>	0.8%
Republicans	31.1%	48.1%	<b>79.2%</b>	12.6%	6.8%	<b>19.4%</b>	1.5%
Democrats	52.1%	37.0%	<b>89.1%</b>	6.4%	3.9%	<b>10.3%</b>	0.6%
Independents	40.3%	42.9%	<b>83.2%</b>	11.1%	5.5%	<b>16.6%</b>	0.2%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	38.4%	43.2%	<b>81.6%</b>	12.9%	5.0%	<b>17.9%</b>	0.6%
Somewhat red	35.9%	45.1%	<b>81.0%</b>	9.0%	7.4%	<b>16.4%</b>	2.6%
Lean red	43.5%	41.0%	<b>84.5%</b>	9.8%	5.0%	<b>14.8%</b>	0.6%
Lean blue	46.2%	40.1%	<b>86.3%</b>	8.5%	4.6%	<b>13.1%</b>	0.5%
Somewhat blue	42.6%	44.4%	<b>87.0%</b>	8.3%	4.8%	<b>13.1%</b>	0.0%
Very blue	46.3%	40.3%	<b>86.6%</b>	8.0%	4.9%	<b>12.9%</b>	0.4%

Q11. Employers should have the right to make their own judgments about an applicant and disqualify them for criminal behavior even if it took place well in the past. It is also appropriate for licensing boards to use past criminal behavior as the basis for deciding whether someone can enter a profession. Someone convicted of embezzlement, even years ago, should never be able to be an accountant.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	20.2%	38.5%	<b>58.7%</b>	25.9%	14.7%	<b>40.6%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	30.4%	38.9%	<b>69.3%</b>	21.2%	9.2%	<b>30.4%</b>	0.4%
Democrats	10.5%	38.5%	<b>49.0%</b>	29.6%	20.5%	<b>50.1%</b>	0.9%
Independents	23.0%	37.6%	<b>60.6%</b>	26.6%	12.0%	<b>38.6%</b>	0.7%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	22.0%	37.6%	<b>59.6%</b>	28.3%	11.5%	<b>39.8%</b>	0.6%
Somewhat red	24.5%	37.7%	<b>62.2%</b>	24.2%	13.4%	<b>37.6%</b>	0.1%
Lean red	16.4%	39.2%	<b>55.6%</b>	27.0%	16.3%	<b>43.3%</b>	1.1%
Lean blue	27.0%	33.4%	<b>60.4%</b>	22.4%	16.6%	<b>39.0%</b>	0.7%
Somewhat blue	14.3%	40.4%	<b>54.7%</b>	29.1%	14.5%	<b>43.6%</b>	1.7%
Very blue	15.3%	43.2%	<b>58.5%</b>	26.2%	15.2%	<b>41.4%</b>	0.1%

Here are two more arguments in favor of and against this proposal.

Q12. Studies show that when people who have served time can't get a job they are more likely to return to crime. This hurts their family and their community. The increased cost of law enforcement and re-imprisonment falls on taxpayers. Discriminating against people with criminal records indefinitely hurts everybody.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	39.5%	40.2%	<b>79.7%</b>	13.7%	5.8%	<b>19.5%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	24.7%	45.8%	<b>70.5%</b>	19.6%	8.9%	<b>28.5%</b>	0.9%
Democrats	52.1%	36.9%	<b>89.0%</b>	7.7%	2.7%	<b>10.4%</b>	0.6%
Independents	39.3%	37.2%	<b>76.5%</b>	15.8%	7.3%	<b>23.1%</b>	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	40.3%	35.6%	<b>75.9%</b>	18.4%	4.9%	<b>23.3%</b>	0.7%
Somewhat red	34.3%	41.4%	<b>75.7%</b>	16.7%	7.5%	<b>24.2%</b>	0.2%
Lean red	38.4%	41.9%	<b>80.3%</b>	13.2%	5.7%	<b>18.9%</b>	0.8%
Lean blue	39.0%	44.0%	<b>83.0%</b>	8.5%	8.2%	<b>16.7%</b>	0.3%
Somewhat blue	39.9%	40.2%	<b>80.1%</b>	15.5%	4.0%	<b>19.5%</b>	0.4%
Very blue	45.9%	38.3%	<b>84.2%</b>	10.1%	3.9%	<b>14.0%</b>	1.8%

Q13. If a former criminal commits a crime while on the job, the employer may be more liable for damages because they knowingly hired someone with a criminal record, even if it is a crime well in the past. That's why insurance companies charge more to cover an employee with a criminal history or even refuse to cover them. It is not fair to require that employers take on this greater risk.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	17.2%	41.8%	<b>59.0%</b>	26.9%	13.3%	<b>40.2%</b>	0.9%
Republicans	25.3%	44.4%	<b>69.7%</b>	22.8%	7.0%	<b>29.8%</b>	0.5%
Democrats	8.9%	38.4%	<b>47.3%</b>	31.6%	20.3%	<b>51.9%</b>	0.7%
Independents	20.4%	44.5%	<b>64.9%</b>	24.0%	9.3%	<b>33.3%</b>	1.7%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	18.8%	45.3%	<b>64.1%</b>	24.6%	10.4%	<b>35.0%</b>	0.9%
Somewhat red	18.7%	40.2%	<b>58.9%</b>	28.0%	12.7%	<b>40.7%</b>	0.5%
Lean red	15.1%	43.1%	<b>58.2%</b>	25.1%	16.1%	<b>41.2%</b>	0.6%
Lean blue	22.3%	36.6%	<b>58.9%</b>	26.8%	13.4%	<b>40.2%</b>	0.9%
Somewhat blue	14.0%	43.0%	<b>57.0%</b>	30.1%	12.2%	<b>42.3%</b>	0.6%
Very blue	12.8%	43.5%	<b>56.3%</b>	27.4%	14.5%	<b>41.9%</b>	1.8%

So, here again is the proposal:

Q14. Limit the period of time during which licensing boards and employers can disqualify an applicant for certain convictions, provided that the person has not committed any other crimes during this period:

- For a misdemeanor, the limit would be to one year after the person completes their sentence,
- For a felony, the limit would be five years after the person completes their sentence

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	6.8	20.8%	19.1%	59.6%	0.4%
Republicans	6.0	28.0%	20.3%	51.4%	0.4%
Democrats	7.7	13.6%	15.3%	70.5%	0.5%
Independents	6.3	23.4%	25.6%	50.6%	0.4%

Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	6.4	19.8%	21.7%	58.3%	0.1%
Somewhat red	6.5	22.8%	16.8%	60.1%	0.3%
Lean red	7.3	20.3%	19.6%	59.1%	0.9%
Lean blue	7.0	21.7%	16.2%	61.5%	0.6%
Somewhat blue	6.9	19.4%	22.3%	57.8%	0.5%
Very blue	6.5	20.0%	19.5%	60.5%	0.0%

Q15. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	73.8%	25.8%	0.4%
Republicans	63.7%	35.8%	0.5%
Democrats	83.3%	16.4%	0.3%
Independents	71.6%	27.8%	0.6%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	71.9%	27.6%	0.5%
Somewhat red	73.7%	25.9%	0.4%
Lean red	71.0%	28.3%	0.6%
Lean blue	76.5%	23.5%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	75.3%	24.1%	0.7%
Very blue	75.0%	24.5%	0.5%

As discussed above, one of the major reasons' employers want to be able to disqualify people who have been convicted of crimes is that they are concerned that if the employee commits a crime, the employer could be sued for knowingly hiring someone who has committed a crime.

Q16. Some people have proposed a new rule that, in the event an employee with a criminal record commits a crime while on the job, the employer could not be held responsible for any damages just because the employer knowingly hired someone with a criminal record.

Would you favor or oppose such a rule?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	77.9%	21.9%	0.2%
Republicans	74.8%	24.9%	0.2%
Democrats	81.5%	18.3%	0.2%
Independents	75.7%	24.1%	0.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	74.5%	25.3%	0.1%
Somewhat red	75.8%	23.9%	0.3%
Lean red	80.4%	19.4%	0.2%
Lean blue	78.2%	21.5%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	77.0%	23.0%	0.0%
Very blue	81.2%	18.6%	0.3%

[ASKED ONLY THOSE RESPONDENTS THAT EITHER OPPOSED OR SKIPPED Q15, BUT FAVORED Q16]

Q17. If such a rule were in place would you then favor the proposal to:

Limit the period of time during which licensing boards and employers can disqualify an applicant for certain convictions, provided that the person has not committed any other crimes during this period:

- For a misdemeanor, the limit would be to **one year** after the person completes their sentence,
- For a felony, the limit would be **five years** after the person completes their sentence



	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know	Oppose both Q15/Q16	Favor Q15	Total Favor
<b>National</b>	5.8%	7.9%	0.4%	12.1%	73.8%	<b>79.6%</b>
Republicans	8.8%	11.7%	0.5%	15.4%	63.7%	<b>72.5%</b>
Democrats	3.0%	5.3%	0.3%	8.1%	83.3%	<b>86.3%</b>
Independents	6.5%	6.7%	0.6%	14.6%	71.6%	<b>78.1%</b>
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>						
Very red	6.7%	9.4%	0.5%	11.5%	71.9%	<b>78.6%</b>
Somewhat red	4.3%	9.5%	0.4%	12.1%	73.7%	<b>78.0%</b>
Lean red	8.4%	7.7%	0.6%	12.2%	71.0%	<b>79.4%</b>
Lean blue	3.4%	6.3%	0.0%	13.7%	76.5%	<b>79.9%</b>
Somewhat blue	6.8%	5.3%	0.7%	12.0%	75.3%	<b>82.1%</b>
Very blue	4.7%	8.8%	0.5%	11.1%	75.0%	<b>79.7%</b>

## [Unrelated Crimes]

Here is another proposal:

Licensing boards and employers could not disqualify a person because they have been convicted of just any crime. They would have to establish that the crime is clearly related to one's ability to perform the duties or responsibilities of their work. For example, someone previously convicted of drunk driving could be disqualified from having a job as a driver.

This rule has already been adopted in over half of states and the proposal, now, is to make it a federal law.

Here is an argument in favor of this proposal.

Q18. Naturally, a person should be disqualified from a job or license if they have committed crimes that are related to their work. But many employers and licensing boards automatically disqualify people for unrelated convictions. Disqualifying a person from becoming a hair stylist or plumber because they were convicted of a minor non-violent crime like possessing marijuana or loitering is unjust and nonsensical.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	50.0%	32.9%	<b>82.9%</b>	10.6%	6.0%	<b>16.6%</b>	0.4%
Republicans	38.6%	40.2%	<b>78.8%</b>	12.7%	8.0%	<b>20.7%</b>	0.5%
Democrats	63.1%	25.9%	<b>89.0%</b>	7.3%	3.5%	<b>10.8%</b>	0.2%
Independents	42.1%	35.0%	<b>77.1%</b>	14.4%	8.2%	<b>22.6%</b>	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	49.3%	32.5%	<b>81.8%</b>	10.0%	8.2%	<b>18.2%</b>	0.0%
Somewhat red	50.1%	33.4%	<b>83.5%</b>	8.9%	6.8%	<b>15.7%</b>	0.8%
Lean red	50.7%	31.4%	<b>82.1%</b>	13.2%	4.8%	<b>18.0%</b>	0.1%
Lean blue	50.9%	31.8%	<b>82.7%</b>	9.4%	7.5%	<b>16.9%</b>	0.5%
Somewhat blue	48.9%	36.4%	<b>85.3%</b>	10.7%	4.0%	<b>14.7%</b>	0.0%
Very blue	51.4%	31.7%	<b>83.1%</b>	11.2%	4.9%	<b>16.1%</b>	0.8%

Here is an argument against the proposal.

Q19. Deciding what crimes are and are not related to a certain job is an impossible task that even reasonable people could argue about endlessly. If employers and licensing boards specify what crimes are related to the work, people who have committed those crimes and get denied a job or license will sue them. This could make it too difficult for an employer or licensing board to impose any limits on what jobs a convicted criminal can do.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	10.8%	35.2%	<b>46.0%</b>	33.2%	20.4%	<b>53.6%</b>	0.4%
Republicans	15.5%	43.5%	<b>59.0%</b>	31.3%	9.3%	<b>40.6%</b>	0.5%
Democrats	6.3%	25.9%	<b>32.2%</b>	34.5%	33.0%	<b>67.5%</b>	0.3%
Independents	12.3%	40.4%	<b>52.7%</b>	33.9%	13.1%	<b>47.0%</b>	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	13.5%	33.3%	<b>46.8%</b>	38.6%	14.0%	<b>52.6%</b>	0.6%
Somewhat red	10.1%	36.1%	<b>46.2%</b>	31.2%	22.3%	<b>53.5%</b>	0.4%
Lean red	11.3%	34.4%	<b>45.7%</b>	33.8%	20.1%	<b>53.9%</b>	0.3%
Lean blue	12.8%	38.4%	<b>51.2%</b>	27.4%	20.6%	<b>48.0%</b>	0.8%
Somewhat blue	8.7%	35.2%	<b>43.9%</b>	36.7%	19.2%	<b>55.9%</b>	0.2%
Very blue	8.2%	32.0%	<b>40.2%</b>	33.5%	26.3%	<b>59.8%</b>	0.0%

Here again is the proposal:

Q20. Licensing boards and employers could not disqualify a person because they have been convicted of a crime when the nature of the crime is **unrelated** to their ability to perform the duties or responsibilities of their work.

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	7.1	17.8%	15.7%	66.1%	0.4%
Republicans	6.2	27.7%	18.2%	53.7%	0.4%
Democrats	8.0	10.0%	10.0%	79.7%	0.3%
Independents	6.6	16.9%	23.8%	59.1%	0.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	6.8	19.3%	12.6%	67.9%	0.2%
Somewhat red	7.0	24.3%	20.9%	54.1%	0.8%
Lean red	6.8	16.7%	15.6%	67.7%	0.0%
Lean blue	7.4	14.0%	15.4%	70.1%	0.5%
Somewhat blue	7.1	19.4%	13.9%	66.1%	0.5%
Very blue	7.3	12.8%	15.2%	71.9%	0.2%

Q21. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	76.3%	23.4%	0.3%
Republicans	64.5%	35.1%	0.4%
Democrats	87.1%	12.8%	0.2%
Independents	74.4%	25.1%	0.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	75.4%	24.6%	0.0%
Somewhat red	69.2%	30.7%	0.1%
Lean red	78.0%	21.3%	0.7%
Lean blue	76.3%	23.2%	0.5%
Somewhat blue	76.4%	23.2%	0.4%
Very blue	83.8%	15.8%	0.4%

## [Housing]

Another area where people with criminal records face discrimination is in public housing. First, here is some background on public housing:

Currently, there are about 9.4 million people living in public housing. These are homes that are only available to low-income people, or those with disabilities. The rent for public housing is limited to about 30 percent of a person’s income. State and Federal government provide subsidies to cover the rest of the cost. Though public housing is subsidized by the government, the public housing program is managed by independent organizations known as “Housing Authorities.”

Housing Authorities can and do disqualify people based on their criminal record--by rejecting their application or evicting them.

Studies show that:

- for those who have served any prison sentence, around 8 in 10 are denied housing
- Housing Authorities are more likely to reject applicants who are racial minorities based on their criminal records

This use of criminal records is of concern because some people who are discriminated against due to their criminal records:

- were only arrested but not charged, or charged with a crime but found not guilty
- were convicted of a crime that is minor and non-violent
- were convicted of a felony but would not reasonably pose a threat to the health or safety of other tenants

Members of Congress have put forward a proposal to address these concerns:

According to the proposal Housing Authorities would not be allowed to disqualify a person from public housing because they:

- have only been arrested and not charged, or charged but found not guilty,
- have been convicted of a minor, non-violent crime.

In the event of a person who has committed a felony, a review board, consisting of members of the Housing Authority and tenants, would determine, on a case-by-case basis, if the person poses a threat to the health or safety of other tenants.

Here is an argument in favor of this proposal.

Q22. People should not be denied public housing unless there is a compelling reason to do so. It is unfair to disqualify someone just because they were arrested, or because they committed a minor nonviolent crime. We shouldn’t assume someone poses a threat. And for those who have served time in prison, the majority never return to crime. Most are just trying to get back on their feet and start their life again, but are denied public housing, causing many of them to become homeless and rely on shelters. It also prevents them from reuniting with their family, many of whom live in public housing. This instability and stress often leads people into drug abuse and to return to crime, creating more costs for society. If any of them really might pose a threat, there is a review process to weed them out.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	42.8%	37.8%	<b>80.6%</b>	12.1%	6.9%	<b>19.0%</b>	0.4%
Republicans	28.2%	42.6%	<b>70.8%</b>	17.3%	11.5%	<b>28.8%</b>	0.3%
Democrats	58.3%	32.3%	<b>90.6%</b>	6.1%	2.8%	<b>8.9%</b>	0.5%
Independents	35.5%	40.9%	<b>76.4%</b>	15.6%	7.6%	<b>23.2%</b>	0.4%

<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	40.0%	39.1%	<b>79.1%</b>	15.8%	5.0%	<b>20.8%</b>	0.1%
Somewhat red	40.2%	37.0%	<b>77.2%</b>	13.3%	8.6%	<b>21.9%</b>	0.9%
Lean red	47.0%	36.7%	<b>83.7%</b>	9.3%	6.8%	<b>16.1%</b>	0.3%
Lean blue	45.5%	33.0%	<b>78.5%</b>	10.6%	10.8%	<b>21.4%</b>	0.1%
Somewhat blue	38.3%	41.1%	<b>79.4%</b>	15.7%	4.7%	<b>20.4%</b>	0.1%
Very blue	46.6%	39.5%	<b>86.1%</b>	8.2%	4.7%	<b>12.9%</b>	1.0%

Here is an argument against.

Q23. It is not anybody's right to stay in public housing. It is the responsibility of Housing Authorities to make sure all of their tenants are going to be good neighbors, and that people are safe in their homes. If they feel that a person who has been charged with a crime, or convicted of a minor crime makes them too much of a risk, then they should be able to reject or evict that person. People who commit even minor crimes are likely to commit a crime again. And for a person who committed a felony, no review process can determine whether they will threaten the safety of other tenants in the future. Keep in mind that most public housing includes families with young children. It is best to err on the side of caution and not tell Housing Authorities how they should do their job.

	<b>Very Convincing</b>	<b>Somewhat Convincing</b>	<b>Total Convincing</b>	<b>Somewhat Unconvincing</b>	<b>Very Unconvincing</b>	<b>Total Unconvincing</b>	<b>Refused / Don't Know</b>
<b>National</b>	15.1%	33.4%	<b>48.5%</b>	31.7%	19.5%	<b>51.2%</b>	0.2%
Republicans	22.7%	40.7%	<b>63.4%</b>	27.9%	8.6%	<b>36.5%</b>	0.1%
Democrats	8.2%	25.2%	<b>33.4%</b>	34.9%	31.3%	<b>66.2%</b>	0.5%
Independents	16.5%	38.3%	<b>54.8%</b>	32.0%	13.2%	<b>45.2%</b>	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	15.7%	39.4%	<b>55.1%</b>	29.5%	15.4%	<b>44.9%</b>	0.0%
Somewhat red	14.8%	33.3%	<b>48.1%</b>	30.9%	20.2%	<b>51.1%</b>	0.9%
Lean red	14.1%	36.6%	<b>50.7%</b>	28.9%	20.2%	<b>49.1%</b>	0.3%
Lean blue	17.0%	33.7%	<b>50.7%</b>	29.4%	19.9%	<b>49.3%</b>	0.0%
Somewhat blue	14.4%	34.7%	<b>49.1%</b>	32.7%	18.0%	<b>50.7%</b>	0.2%
Very blue	13.8%	23.3%	<b>37.1%</b>	40.7%	22.1%	<b>62.8%</b>	0.1%

So, here again is the proposal:

Q24. Housing Authorities would not be allowed to disqualify a person from public housing because:

- they have been arrested but not charged, or charged but found not guilty,
- they have been convicted of a minor, non-violent crime.

In the event of a person who has committed a felony, a review board, consisting of members of the Housing Authority and tenants, would determine, on a case-by-case basis, if the person poses a threat to the health or safety of other tenants.

How acceptable is this proposal to you?

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Unacceptable (0-4)</b>	<b>Just Tolerable (5)</b>	<b>Acceptable (6-10)</b>	<b>Refused / Don't Know</b>
<b>National</b>	7.3	15.1%	14.1%	70.4%	0.5%
Republicans	6.6	20.5%	18.1%	60.9%	0.5%
Democrats	8.2	8.8%	8.9%	81.9%	0.4%
Independents	6.7	19.1%	18.1%	62.4%	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	7.2	17.6%	12.5%	69.3%	0.6%
Somewhat red	7.6	13.4%	15.7%	70.2%	0.7%
Lean red	7.5	13.0%	16.3%	70.2%	0.5%
Lean blue	7.0	14.2%	16.3%	69.4%	0.1%
Somewhat blue	7.3	17.8%	12.9%	68.6%	0.7%
Very blue	7.3	15.7%	10.0%	74.1%	0.2%

Q25. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	78.5%	20.7%	0.9%
Republicans	69.6%	29.7%	0.7%
Democrats	88.0%	11.1%	0.8%
Independents	73.8%	25.0%	1.2%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	75.9%	23.6%	0.5%
Somewhat red	81.7%	17.6%	0.6%
Lean red	76.1%	22.1%	1.8%
Lean blue	78.0%	21.1%	0.9%
Somewhat blue	77.6%	22.2%	0.2%
Very blue	80.9%	18.1%	1.0%

**[ASKED IF OPPOSED OR SKIPPED Q25]**

Q25a. Another proposal would allow Housing authorities to disqualify a person if they are convicted of a crime, whether it is major or minor. But they would not be able to disqualify a person if they were only arrested but not charged or charged but found not guilty.

Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know	Favor Q15	Total Favor
<b>National</b>	10.2%	9.6%	1.7%	78.5%	<b>88.7%</b>
Republicans	17.5%	11.7%	1.1%	69.6%	<b>87.1%</b>
Democrats	3.6%	7.0%	1.4%	88.0%	<b>91.6%</b>
Independents	11.3%	11.5%	3.4%	73.8%	<b>85.1%</b>
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	11.5%	11.6%	1.0%	75.9%	<b>87.4%</b>
Somewhat red	6.0%	11.1%	1.2%	81.7%	<b>87.7%</b>
Lean red	13.5%	8.4%	2.0%	76.1%	<b>89.6%</b>
Lean blue	9.8%	11.1%	1.1%	78.0%	<b>87.8%</b>
Somewhat blue	11.3%	8.5%	2.6%	77.6%	<b>88.9%</b>
Very blue	10.6%	6.1%	2.4%	80.9%	<b>91.5%</b>

**[Sealing Records]**

**[For Arrests and Non-Conviction]**

Here is another proposal related to people with criminal records. As we have been discussing, when a person has been arrested but not charged, or charged but found not guilty, that information is available to potential employers or landlords.

Here is another proposal in Congress:

People who have been arrested but not charged, or charged but found not guilty, can, for a minor cost, have their records sealed so that it is not public and thus not available to potential employers or landlords. Legally, they would not need to disclose their arrest or charge to an employer or landlord.

Here are arguments for and against this proposal:

Q26. If a person is just arrested, or charged but found not guilty, there is no reason for the public, including potential employers or landlords, to know about this. People should be treated as innocent

until proven guilty. Too many people wrongly assume that because someone got arrested that they must have done something wrong. The person can get punished, by being denied a job or housing, when they were innocent.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	54.1%	31.3%	<b>85.4%</b>	9.3%	4.7%	<b>14.0%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	45.6%	38.4%	<b>84.0%</b>	9.5%	6.1%	<b>15.6%</b>	0.5%
Democrats	63.3%	25.7%	<b>89.0%</b>	7.4%	2.8%	<b>10.2%</b>	0.8%
Independents	49.2%	30.3%	<b>79.5%</b>	13.4%	6.2%	<b>19.6%</b>	0.9%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	48.4%	34.4%	<b>82.8%</b>	12.3%	4.9%	<b>17.2%</b>	0.0%
Somewhat red	55.8%	31.3%	<b>87.1%</b>	5.7%	6.1%	<b>11.8%</b>	1.1%
Lean red	56.7%	31.0%	<b>87.7%</b>	7.0%	4.1%	<b>11.1%</b>	1.2%
Lean blue	53.4%	30.9%	<b>84.3%</b>	10.4%	4.9%	<b>15.3%</b>	0.4%
Somewhat blue	51.2%	35.8%	<b>87.0%</b>	10.8%	2.0%	<b>12.8%</b>	0.2%
Very blue	56.4%	25.2%	<b>81.6%</b>	11.2%	6.0%	<b>17.2%</b>	1.1%

Q27. Just because a person was not convicted, does not mean that the arrest should not be public. It can be very difficult to get a conviction, either because of lost evidence or uncooperative witnesses, so a lot of people who committed crimes end up walking free. The details may be relevant to an employer or landlord. If the person did not do anything wrong, they can explain this to the potential employer or landlord.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	9.9%	30.7%	<b>40.6%</b>	29.4%	29.3%	<b>58.7%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	11.3%	40.7%	<b>52.0%</b>	31.1%	16.2%	<b>47.3%</b>	0.7%
Democrats	7.6%	21.0%	<b>28.6%</b>	28.0%	42.5%	<b>70.5%</b>	1.0%
Independents	12.7%	33.6%	<b>46.3%</b>	29.4%	24.4%	<b>53.8%</b>	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	8.4%	36.5%	<b>44.9%</b>	31.5%	23.4%	<b>54.9%</b>	0.2%
Somewhat red	11.3%	28.5%	<b>39.8%</b>	30.4%	28.8%	<b>59.2%</b>	0.9%
Lean red	11.1%	29.0%	<b>40.1%</b>	28.8%	30.3%	<b>59.1%</b>	0.8%
Lean blue	12.6%	28.0%	<b>40.6%</b>	27.1%	32.0%	<b>59.1%</b>	0.3%
Somewhat blue	6.2%	34.0%	<b>40.2%</b>	32.4%	27.1%	<b>59.5%</b>	0.3%
Very blue	9.7%	29.4%	<b>39.1%</b>	24.6%	34.7%	<b>59.3%</b>	1.6%

Q28. So, here again is the proposal:

People who have been just arrested or charged but found not guilty can, for a minor cost, have their records sealed so that it is not publicly available. Legally, they would not need to disclose their arrest or charge to an employer or landlord.

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	7.5	17.5%	14.2%	67.7%	0.6%
Republicans	6.9	23.0%	15.5%	60.8%	0.7%
Democrats	8.3	12.2%	9.6%	77.6%	0.6%
Independents	7.0	18.9%	22.1%	58.4%	0.6%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	6.5	23.9%	11.1%	65.1%	0.0%
Somewhat red	7.6	17.3%	15.6%	66.3%	0.8%
Lean red	7.4	14.6%	17.0%	68.1%	0.3%
Lean blue	8.3	14.4%	14.5%	69.9%	1.2%
Somewhat blue	7.6	18.0%	16.0%	65.1%	0.8%
Very blue	7.8	17.5%	11.0%	70.8%	0.7%

Q29. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	76.7%	22.2%	1.2%
Republicans	69.7%	29.8%	0.5%
Democrats	84.7%	14.3%	1.0%
Independents	71.8%	25.4%	2.8%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	74.5%	25.5%	0.0%
Somewhat red	75.4%	24.4%	0.3%
Lean red	74.3%	23.4%	2.3%
Lean blue	82.5%	16.7%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	73.8%	23.8%	2.4%
Very blue	79.0%	19.5%	1.5%

**[For Non-Violent Drug Offenses]**

There is a similar proposal, that would apply to people with non-violent drug offenses, meaning their offense did not include any use of violence or the threat of violence.

According to this proposal, for a person convicted of a non-violent drug offense, five years after they finish their sentence or probation, information about the offense would be automatically sealed. Legally, they would not need to disclose their arrest or conviction to an employer or landlord.

Here are arguments in favor of and against this proposal.

Q30. People should not carry around the burden of their past misdeeds forever. This is especially true for people who were convicted of nonviolent drug offenses. As long as that record is open, it will make employment and housing harder to get. People should not be effectively punished over and over again for the rest of their life. After five years we need to allow people a fresh start.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	45.4%	37.7%	<b>83.1%</b>	11.6%	5.0%	<b>16.6%</b>	0.3%
Republicans	33.8%	43.9%	<b>77.7%</b>	15.3%	6.8%	<b>22.1%</b>	0.2%
Democrats	59.3%	30.7%	<b>90.0%</b>	7.0%	2.5%	<b>9.5%</b>	0.5%
Independents	36.0%	41.6%	<b>77.6%</b>	14.8%	7.4%	<b>22.2%</b>	0.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	43.1%	38.8%	<b>81.9%</b>	13.4%	4.7%	<b>18.1%</b>	0.0%
Somewhat red	42.8%	37.4%	<b>80.2%</b>	12.0%	6.9%	<b>18.9%</b>	1.0%
Lean red	47.3%	38.1%	<b>85.4%</b>	10.3%	4.1%	<b>14.4%</b>	0.2%
Lean blue	47.1%	35.5%	<b>82.6%</b>	10.7%	6.6%	<b>17.3%</b>	0.1%
Somewhat blue	40.0%	41.5%	<b>81.5%</b>	14.5%	3.7%	<b>18.2%</b>	0.3%
Very blue	52.3%	34.2%	<b>86.5%</b>	8.9%	4.2%	<b>13.1%</b>	0.4%

Q31. Hiring or renting to a person with a history of drug use is risky. Just because they have not been caught using drugs for five years does not mean they aren't still using drugs. Employers and landlords have the right to not want possible drug users working alongside their employees, dealing with their customers, or living in their communities.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	13.3%	34.6%	<b>47.9%</b>	28.5%	23.3%	<b>51.8%</b>	0.4%
Republicans	18.2%	45.8%	<b>64.0%</b>	25.1%	10.8%	<b>35.9%</b>	0.1%
Democrats	7.5%	23.6%	<b>31.1%</b>	30.7%	37.6%	<b>68.3%</b>	0.5%
Independents	17.0%	38.0%	<b>55.0%</b>	29.7%	14.7%	<b>44.4%</b>	0.6%

<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	16.1%	39.9%	<b>56.0%</b>	25.7%	18.3%	<b>44.0%</b>	0.0%
Somewhat red	14.0%	33.2%	<b>47.2%</b>	28.4%	23.8%	<b>52.2%</b>	0.7%
Lean red	13.3%	34.1%	<b>47.4%</b>	29.0%	22.9%	<b>51.9%</b>	0.6%
Lean blue	12.3%	36.1%	<b>48.4%</b>	26.0%	25.7%	<b>51.7%</b>	0.0%
Somewhat blue	13.9%	32.3%	<b>46.2%</b>	31.5%	21.5%	<b>53.0%</b>	0.8%
Very blue	9.9%	31.3%	<b>41.2%</b>	29.9%	28.7%	<b>58.6%</b>	0.3%

Q32. So, here again is the proposal:

For a person convicted of a non-violent drug offense, five years after they finish their sentence or probation, information about the offense would be automatically sealed. Legally, they would not need to disclose their arrest or conviction to an employer or landlord.

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	7.1	17.6%	17.1%	65.0%	0.3%
Republicans	6.3	23.5%	19.6%	56.7%	0.2%
Democrats	8.1	11.1%	12.1%	76.3%	0.5%
Independents	6.1	21.3%	23.6%	55.1%	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	6.1	24.9%	15.7%	59.4%	0.0%
Somewhat red	7.4	16.3%	19.2%	63.9%	0.6%
Lean red	7.1	18.2%	17.3%	64.2%	0.3%
Lean blue	7.6	13.5%	16.4%	69.6%	0.4%
Somewhat blue	6.5	19.5%	18.1%	62.4%	0.0%
Very blue	7.7	14.2%	15.8%	69.5%	0.5%

Q33. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	75.4%	23.9%	0.7%
Republicans	67.9%	31.8%	0.3%
Democrats	83.6%	15.3%	1.1%
Independents	71.2%	28.0%	0.8%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	71.8%	28.2%	0.0%
Somewhat red	75.2%	24.5%	0.3%
Lean red	73.7%	25.7%	0.6%
Lean blue	79.6%	19.0%	1.3%
Somewhat blue	71.1%	28.0%	0.9%
Very blue	80.4%	18.1%	1.5%

Q34. Some people think that someone with a non-violent drug offense should not have to disclose this information. Others think that they should have to disclose it for a limited number of years, or forever. Do you think after someone has completed their sentence for a nonviolent drug offense they:

1. Should not have to disclose it
2. Should have to disclose it for \_\_\_ years [please enter the number of years you favor]
3. Should have to disclose it forever

	Median (Years)	Should not have to disclose it	Should have to disclose it for ___ years	Should have to disclose it forever	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	3	38.3%	50.5%	10.3%	0.9%
Republicans	5	26.3%	57.1%	15.8%	0.8%
Democrats	0	49.8%	43.8%	5.2%	1.2%
Independents	3	35.0%	53.0%	11.5%	0.5%



Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	5	27.5%	57.7%	14.5%	0.3%
Somewhat red	2	43.7%	44.9%	11.1%	0.3%
Lean red	3	34.2%	56.1%	8.8%	0.9%
Lean blue	2	44.6%	43.7%	10.8%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	3	36.1%	55.6%	7.8%	0.4%
Very blue	2	42.5%	46.1%	8.4%	3.0%

## [Reinstate the Right to Vote for Felons]

Now let's look at the right to vote.

In nearly all states, people who have committed a felony lose their right to vote while they are in prison, and in some states, this can apply to those who have served time in prison for committing misdemeanors as well.

In some states people who are no longer in prison continue to be barred from voting:

- During their period of parole or probation
- For an extended period, such as five years for certain crimes
- Until they pay certain fees

In some states, for some crimes, people can permanently lose the right to vote. Currently, there are nearly 6 million citizens who are not in prison but do not have the right to vote.

Here is a proposal which would change this:

A person who completes their prison sentence would have their right to vote in federal elections immediately restored.

Here is an argument in favor of this proposal.

Q35. Taking the vote away from 6 million citizens is a violation of the values that this country was founded on. People who have served their prison sentence should not be treated like second-class citizens. Voting is the essence of being a citizen in a democracy; all citizens should have the right to make their voice heard. It is also positive for society for as many people as possible to participate in the civic process of voting. Voting helps reintegrate people into the community and is part of the process of making them responsible and engaged citizens.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	47.4%	30.2%	<b>77.6%</b>	11.1%	11.1%	<b>22.2%</b>	0.3%
Republicans	26.2%	38.6%	<b>64.8%</b>	15.9%	19.0%	<b>34.9%</b>	0.2%
Democrats	70.3%	21.2%	<b>91.5%</b>	5.0%	3.4%	<b>8.4%</b>	0.1%
Independents	36.0%	34.5%	<b>70.5%</b>	15.5%	13.4%	<b>28.9%</b>	0.7%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	47.4%	28.0%	<b>75.4%</b>	13.1%	11.2%	<b>24.3%</b>	0.3%
Somewhat red	41.1%	32.6%	<b>73.7%</b>	14.9%	10.7%	<b>25.6%</b>	0.7%
Lean red	49.9%	29.0%	<b>78.9%</b>	9.8%	11.1%	<b>20.9%</b>	0.2%
Lean blue	47.2%	30.7%	<b>77.9%</b>	7.9%	13.9%	<b>21.8%</b>	0.3%
Somewhat blue	42.4%	33.6%	<b>76.0%</b>	12.6%	11.4%	<b>24.0%</b>	0.0%
Very blue	58.8%	25.6%	<b>84.4%</b>	7.4%	8.2%	<b>15.6%</b>	0.0%

Here is an argument against this proposal:

Q36. Giving former prisoners the ability to vote again as soon as they leave prison is assuming that just because they served their sentence, they are now upstanding citizens who should be trusted with the responsibilities and privileges of voting. Most people who have committed crimes, after leaving prison, end up committing crimes again and going back to prison. These are not the kind of people who should be allowed to play a role in electing our leaders.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	14.8%	22.4%	<b>37.2%</b>	23.6%	38.5%	<b>62.1%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	24.6%	29.8%	<b>54.4%</b>	25.9%	19.0%	<b>44.9%</b>	0.7%
Democrats	5.7%	13.8%	<b>19.5%</b>	19.8%	60.3%	<b>80.1%</b>	0.4%
Independents	16.6%	27.9%	<b>44.5%</b>	28.0%	26.3%	<b>54.3%</b>	1.2%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	22.5%	27.2%	<b>49.7%</b>	20.1%	29.4%	<b>49.5%</b>	0.8%
Somewhat red	13.1%	22.0%	<b>35.1%</b>	23.3%	40.8%	<b>64.1%</b>	0.9%
Lean red	15.5%	24.9%	<b>40.4%</b>	21.3%	38.1%	<b>59.4%</b>	0.2%
Lean blue	13.5%	19.0%	<b>32.5%</b>	26.0%	41.5%	<b>67.5%</b>	0.0%
Somewhat blue	11.6%	24.0%	<b>35.6%</b>	30.0%	32.4%	<b>62.4%</b>	2.0%
Very blue	13.1%	17.4%	<b>30.5%</b>	21.7%	47.6%	<b>69.3%</b>	0.2%

Here is another pair of arguments in favor of and against this proposal:

Q37. There is plenty of evidence that, for the same crime, people with lower incomes and minorities get sent to prison much more readily than other people. This is unjust and contributes to people with lower incomes and minorities being under-represented in the voting population. It is contrary to the principle of democracy that all people should be represented.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	39.8%	28.9%	<b>68.7%</b>	18.2%	12.3%	<b>30.5%</b>	0.8%
Republicans	15.4%	31.6%	<b>47.0%</b>	28.7%	23.7%	<b>52.4%</b>	0.6%
Democrats	63.7%	24.1%	<b>87.8%</b>	8.5%	2.8%	<b>11.3%</b>	1.0%
Independents	32.1%	34.9%	<b>67.0%</b>	20.2%	12.1%	<b>32.3%</b>	0.7%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	34.7%	32.5%	<b>67.2%</b>	20.3%	12.1%	<b>32.4%</b>	0.4%
Somewhat red	37.4%	24.9%	<b>62.3%</b>	18.0%	19.3%	<b>37.3%</b>	0.3%
Lean red	43.7%	24.9%	<b>68.6%</b>	17.3%	13.1%	<b>30.4%</b>	1.0%
Lean blue	40.9%	29.0%	<b>69.9%</b>	17.9%	11.5%	<b>29.4%</b>	0.7%
Somewhat blue	36.0%	31.7%	<b>67.7%</b>	21.2%	10.1%	<b>31.3%</b>	1.0%
Very blue	48.4%	29.6%	<b>78.0%</b>	14.5%	6.1%	<b>20.6%</b>	1.4%

Q38. The Federal government should not get involved in telling states who they will let vote. The Founders spelled out in the Constitution that it is up to the states to decide how they want to conduct their elections, including federal elections, which means they should be able to decide who gets to vote in them.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	22.9%	27.0%	<b>49.9%</b>	20.6%	28.9%	<b>49.5%</b>	0.6%
Republicans	36.6%	32.4%	<b>69.0%</b>	18.5%	12.1%	<b>30.6%</b>	0.4%
Democrats	10.9%	21.0%	<b>31.9%</b>	20.8%	46.7%	<b>67.5%</b>	0.5%
Independents	23.8%	30.2%	<b>54.0%</b>	23.9%	20.5%	<b>44.4%</b>	1.5%

<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	26.7%	31.0%	<b>57.7%</b>	17.9%	23.7%	<b>41.6%</b>	0.7%
Somewhat red	28.0%	23.7%	<b>51.7%</b>	21.5%	26.9%	<b>48.4%</b>	0.0%
Lean red	20.9%	27.8%	<b>48.7%</b>	21.3%	29.3%	<b>50.6%</b>	0.8%
Lean blue	20.8%	27.5%	<b>48.3%</b>	20.8%	30.0%	<b>50.8%</b>	0.8%
Somewhat blue	17.9%	28.0%	<b>45.9%</b>	24.0%	29.1%	<b>53.1%</b>	1.0%
Very blue	21.6%	22.9%	<b>44.5%</b>	18.4%	36.3%	<b>54.7%</b>	0.8%

Q39. So, here again is the proposal:

A person who completes their prison sentence would have their right to vote in federal elections immediately restored.

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	6.6	25.9%	14.0%	59.8%	0.2%
Republicans	4.7	44.8%	17.2%	37.8%	0.2%
Democrats	8.3	9.5%	8.3%	82.0%	0.2%
Independents	6.2	27.3%	20.9%	51.5%	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	5.9	32.3%	10.6%	56.9%	0.1%
Somewhat red	6.3	27.3%	16.7%	56.0%	0.0%
Lean red	6.6	26.9%	12.1%	60.9%	0.2%
Lean blue	6.7	21.2%	18.4%	60.3%	0.1%
Somewhat blue	7.1	27.2%	13.0%	59.0%	0.9%
Very blue	7.0	20.9%	13.0%	66.1%	0.1%

Q40. So, finally, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
<b>National</b>	69.0%	30.7%	0.3%
Republicans	48.3%	51.4%	0.3%
Democrats	87.2%	12.6%	0.2%
Independents	67.3%	32.3%	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	64.6%	35.2%	0.2%
Somewhat red	67.2%	32.8%	0.0%
Lean red	67.1%	32.1%	0.8%
Lean blue	74.0%	25.8%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	66.9%	33.1%	0.0%
Very blue	74.5%	25.0%	0.5%

###