

TO: Interested Parties

FROM: Kellyanne Conway, President & CEO  
the polling company™, inc./WomanTrend

DATE: March 4, 2010

RE: Analysis of Findings: Targeted Congressional District Surveys

---

### ***Introduction & Methodology***

On behalf of **The Susan B. Anthony List**, the polling company™, inc./WomanTrend conducted surveys of 300 registered voters in 8 congressional districts across Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. The surveys were fielded March 1-3, 2010 and each survey was in the field for a minimum of two nights.

The surveys were conducted in the following districts:

- Ohio-01: Congressman Steve Driehaus
- Ohio-06: Congressman Charlie Wilson
- Ohio-09: Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur
- Ohio-16: Congressman John Boccieri
- Indiana-08: Congressman Brad Ellsworth
- Indiana-09: Congressman Baron Hill
- Pennsylvania-04: Congressman Jason Altmire
- Pennsylvania-11: Congressman Paul Kanjorski

Five of these congressional districts were won by Senator John McCain in November 2008 (OH-06, OH-16, IN-08, IN-09, PA-04) and three were carried by President Barack Obama (OH-01, OH-09, PA-11).

Surveys were run independently of each other and the data are not assessed in the aggregate. Interviews were collected using live callers at a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) facility. The sample was drawn using lists of registered voters in the eight congressional districts and included targeted sample to reach younger voters.

Each survey has a margin of error of  $\pm 5.65\%$  at the 95% confidence interval, meaning that in 19 out of 20 cases, the data would not differ by more than 5.65 percentage points in either direction if the same sampling method were employed.

## Key Findings

- **Healthcare Reform Now: What Should We Do?** Respondents were presented with four possible options as to what “next steps” should be for healthcare reform: pass current legislation with minor changes, pass with major changes, start from scratch, or stop working on the issue altogether. A fair number of voters gravitated toward each of the options and it is evident that voters are not saying “no” to healthcare reform, but that they are saying “no” to this version of healthcare reform.

**In six of the eight congressional districts surveyed, pluralities of voters preferred that Congress “start from scratch” on healthcare reform.** In the average congressional district studied, just 24% of respondents favored Congress passing “current legislation with minor changes,” but support for this approach ranged from 17% (in Indiana-08) to 32% (in Pennsylvania-11 and Ohio-16 alike).

- **Voters Reject Federal Funding of Abortion, Including When It is Part of Healthcare Reform:**
  - At least two-thirds of voters in each Congressional District opposed “using tax dollars to pay for abortions” and in all districts majorities “strongly opposed.” Furthermore, in three districts opposition reached 80% (Ohio-06, Ohio-16, and Indiana-08). Support never peaked higher than 25% in any of the eight districts studied.
  - **Objections to Federal Funding of Abortion Even More Pronounced In Terms of Healthcare Reform:** Majorities of voters in all congressional districts not only opposed, but **strongly rejected**, “taxpayer funding of abortion as part of healthcare reform.” Support averaged 20% in the eight districts, but ranged from 13% in Indiana-08 to 28% in Ohio-09.
  - At least three-in-five voters in these eight congressional districts agreed that “Abortion and abortion funding have no place in healthcare legislation.” Majorities **strongly** agreed in all but one of the districts (Pennsylvania-11). However, more than 70% of voters agreed in four of the districts surveyed (Ohio-06, Ohio-16, Indiana-08, and Indiana-09). Disagreement peaked at 35% in Pennsylvania’s 11<sup>th</sup> District, but was below 30% in more than one-half of the districts surveyed.
- Respondents were told that the version of healthcare reform that passed in November 2009 included an amendment with bipartisan support ***“that would prevent a new government-run healthcare program from paying for abortions”***. Then, respondents were presented with three options and asked what they would like their own Member to do: vote for the new bill even if it excludes this amendment; vote for the bill only if it contains such an amendment; or vote against the bill regardless of whether or not it has the amendment.

**Pluralities of voters in all districts wanted their Members of Congress to cast votes opposing the bill.** Among those who favored their Members supporting the bill, it was the case in most districts that voters preferred that their Members vote for a bill only if it contains an amendment preventing federal funding of abortion.

- **Voting for healthcare reform that includes federal funding of abortion will carry negative political currency in any of the eight districts surveyed.** In each district, voters were more apt to reject, rather than embrace, a candidate who “votes for healthcare legislation that includes federal government funding of abortion.” In fact, majorities of voters in seven of the eight districts said they would be less likely to support a candidate knowing he or she cast a vote for this type of legislation. And, in those same seven of eight districts, no more than 24% of voters in any district said they would be more likely to support a candidate knowing he or she supported this policy.
  - Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur of Ohio’s Ninth District was the only candidate for whom less than a majority of constituents would be less likely to support. Nonetheless, 47% still said they would be less likely to vote for her (vs. 33% more likely) if she backed taxpayer funding of abortion in healthcare legislation.
  - Opposition to a candidate with this “voting history” was highest in Indiana-08, 65% said they would be less likely to support Brad Ellsworth for reelection (vs. 20% more likely).

**Members of Congress who support healthcare reform are already in positions of weakness, but supporting healthcare reform that includes federal funding of abortion makes them more vulnerable.** Not only did a vote for abortion funding carry negative political currency in every single district, but to no more than 13% of voters any district was this “a non-issue.” In the question about what they want their Members to do (vote against the bill, for the bill with the amendment, or for the bill without the amendment), no more than 16% of voters in any district said “do not know” or “refused”. As is often the case on public policy matters, voters demur or punt when they feel under-informed or unable to make decisions on questions of the day. In this survey, voters adamantly chose one of the three

## *Spotlight on Independents*

- Pluralities of Independents in all districts believed that Congress should “start from scratch.” The highest percentage of Independents saying that Congress should “pass with minor change” was 25% (in both PA-04 and PA-11).
- In all Congressional Districts, majorities of self-identified Independents opposed both “using tax dollars to pay for abortions” and “taxpayer funding of abortions as part of healthcare reform.” In fact, at least 63% of Independents opposed the first idea in each district and at least 62% opposed with the second idea in each district.
- Majorities of self-identified Independents in every Congressional District agreed: *“Abortion and abortion funding have no place in healthcare legislation.”*
- **A Member of Congress who supports healthcare reform that includes federal funding of abortion faces an uphill battle among Independents. In all Congressional Districts, it was a net negative, meaning that the percentage of voters less likely to support the Member if he or she supports the bill outweighed the percentage of voters more likely to support. In fact, it reached as high as 73% in Ohio’s 6<sup>th</sup> District and 64% in Ohio’s 16<sup>th</sup> District.**

## *Lack of Evidence of a Gender Gap*

- **At least 67% of men and 65% of women in all districts opposed “using tax dollars to pay for abortions.”** Men and women differed by an average of 3.25 percentage points in their opposition across the districts, but by no more than seven points overall (84% of men opposed vs. 77% of women opposed in Indiana-08).
- **At least 65% of men and 66% of women opposed “taxpayer funding of abortions as part of healthcare reform” in every district.** Men’s and women’s opinions diverged by an average of 3.5 percentage points across the districts, but by no more than eight points overall (again, in Indiana-08, 86% of men opposed vs. 76% of women).
- **Majorities of men and women in every district agreed that “Abortion and abortion funding have no place in healthcare legislation.”** Agreement with this statement differed by an average of 4.25 percentage points within every district between men and women. More than 60% percent of both men and women agreed in seven of the eight districts and more than 70% of both men and women agreed in two of the districts.
- Both men and women in every district expressed that a vote for healthcare reform with abortion funding carries negative political currency. Men and women in every district were similarly less likely to support an incumbent if he or she supports the legislation.

## Analysis of Findings

<i>From what you have read, seen, or heard about President Obama's and Congressional Democrats' healthcare reform proposals, do you think that Congress should...(READ AND ROTATED TOP TO BOTTOM AND BOTTOM TO TOP)</i>								
<u>OH-01</u>	<u>OH-06</u>	<u>OH-09</u>	<u>OH-16</u>	<u>IN-08</u>	<u>IN-09</u>	<u>PA-04</u>	<u>PA-11</u>	
20%	22%	32%	22%	17%	18%	26%	32%	PASS CURRENT LEGISLATION WITH MINOR CHANGES
17%	14%	15%	12%	13%	16%	8%	15%	PASS CURRENT LEGISLATION WITH MAJOR CHANGES
28%	32%	22%	36%	32%	33%	35%	27%	START FROM SCRATCH
21%	19%	17%	18%	27%	24%	21%	14%	STOP WORKING ON HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION THIS YEAR
11%	14%	12%	10%	10%	9%	10%	12%	DO NOT KNOW/CANNOT JUDGE (VOLUNTEERED)
3%	*	1%	2%		*	1%	1%	REFUSED (VOLUNTEERED)

### Ohio-01

- “Start from scratch” was the preferred response for all age ranges and both genders. Majorities of both Republicans (70%) and Independents (55%) agreed that Congress should either “start from scratch” or “stop working on healthcare legislation this year.”
- Southeast Cincinnati respondents (32%) were most likely to support passing the current legislation with only minor changes, whereas in Hamilton County, 63% supported that Congress either “start from scratch” or “stop working on healthcare legislation this year.” These options were the majority in Butler County (62%) and South-Central Cincinnati (61%)
- Forty-two percent of pro-life Independents favored Congress going back to square one, and were joined by 38% of pro-life Republicans and 13% of pro-life Democrats.

### Ohio-06

- The plurality of men (34%), women (29%) and voters in all age cohorts preferred that Congress scrap its current legislation and start anew on healthcare. Similar sentiments were echoed among pluralities of self-identified Independents (38%) and Republicans (40%); the plurality of Democrats wanted the legislation to pass with only “minor changes” (40%).

- The plurality of pro-choice voters (39%) preferred that Congress pass it with only slight modifications, but still 13% wanted it passed with major revisions; 23% hoped Congress would start from scratch; and 13% preferred Congress put the issue aside until next year.

### **Ohio-09**

- Pluralities of men (33%), women (32%), and voters in all age groups and of all regions in the 9<sup>th</sup> District to move forward with current legislation with only slight changes to the bill.
- Sixty-one percent of self-identified Democrats favored passing the bill with minimal changes, compared to 21% of Independents and 8% of Republicans. Republicans were more inclined to prefer starting from scratch (40%) or stopping work altogether (30%). One-in-five Independents hoped there would be major overhaul to the bill while another one-quarter advocated hitting the reset button and 15% thought Congress should halt their efforts on healthcare for the year.

### **Ohio-16**

- Pluralities of men (42%) and women (30%) indicated that their preference would be for Congress to start from scratch on healthcare. An additional 17% of the former and 19% of the latter wanted Congress to put aside the issue for the year.
- Forty-eight percent of self-identified Democrats wanted Congress to push forward with the current legislation with minor changes and an additional 19% wanted Members to implement major changes to the current proposals. Twenty-three percent hoped Congress would start from scratch (13%) or stop altogether (13%).
- Among self-identified Independents and Republicans, the preference was to “start from scratch” (47% and 49%, respectively). Only 21% of Independents and 18% of Republicans believed that the current legislation (with minor or major changes) should be the basis for moving forward.

### **Indiana-08**

- Across all demographic groups the preference was for Congress to start from scratch on healthcare. In fact, 36% of men and 29% of women, as well as at least 29% of voters in each age cohort preferred that Congress take a fresh look at reform.
- While the plurality of self-identified Democrats (42%) wanted Congress to move forward with only slight changes, pluralities of self-identified Independents (35%) and Republicans (40%) alike demanded Congress begin anew.

### **Indiana-09**

- Respondents’ most favored approach was for Congress to start from scratch on healthcare (33%). A majority of men (55%) and plurality of women urged Congress to either start from scratch or stop working on healthcare legislation this year.
- Start from scratch was the most favored option for every age cohort, peaking at 37% for those in between the ages of 55-64.

- Support for the current proposal with only minor changes split along partisan lines, as 40% of self-identified Democrats believed that the legislation should pass with minor changes, a position shared by only 3% of Republicans and 17% of Independents. Thirty-five percent of Independents selected “start from scratch” as the appropriate course of action while an additional 21% wanted Congress to throw in the towel altogether for the year. Another 18% of Independents favored Congress passing the bill, but only after undergoing major changes.

#### **Pennsylvania-04**

- Pluralities of men (34%), women (36%), and voters of all age cohorts and regions of the district hoped that Congress would do away with the healthcare legislation it is currently considering and start fresh.
- Self-identified Democrats were notably more inclined than self-identified Independents or Republicans to favor Congress making only minor revisions to the current legislation (47% vs. 25% vs. 6%). Pluralities of Independents and Republicans, on the other hand, hoped Congress would just start from scratch (36% and 49%, respectively).
- Thirty-five percent of pro-choice voters and 22% of pro-life voters wanted Congress to proceed with only minor changes, meaning majorities hoped Congress would make major revisions, press the reset button, or take a recess altogether.

#### **Pennsylvania-11**

- Pluralities of men (30%) and women (34%) wanted Congress to pass legislation with slight modifications, but what is more telling was that forty-four percent of men and 38% of women combined wanted Congress to either start from scratch or stop working on healthcare altogether for the year.
- No more than 37% of any age cohort – in this case, 18-34 year olds – wanted Congress to proceed with making only a few changes.
- Whereas the plurality (45%) of self-identified Democrats were ready to move with only “minor changes”, pluralities of self-identified Republicans (47%) and self-identified Independents (39%) hoped Congress would “start from scratch” (compared to 16% of Democrats).

<i>Regardless of your personal position on abortion, do you (ROTATED) support or oppose using tax dollars to pay for abortions? (PROBED: And would that be STRONGLY or SOMEWHAT SUPPORT/OPPOSE?)</i>								
<b>OH-01</b>	<b>OH-06</b>	<b>OH-09</b>	<b>OH-16</b>	<b>IN-08</b>	<b>IN-09</b>	<b>PA-04</b>	<b>PA-11</b>	
<b>24%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>TOTAL SUPPORT (NET)</b>
12%	5%	10%	7%	5%	8%	6%	8%	STRONGLY SUPPORT
12%	12%	15%	8%	8%	9%	12%	14%	SOMEWHAT SUPPORT
<b>73%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>TOTAL OPPOSE (NET)</b>
11%	15%	15%	13%	11%	10%	15%	16%	SOMEWHAT OPPOSE
61%	65%	52%	67%	69%	67%	61%	55%	STRONGLY OPPOSE
3%	2%	7%	4%	5%	4%	3%	5%	DO NOT KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	REFUSED (VOLUNTEERED)

### **Ohio-01**

- Majorities of Whites (79%) and African Americans (54%) both opposed using tax dollars for abortions.
- Pro-life Republicans (90%) were **strongly opposed** to taxpayer-subsidized abortions and were joined by majorities of pro-life Independents (82%) and pro-life Democrats (54%).
- Democrats were 3 points more supportive of taxpayer funded abortions (49%-46%). Only 25% of Democrats **intensely supported** this position, while 79% of Republicans were **strongly opposed**.

### **Ohio-06**

- Statistically-similar percentages of men (80%) and women (79%) indicated their opposition to the use of tax dollars for abortions; majorities of both genders opposed strongly (68% of men and 63% of women).
- Opposition cut across age and regional lines, too, with majorities not only opposing, but all doing so strongly.
- Seventy-one percent of self-identified Democrats, 82% of Independents, and 88% of Republicans rejected the use of tax dollars to fund abortions and majorities intensely opposed it (54%, 73%, and 72%, respectively).
- Pro-life voters unsurprisingly rejected using tax dollars for abortions by a 92%-7% margin; pro-choice voters split 45% support vs. 48% oppose. However, intensity was negative among the pro-choice voters: 30% strongly opposed while 15% strongly supported.

### **Ohio-09**

- Majorities of men (67%), women (65%), and voters of all ages (excluding seniors) and political parties opposed using tax dollars to pay for abortions. Opposition was notably high among 18-34 year olds (76%).
- Self-identified Democrats rejected federal funding of abortion by a 51%-40% margin, while Independents were against it 63%-23% and Republicans were opposed by an 89%-10% margin.
- The majority of pro-life voters opposed doling out tax dollars to pay for abortions. Pro-choice voters supported doing so, but only by a slim 46%-39% margin.

### **Ohio-16**

- Not only did majorities of men, women, and voters of all ages and regions oppose using tax dollars to pay for abortions, but majorities strongly rejected it.
- Sixty-five percent of Democrats, 78% of Independents, and 92% of Republicans rejected using taxes for abortions; and the plurality of Democrats (49%) and majorities of Independents (67%) and Republicans (78%) did so strongly.
- Ninety-two percent of pro-life voters were joined by 52% of pro-choice voters in opposition (including 51% of pro-choice women and 60% of pro-choice men).

### **Indiana-08**

- By more than 6-to-1, voters in this district opposed using tax dollars to pay for abortions. Opposition outweighed support by 7-to-1 among men (84% vs. 12%) and by 5.5-to-1 among women (77% vs. 14%) and by at least 4-to-1 among all age cohorts.
- The issue was a losing one across all political self-

#### **SPOTLIGHT ON NATIONAL DATA**

##### **CNN – November 13-15, 2009**

*Generally speaking, are you in favor of using public funds for abortions when the woman cannot afford it, or are you opposed to that?*

37%	FAVOR
61%	OPPOSE
2%	INDIFFERENT
1%	NO OPINION

##### **Washington Post – November 12-15, 2009**

*Say someone buys private health insurance using government assistance to help pay for it. Do you think insurance sold that way should or should not be allowed to include coverage for abortions?*

35%	SHOULD
61%	SHOULD NOT
4%	NO OPINION

##### **New York Times/CBS News – November 13-16, 2009**

*If the federal government provides subsidies or credits to help people buy health insurance, do you think those insurance plans should or should not cover abortion procedures?*

##### **34% TOTAL FEEL THEY SHOULD (NET)**

22%	FEEL STRONGLY THAT THEY SHOULD
12%	FEEL SOMEWHAT THAT THEY SHOULD

##### **56% TOTAL FEEL THEY SHOULD NOT (NET)**

12%	FEEL SOMEWHAT THAT THEY SHOULD NOT
44%	FEEL STRONGLY THAT THEY SHOULD NOT
2%	DOESN'T MATTER
8%	DON'T KNOW

identifications: By a 40-point margin Democrats opposed using tax dollars for abortions (66% oppose vs. 26% support). Even larger margins emerged among Independents (79% oppose vs. 12% support) and Republicans (89% oppose vs. 3% support).

- Pro-life voters opposed subsidizing abortions with federal money 89%-7%, and were joined by pro-choice voters who also rejected it 54%-34%.

### **Indiana-09**

- Majorities across gender, age ranges, and party lines all opposed using tax dollars for abortions. In fact, majorities of men and women and voters of all ages strongly opposed.
- Both self-identified Republicans (88%) and Independents (68%) demonstrated high degrees of intensity by “strongly” opposing tax dollars for abortions and were joined by 43% of Democrats. Overall, a majority of Democrats opposed (59%).
- Ninety-two percent of pro-life voters and 47% of pro-choice voters opposed using tax dollars to pay for abortion. Unsurprisingly, intensity depended on self-identified views towards life. Although while 83% of pro-life respondents **strongly opposed** using tax dollars for abortion, only 29% of pro-choice respondents **strongly supported** using tax dollars for abortions. Pro-choice males (45%) were less willing to support using tax dollars for abortions than their pro-choice female counterparts (59%).

### **Pennsylvania-04**

- In Pennsylvania’s Fourth District, majorities of voters across the demographic and political spectra opposed using tax dollars for abortions. In fact, majorities of men, women, voters of all ages and regions, as well as 52% of self-identified Independents and 87% of self-identified Republicans, plus the plurality of self-identified Democrats (43%) strongly opposed funding abortions with tax dollars.
- Naturally, pro-life voters opposed federal funding of abortion by a margin of 92%-6%, and the majority of pro-choice voters also opposed, but by a smaller 52%-41%. Nonetheless, 34% strongly opposed while 16% strongly supported using tax dollars to fund abortions.

### **Pennsylvania-11**

- Not only did majorities of men, women, and voters of all ages and regions oppose “using tax dollars to pay for abortions”, but majorities of the aforementioned cohorts **strongly opposed**.
- Additionally, 69% of self-identified Democrats and Independents alike, as well as 76% of self-identified Republicans rejected using tax dollars to fund abortions. Intensity was strong: 49% of Democrats, 58% of Independents, and 63% of Republicans **strongly opposed**.

- “Pro-life” voters opposed the policy by an 84%-13% margin while pro-choice voters supported it 48%-46%. Pro-choice women were notably more opposed than their male counterparts (55% oppose vs. 38% support among women and 56% support vs. 38% oppose among men).

<i>Regardless of your personal position on abortion do you (ROTATED) support or oppose taxpayer funding of abortions as part of healthcare reform? (PROBED: And would that be STRONGLY or SOMEWHAT SUPPORT/OPPOSE?)</i>								
<b>OH-01</b>	<b>OH-06</b>	<b>OH-09</b>	<b>OH-16</b>	<b>IN-08</b>	<b>IN-09</b>	<b>PA-04</b>	<b>PA-11</b>	
<b>26%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>TOTAL SUPPORT (NET)</b>
13%	7%	10%	6%	6%	8%	6%	11%	STRONGLY SUPPORT
13%	10%	18%	9%	7%	11%	13%	13%	SOMEWHAT SUPPORT
<b>72%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>TOTAL OPPOSE (NET)</b>
10%	13%	14%	12%	10%	9%	11%	13%	SOMEWHAT OPPOSE
62%	66%	52%	67%	71%	66%	63%	55%	STRONGLY OPPOSE
2%	3%	5%	5%	5%	3%	4%	6%	DO NOT KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	REFUSED (VOLUNTEERED)

### **Ohio-01**

- Democrats supported incorporating taxpayer-funded abortion into healthcare reform by a slim 50%-47% spread. Otherwise, vast majorities of Independents (83%) and Republicans (89%) stood in opposition to these strictures.
- Pro-lifers in each cohort possessed a high degree of intensity in opposing funding abortion coverage, as 82% of pro-life women, 83% of pro-life men, 54% of pro life Democrats, 82% of pro-life Independents, and 94% of pro-life Republicans all **strongly opposed** this suggestion.
- Statistically-similar percentages of pro-choice voters strongly supported and strongly opposed taxpayer funding of abortions in healthcare reform (31% and 29%, respectively).

### **Ohio-06**

- Across gender, age, political, and regional lines voters in Ohio’s Sixth Congressional District opposed including taxpayer funding of abortion in healthcare reform. Notably, majorities of respondents in all demographic and political groups **strongly opposed** the inclusion, including 66% of men and women alike.

- Pro-life voters opposed taxpayer funding of abortion as a part of healthcare reform by a 92%-6% margin while pro-choice respondents backed it by a 49%-42% margin. The “strongest opponents” outweighed the “strongest supporters” among pro-choice voters (31% strongly oppose vs. 21% strongly support).
- Even 62% of voters who said they favor passing the bill with only minor changes endorsed taxpayer funding of abortion in the legislation. Also expressing opposition were 80% who preferred major changes to the bill, 84% who wanted Congress to “start over”, and 89% who wished Congress would drop the issue for the year.

### **Ohio-09**

- Seniors comprised the sole demographic group of which less than a majority of respondents opposed, as 65% of men, 66% of women, and at least 57% of voters in other age cohorts rejected taxpayer funding of abortion as part of healthcare reform.
- Majorities of self-identified Independents (62%) and Republicans (88%), as well as one-half of Democrats (50%) rejected taxpayer funding of abortion as a part of healthcare reform. In fact, majorities of Independents (52%) and Republicans (74%) strongly disliked including abortion funding in the legislation.
- Eleven points divided the pro-choice voters: 50% favored the inclusion of funding for abortions in reform, 39% opposed it.

### **Ohio-16**

- Not only did majorities of men, women, and voters of all ages, regions, and political stripes oppose the inclusion of taxpayer funding of abortions as part of healthcare reform, but majorities did so strongly. Fifty-one percent of self-identified Democrats, 69% of Independents, and 79% of Republicans **intensely opposed** financial support for abortions within healthcare reform.
- The majority of pro-choice voters (59%) joined the majority of pro-life voters (92%) in opposition.

### **Indiana-08**

- When framed in terms of healthcare reform, majorities of men, women, and voters of all ages and political parties opposed taxpayer funding of abortions. In fact, support peaked at 18% (among seniors) across gender and age cohorts and at 24% (among Democrats) across the political spectrum.
- A slim majority of self-identified Democrats (51%) and hefty majorities of self-identified Independents (74%) and Republicans (79%) **strongly rejected** including taxpayer funding of abortions in healthcare reform.
- Eighty-nine percent of pro-life voters were against including taxpayer funding of abortions in reform and were joined by 57% of pro-choice voters (including 47% of pro-choice women and 69% of pro-choice men).

### **Indiana-09**

- Healthy majorities of each gender, age range, and party affiliation opposed taxpayer funding for abortions as part of healthcare reform. Notable peaks occurred amongst 18-34 year olds, where 83% opposed, and females, 76% of whom are likewise opposed.
- Ninety-two percent of pro-life Republicans were **strongly opposed** to taxpayer-funded abortions within the healthcare bill, in contrast to 29% of pro-choice respondents who strongly supported including abortion funding in the healthcare legislation.
- Majorities of self-identified Democrats (57%), Independents (71%), and Republicans (93%) opposed taxpayer-funded abortions as part of healthcare reform. Also noteworthy is that 80% of pro-life Democrats opposed taxpayer-funded abortions.

### **Pennsylvania-04**

- Not only did majorities of voters across the demographic spectrum oppose taxpayer funding of abortion in healthcare reform, but so too did majorities of self-identified Democrats (62%), Independents (70%), and Republicans (85%). In fact, exactly one-half of Democrats, 55% of Independents, and 77% of Republicans **strongly opposed** including provisions for federal funding of abortion in healthcare reform.
- Pro-choice voters joined pro-lifers in opposing this funding by a 52%-40% margin. Pro-choice men were more opposed than pro-choice women (60%-31% vs. 48%-45%). Still, statistically-similar pluralities of pro-choice women (37%) and pro-choice men (37%) intensely rejected adding provisions for abortion funding in healthcare reform.

### **Pennsylvania-11**

- Sixty-eight percent of men and women alike, as well as at least 63% of voters in all age cohorts, 59% in all regions, 66% of self-identified Democrats, 69% of self-identified Independents, and 71% of self-identified Republicans opposed “taxpayer funding of abortions as part of healthcare reform.” Majorities of all demographic cohorts, self-identified Independents and Republicans, as well as 49% of self-identified Democrats indicated that they strongly opposed.
- Eighty-three percent of pro-lifers (majority) and 49% of pro-choicers (plurality) rejected the inclusion of taxpayer funding of abortion in healthcare reform.
- One-half of voters who want “minor changes to the legislation”, 70% who want “major changes”, 79% who want Congress to start from scratch, and 90% who want Congress to stop working on healthcare altogether opposed taxpayer funding of abortion.

<i>In November 2009 the U.S. House of Representatives passed healthcare reform with an amendment that would prevent a new government-run healthcare program from paying for abortions. This amendment had bipartisan support from (ROTATED) Democrats and Republicans. When the House of Representatives votes on the next version of healthcare reform, do you think that your Member of Congress should (READ AND ROTATED TOP TO BOTTOM AND BOTTOM TO TOP)</i>								
<b>OH-01</b>	<b>OH-06</b>	<b>OH-09</b>	<b>OH-16</b>	<b>IN-08</b>	<b>IN-09</b>	<b>PA-04</b>	<b>PA-11</b>	
22%	15%	26%	14%	12%	14%	19%	27%	VOTE FOR THE BILL EVEN IF IT ALLOWS FOR FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION
24%	28%	28%	28%	29%	29%	23%	24%	VOTE FOR THE BILL ONLY IF IT HAS THE AMENDMENT PREVENTING FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION
38%	48%	37%	45%	51%	44%	47%	38%	VOTE AGAINST THE BILL REGARDLESS OF WHETHER IT HAS THE AMENDMENT PREVENTING FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION
11%	7%	8%	9%	5%	10%	7%	10%	DO NOT KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
5%	5%	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%	1%	REFUSED (VOLUNTEERED)

**Ohio-01**

- Pluralities of both genders (males 42%, females 35%) recommended their representative vote against the bill regardless of whether or not it has the amendment preventing federal funding of abortion.
- Only Democrats (43%) were more inclined to vote for the bill irrespective of any amendments preventing abortion funding. Fifty-seven percent of Independents and 71% of Republicans implored their elected official to either vote for the bill ONLY if it has a provision preventing government funded abortions or to simply vote against the bill.

**Ohio-06**

- Pluralities of men (49%) and women (46%) as well as majorities of voters at the bookends of the age spectrum and pluralities in the middle age cohorts encouraged their Members of Congress to vote against the bill regardless of whether it does or does not provide funding for abortion.
- A plurality of self-identified Democrats (35%) as well as majorities of Independents (51%) and Republicans (60%) preferred their Members not vote for the bill. However, among those Independents and Republicans who favored their Member vote for it, 26% of the former and 30% of the latter qualified their desires with demands for provisions preventing the funding of abortion. Just 12% of Independents and 7% of Republicans wanted their Member to support the bill even if it allowed for federal funding of abortion.

### **Ohio-09**

- Pluralities of men (40%) and women (34%) encouraged their Member of Congress to vote against the bill. Joining them were pluralities of voters aged 18-34 and 35-54 (41% and 39%, respectively), and self-identified Independents (40%), as well as the majority of self-identified Republicans (60%).
- Overall, voters split evenly between voting for the bill with the amendment and voting for it without the amendment. This trend was evident among men and women, self-identified Independents, and pro-life voters.

### **Ohio-16**

- Pluralities of men (47%) and women (42%) preferred that their Member of Congress vote against the bill, regardless of the presence or absence of a stipulation on federal funding of abortion. Among those who wanted their Member to vote for it, men and women were each more likely to favor a vote for legislation containing a provision preventing the federal funding abortion than to favor a vote without the provision (24% 15% among men and 32%-14% among women).
- Self-identified Democrats split fairly evenly: 30% wanted their Member to vote for it even without the provision; 31% wanted their Member to support it if only the provision were included; and 27% wanted their Member to vote against it regardless of the stipulations on federal funding of abortion.
- Only 10% of pro-life Democrats in the district wanted their Member to proceed supporting the bill without the provision preventing federal funding of abortions. Instead, 40% told their Member to vote for it, but only if there were no federal funding of abortions. Another 38% of pro-life Democrats said to “vote no” on the bill.

### **Indiana-08**

- Not only did the majority of men (52%) and one-half of women (50%) indicate that they would like to see their Member of Congress vote against the bill, but among both genders, percentages favoring a “yes” vote for the bill with the amendment preventing federal funding of abortion outweighed the percentages favoring a “yes” vote without the amendment by at least 2-to-1.
- The plurality of self-identified Democrats (42%) said that their Member of Congress should vote for the bill only if it has the amendment to prevent federal funding of abortion. An additional 27% said their Member should support it even if it lacks the amendment while 23% felt their Member should vote against it no matter what.
- Among self-identified Independents, the desire was strongest to vote against the bill (58%). By 3-to-1, voters preferred a “yes” vote with the amendment than a “yes” vote without it (24% vs. 8%).
- Pro-choice voters split evenly: 31%-31%-31% among the three options.

### Indiana-09

- Fifty-one percent of men, but only 37% of women, preferred that their Member of Congress vote against the bill regardless of whether or not it contained federal funding of abortion. Statistically-similar percentages of men and women said that their Member should vote for the bill even if it contains federal funding of abortion (13% and 14%, respectively). However, men were 15 points more likely than women to declare that their Member should vote for the bill only if it prevents the federal government from spending money on abortions.
- Forty-two percent of those who would pass the healthcare legislation with major changes recommended voting for the bill only if it has the amendment prevent federal funding of abortion. Predictably, 77% of those who want Congress to stop working on healthcare this year advised voting against the bill regardless of whether it has the amendment preventing funding or not.
- The majority of voters in the Northeast region of the district (52%) as well as pluralities in the Northwest (32%), Central (47%), and Southwest (47%) areas of the district said that they want their Member to vote against the reform regardless of whether or not it disallows the federal funding of abortion.

### Pennsylvania-04

- One-half of men and 45% of women preferred that their Member of Congress vote against the bill, with or without language preventing federal funding of abortion.
- Self-identified Democrats split evenly between voting against the bill altogether and voting for the bill even if it lacked the language preventing the federal funding of abortion (32% and 31%, respectively). Twenty-six percent of Democrats wanted their Member to support the bill only if it disallowed funding of abortion.
- The plurality of Independents (39%) wanted their Member to vote against the bill while an additional 20% wanted their Member to vote for it, but only with the language preventing financial support for abortions. Thirty percent hoped their Member would support it without the language.
- Two-thirds of Republicans said to vote against the bill while another 22% said to vote for it with the provisions preventing the funding of abortions. Just 4% wanted their Member to vote for it without the provisions.

### Pennsylvania-11

- Pluralities of men (42%), women (35%), and voters in all age cohorts felt that their Member of Congress should cast a vote against healthcare reform **regardless of the presence or absence of funding for abortion.**
- Among self-identified Democrats, 33% favored their Member voting for the bill, even if allowed for federal funding of abortion; 26% wanted their Member to support the bill, but only if it prevented federal funding of abortion; and 31% preferred the Member oppose it with or without the provisions for funding abortion.

- A narrow majority of pro-choice voters (53%) wanted their Member to vote for the bill, even if it included the provision for abortion funding. Twenty-three percent of remaining pro-choicers wanted their Member to reject the bill while 16% wanted them to vote for it with the provision preventing abortion funding.

<i>Please tell me whether you (ROTATED) agree or disagree with the following statement: “Abortion and abortion funding have no place in healthcare legislation.” (PROBED: And would that be STRONGLY or SOMEWHAT AGREE/DISAGREE?)</i>								
<b>OH-01</b>	<b>OH-06</b>	<b>OH-09</b>	<b>OH-16</b>	<b>IN-08</b>	<b>IN-09</b>	<b>PA-04</b>	<b>PA-11</b>	
<b>64%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>TOTAL AGREE (NET)</b>
52%	61%	45%	60%	60%	61%	54%	46%	STRONGLY AGREE
12%	13%	16%	11%	12%	11%	10%	16%	SOMEWHAT AGREE
<b>33%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>TOTAL DISAGREE (NET)</b>
14%	13%	16%	9%	10%	11%	16%	16%	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE
19%	13%	16%	14%	13%	12%	14%	19%	STRONGLY DISAGREE
2%	2%	4%	4%	3%	2%	4%	2%	DO NOT KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
2%	*	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%	REFUSED (VOLUNTEERED)

### **Ohio-01**

- All age ranges agreed that healthcare should not include abortion coverage, with peaks within the 55-64 bracket (54%) and 65+ range (68%).
- Fifty-six percent of pro-choice respondents felt that funding abortions could be appropriate for healthcare reform, in contrast to 69% of pro-lifers **strongly agreed** that abortion coverage is outside the realm of healthcare reform.
- African-Americans were narrowly split: 49% agreed while 48% disagreed. Whites evidenced more solid agreement (70%-28%).

### **Ohio-06**

- Agreement outpaced disagreement by a margin of more than 3-to-1 among the entire population surveyed in Ohio’s Sixth Congressional District, and the same was true among men (79%-20%), 35-54 year olds (80%-20%), seniors (82%-12%), Independents (77%-21%), Republicans (84%-13%), and pro-life voters (84%-14%). By margins of more than 2-to-1 agreement was larger than disagreement among women (71%-26%) and 18-34 year olds (69%-29%).

- Sixty-four percent of self-identified Democrats agreed while 34% disagreed. Self-identified Democrats were three times more likely to “strongly agree” than “strongly disagree” (47% vs. 15%).
- Among voters who favored passing the bill with slight changes, 58% agreed while 42% disagreed.

### **Ohio-09**

- Majorities of men (58%), women (64%), and voters of all ages and regions of the districts agreed that abortion and abortion funding have no place in healthcare.
- Agreement outpaced disagreement among Independents (57%-38%) and Republicans (83%-16%) while parity was achieved among Democrats (47%-46%). Intensity was matched evenly among Democrats (24% strongly agree vs. 25% somewhat agree).
- Whereas pro-life voters overwhelmingly affirmed the statement (79%-18%), pro-choice voters were less outspoken. Though a majority of pro-choice voters disagreed (55%), nearly two-in-five (39%) agreed. Pro-life Democrats were notably opposed (67%-27%).

### **Ohio-16**

- Cohesiveness of opinion emerged across gender, age, regional, and political party lines, as majorities of voters believed that abortion and abortion funding should have no role in healthcare reform. In fact, 60% of self-identified Democrats, 69% of Independents, and 83% of Republicans agreed.
- Agreement was stronger among pro-life voters than among pro-choice voters, but the overwhelming agreement among pro-life voters was not witnessed in the reverse among the pro-choice crowd. Whereas 86% of pro-life respondents agreed and just 10% disagreed, 46% of pro-choice voters empathized with the argument and 51% distanced themselves from it.

### **Indiana-08**

- By more than 3-to-1, voters agreed that abortion and abortion policy have no place in healthcare legislation. In fact, a 3.5-to-1 margin emerged among men (75% agree vs. 20% disagree) and 2.65-to-1 among women (69% agree vs. 26%). Intensity favored agreement among both men and women, as majorities of both sexes strongly backed the statement (65% and 56%, respectively).
- Fifty-seven percent of self-identified Democrats agreed (vs. 39% disagreed), as did 73% of Independents (vs. 20% disagreed) and 83% of Republicans (vs. 15% disagreed).
- Pro-choice voters were nearly evenly divided: 44% felt there is a place for abortion and funding of abortion in healthcare policy while 46% felt they did not belong in this issue. Intensity was also evenly matched: 26% strongly agreed while 25% strongly disagreed.

### **Indiana-09**

- Respondents demonstrated tripartisan agreement on this question, as 52% of Democrats, 70% of Independents, and 89% of Republicans agreed that abortion and abortion funding have no place in healthcare legislation. Even pro-choice respondents were nearly split, as 47% agreed and 53% disagreed.
- Those who said that Congress should start over with health care legislation and those who hoped Congress will stop working on healthcare legislation both strongly agreed that abortion funding has no place in health care legislation (69% and 83%, respectively).
- Eighty-seven percent of those against the bill (regardless of whether it has the amendment preventing federal funding of abortion) agreed that abortion has no place in healthcare legislation, and 80% of that cohort strongly agreed. Among those who said they would vote for the bill without a specific amendment to prevent federally-funded abortions, 63% strongly disagreed that abortion funding has no place in healthcare legislation.

### **Pennsylvania-04**

- Agreement outpaced disagreement by at least 2-to-1 among men, women, and voters in all age cohorts excluding 55-64. The majority of 55-64 year olds agreed (53%), but still 45% disagreed.
- Similarly, the argument was upheld among Democrats by a 50%-42% margin; among Independents by a 64%-34% margin; and among Republicans by a 78%-19% spread.
- Pro-life voters agreed by nearly 4-to-1 (77% vs. 20%) while 46% of pro-choice voters agreed and 47% disagreed.
- One-in-five voters who earlier said that Congress should pass the bill even if it lacks provisions preventing abortion funding agreed with the statement that abortion and its funding have no place in healthcare legislation.

### **Pennsylvania-11**

- Majorities of men, women, and voters of all ages, political parties, and regions of the 11<sup>th</sup> Congressional District agreed with the statement that healthcare legislation should exclude abortion and abortion funding. Men (51%), Self-identified Republicans (59%) and Independents (56%), and pro-life voters (56%), as well as pluralities of women, voters in all age cohorts, and self-identified Democrats **strongly agreed with the sentiment.**

<i>Would you be (ROTATED) more likely or less likely to vote to re-elect Congressman/Congresswoman _____ this year if (s)he votes for healthcare legislation that includes federal government funding of abortion? (PROBED: And would that be MUCH or SOMEWHAT MORE/LESS LIKELY?)</i>				
<b><u>OH-01</u></b>	<b><u>OH-06</u></b>	<b><u>OH-09</u></b>	<b><u>OH-16</u></b>	
Congressman Steve Driehaus	Congressman Charlie Wilson	Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur	Congressman John Boccieri	
<b>-32</b>	<b>-46</b>	<b>-14</b>	<b>-48</b>	<b>NET (MORE LIKELY-LESS LIKELY)</b>
<b>23%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>TOTAL MORE LIKELY (NET)</b>
10%	9%	21%	7%	MUCH MORE LIKELY
13%	9%	12%	7%	SOMEWHAT MORE LIKELY
<b>55%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>TOTAL LESS LIKELY (NET)</b>
10%	13%	9%	12%	SOMEWHAT LESS LIKELY
45%	51%	38%	50%	MUCH LESS LIKELY
12%	12%	13%	13%	MAKES NO DIFFERENCE (VOLUNTEERED)
6%	6%	6%	8%	DO NOT KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
4%	1%	1%	4%	REFUSED (VOLUNTEERED)

<b><u>IN-08</u></b>	<b><u>IN-09</u></b>	<b><u>PA-04</u></b>	<b><u>PA-11</u></b>	
Congressman Brad Ellsworth	Congressman Baron Hill	Congressman Jason Altmire	Congressman Paul Kanjorski	
<b>-49</b>	<b>-41</b>	<b>-37</b>	<b>-29</b>	<b>NET (MORE LIKELY-LESS LIKELY)</b>
<b>16%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>TOTAL MORE LIKELY (NET)</b>
12%	10%	8%	11%	MUCH MORE LIKELY
4%	10%	13%	13%	SOMEWHAT MORE LIKELY
<b>65%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>TOTAL LESS LIKELY (NET)</b>
12%	10%	12%	14%	SOMEWHAT LESS LIKELY
53%	51%	46%	39%	MUCH LESS LIKELY
10%	12%	12%	12%	MAKES NO DIFFERENCE (VOLUNTEERED)
6%	5%	7%	9%	DO NOT KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)

3%	2%	3%	1%	REFUSED (VOLUNTEERED)
----	----	----	----	-----------------------

**Ohio-01: Steve Driehaus:** By a margin of more than 2-to-1, voters said that they would be less likely, rather than more likely, to support Congressman Steve Driehaus for reelection if he supports healthcare reform that includes federal funding of abortion. The plurality (45%) of respondents indicated that they would be much less likely to back Driehaus, four-and-a-half times the 10% who said they would be much more likely to support him.

- A substantial margin of Independents (65%-13%) were less likely to re-elected Driehaus if he casts a vote for government-funded abortion, joined by 78% of Republicans and majorities of both genders (males 56%, females 53%).
- Among those believing abortion funding has no place in health care, 63% were **MUCH** less likely to vote for Driehaus' re-election under these circumstances.
- Respondents in each region shared the sentiment that voting for abortion damages Driehaus' re-election chances, with majorities in Butler County (69%), Hamilton County (63%), North Cincinnati (54%), South-Central Cincinnati (66%), and a plurality in South-East Cincinnati (37%).

**Ohio-06: Charlie Wilson:** By a margin of 3 ½-to-1, voters in Ohio's Sixth Congressional District reported that they would be less likely to support Charlie Wilson for reelection if he supports legislation that includes federal government funding of abortion.

- A vote for legislation that funds abortions carries negative political currency for Congressman Charlie Wilson among men (71%), women (57%), all age cohorts – especially seniors (70%) – and all regions of the district.
- Self-identified Independents were six times more likely to say that they would be disinclined, rather than encouraged, to support a candidate who supported healthcare legislation that funded abortion (73% less likely vs. 12% more likely). Republicans were eight times more likely to say that they would be discouraged rather than encouraged (80% less likely vs. 10% more likely).
- The vote also carried negative weight among self-identified Democrats, among whom 44% said they would less likely to support a candidate who favored the bill while 29% said they would be more likely to do so.

**Ohio-09: Marcy Kaptur:** Though the only Member of Congress tested for whom the “less likely” was below 50%, the percentage of voters disinclined to support Kaptur outpaced the percentage of voters encouraged to do so (47% less likely vs. 33% more likely). **In fact, 38% of voters indicated that they would be much less likely to support Kaptur knowing that she supported healthcare legislation which included federal funding of abortion. This intensity outweighed the combined percentages of voters “somewhat” or “much” more likely to support her (33%).**

- No gender gap emerged, as 48% of men and 46% of women said they would be less likely to support Kaptur for reelection (compared to 33% of men and 33% of women more likely).
- Voters aged 18-34, 35-54, and 55-64 were more likely than their older counterparts to note that Kaptur’s support for the legislation would impact them negatively (53% of 18-34, 49% of 35-54, and 49% of 55-64 vs. 32% of 65+ “less likely”).
- The plurality of self-identified Independents (48%) and majority of Republicans (80%) said they would be disinclined to support Kaptur if she voted for the bill. The majority of Democrats (57%) said casting a vote for a bill with federal funding of abortion would make them more supportive of her.

**Ohio-16: John Bocchieri:** By more than 4-to-1, voters in the 16<sup>th</sup> District of Ohio indicated that they would be less, rather than more, likely to support Congressman John Bocchieri for reelection if he supports healthcare reform that includes federal funding for abortion.

- Congressman Bocchieri will face an uphill battle across multiple demographic cohorts if he backs legislation containing federal funding for abortion: majorities of men (58%), women (65%), and voters in all age cohorts and regions of the district said they would be less inclined to back Bocchieri if he supported the bill.
- Even among his party faithful would Bocchieri encounter difficulties. Forty-three percent of Democrats indicated they would be less inclined to support Bocchieri if he favors the bill (while 30% said they would be more apt to back him). Among Independents, the issue is certainly a losing one: 64% less likely vs. 10% more likely. And, among Republicans, the margin was an astounding 77% less likely vs. 6% more likely.
- Forty-one percent of pro-choice voters said they would be disinclined to support Bocchieri, and 30% more likely to do so, if he supports the bill.

**Indiana-08: Brad Ellsworth:** Voters in Indiana’s Eighth District indicated that by a margin of 65%-16% they would be less likely to support Congressman Brad Ellsworth for reelection if he voted for taxpayer funding of abortion in healthcare reform. Intensity was negative, as a majority (53%) of voters said they would be much less likely to support Ellsworth if he supported this legislation.

- Across all demographic cohorts – men, women, and voters of all ages and regions – would Congressman Ellsworth be punished for casting this vote.
- Ellsworth’s party faithful were divided. Thirty-eight percent of self-identified Democrats said they would be more likely to back Ellsworth if he supported this legislation while 39% said they would be less likely to do so. Among self-identified Independents, the margin was a larger – and perhaps insurmountable – 70% less likely vs. 14% more likely.

**Indiana-09: Baron Hill:** By a margin of 3-to-1, voters in Indiana’s Ninth Congressional District said they would be less likely to vote to reelect Baron Hill in November if he supports legislation that contains federal funding of abortion (20% more likely vs. 61% less likely). In fact, a majority (51%) of respondents said they would be much less likely to support him, five times the 10% of voters who said they would be much more likely to back him.

- Across a broad spectrum of ages, gender, and political affiliation, respondents agreed that they would be less likely to re-elect Baron Hill if he votes for healthcare legislation that includes federal funding of abortions. In fact, 50% of men and 52% of women indicated that they would be **much less likely** to reelect Hill if he supported this type of legislation.
- Even Democrats were less likely to vote for Hill by a 43-41% split. Fifty-three percent of Independents would be less likely to vote for Hill’s re-election under these circumstances (and just 21% more likely).
- Among respondents who opposed using tax dollars for abortion, 75% were less likely to vote for Hill if he voted for healthcare legislation providing for government-funded abortions, while 65% were **much** less likely to vote for him.
- Majorities of respondents in the Northeast, Central, and Southwest regions were less likely to re-elect Congressman Hill if he votes for healthcare legislation that includes abortion funding, with a plurality of respondents (49%) in the Northwest similarly aligning. Sixty-one percent of Northeast region residents were **much** less likely to vote for him in this scenario.

**Pennsylvania-04: Jason Altmire:** For the two-term Congressman, a vote for healthcare legislation within funding for abortion is not a good way to shore up support for reelection. Fifty-eight percent of voters in Altmire’s district said they would be less likely to vote for a candidate who supported healthcare legislation with funding for abortion; just 21% said they would be more apt to back him.

- Altmire would suffer among majorities of men (55%), women (60%), and majorities of voters in all age cohorts excluding 55-64 year olds. Though just 45% of voters aged 55-64 indicated they would be less likely to support Altmire, a smaller 25% indicated that they position carried positive weight.
- Even among Democrats could Altmire face consequences come November. Forty-four percent of Democrats said they would be less likely to vote for him if he backed federal funding of abortion; thirty-four percent said they would be more supportive of him. Among the always up-for-grabs Independents, 50% said they would be less likely to back Altmire and 27% more likely to do so if he votes for the legislation.

**Pennsylvania-11: Paul Kanjorski:** By a margin of more than 2-to-1, voters indicated that they would be less, rather than more, likely to back Paul Kanjorski for reelection if he casts a vote for healthcare legislation containing federal government funding of abortion. In fact, the percentage of voters indicating that they would be “much less likely” to support Kanjorski outweighed the percentage indicating that they would be “much more likely” to support him by an eye-popping margin of 3.5-to-1 (39% vs. 11%).

- The majority of men (53%) and women (54%) as well as majorities in all age cohorts indicated that Kanjorski’s vote for healthcare reform with abortion funding would make them less inclined to back him in November.
- Not only did majorities of Republicans (70%) and Independents (58%) indicate that they would be less inclined to support Kanjorski, but so too did the plurality of Democrats (43%). In fact, 30% of self-identified Democrats said they would be much less likely to support Kanjorski while just 15% said they would be much more likely to do so.