

William Cromer Associates  
136 11th Street, S.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20003

REGION \_\_\_\_\_

Contact: William Cromer  
202-544-0284

Pennsylvania  
March, 1993

Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Length of Interview: \_\_\_\_\_  
(be accurate to the minute)

Phone # \_\_\_\_\_

Sex of           1. Male   Name of Respondent: \_\_\_\_\_  
Respondent:   2. Female

---

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_, and I'm from The Cromer Group, a national research firm. We're conducting a public opinion survey and I'd like to talk to the youngest man, age 18 or older, who is at home right now. (IF NO MALE, ASK TO SPEAK TO THE YOUNGEST WOMAN, AGE 18 OR OLDER WHO IS AT HOME. WHEN RESPONDENT IS SELECTED:) We're not selling anything and I won't ask you for a contribution or donation.

---

1. First, are you registered to vote at this address?

1. Yes/100%           Go to Q2

2. No                We need to talk to people who are  
3. Don't Know       registered voters. Does anyone in  
                      your household qualify? (IF NEW  
                      PERSON, RETURN TO INTRO. IF NO  
                      VOTER, TERMINATE.)

2. In what county do you reside?

REGION I/16%

01 Philadelphia

REGION II/18%

(SE Suburban)

02 Bucks

03 Chester

04 Delaware

05 Montgomery

REGION III/14%

(Northeast)

06 Berks

07 Carbon

08 Lackawanna

09 Lehigh

10 Luzerne

11 Monroe

12 Northampton

13 Pike

14 Schuylkill

15 Susquehanna

16 Wayne

17 Wycoming

REGION VII/13%

67 Allegheny

REGION IV/17%

(Central)

18 Adams

19 Bedford

20 Blair

21 Bradford

22 Centre

23 Clinton

24 Columbia

25 Cumberland

26 Dauphin

27 Franklin

28 Fulton

29 Huntingdon

30 Juniata

31 Lancaster

32 Lebanon

33 Lycoming

34 Mifflin

35 Montour

36 Northumberland

37 Perry

38 Potter

39 Snyder

40 Sullivan

41 Tioga

42 Union

43 York

REGION V/7%

(Northwest)

44 Armstrong

45 Cameron

46 Clarion

47 Clearfield

48 Crawford

49 Elk

50 Erie

51 Forest

52 Jefferson

53 McKean

54 Mercer

55 Venango

56 Warren

REGION VI/14%

(Southwest)

57 Beaver

58 Butler

59 Cambria

60 Fayette

61 Greene

62 Indiana

63 Lawrence

64 Somerset

65 Washington

66 Westmoreland

3. There's been more talk lately about changing the way we elect our judges to the top state courts -- the State Supreme Court, Superior Court, the Commonwealth Court. Here are two statements that others have made about the method to selecting the state's top judges. Tell me which of these two comes closer to your point of view.

25% We should stop choosing our top judges by public elections and establish a panel of knowledgeable people who will recommend qualified individuals to be chosen by the Governor and with the backing of the State Senate. This is the only way to remove politics from choosing our judges and ensure we have qualified people sitting on our State's top courts.

OR

66% Popular elections are the very heart of our system of government. To stop electing our judges would mean that one branch of government -- the courts -- would lack public accountability. If appointed, judges would be more accountable to the other two branches -- the Governor and the Legislature -- than to the people. Political campaigns are not necessarily bad; in fact, they're good. They make these judges get out among all the people. We should keep electing our state's top judges.

4% A little of both (Vol.)  
3% Neither (Vol.)  
2% Can't Say

4. All the judges in the top three courts of the state must face the voters, they must campaign for office and they must win a majority of your votes to serve on the bench. This right to vote for the State's judges was written into the State Constitution back in 1850. How important is it to you to keep this right to elect our judges? Is it extremely important, very important, only somewhat important, not so important, or not important at all?
  1. Extremely Important/35%
  2. Very important/36%
  3. Only somewhat important/16%
  4. Not so important/7%
  5. Not important at all/5%
  6. Can't Say/0%
5. In Pennsylvania we have three separate statewide courts. One is the State Supreme Court, one is called the State Superior Court, and the other is the Commonwealth Court. First of all, can you recall having voted for a judge who ran for a seat on any of these three courts -- State Supreme Court, State Superior Court or the Commonwealth Court -- in the last five years or so, or not?
  1. Yes/49%
  2. No/44%
  3. Can't Say/7%
6. Have you ever worked on a campaign or worked for or with a political party that helped get a judge elected to one of these three statewide courts, or not?
  1. Yes/10%
  2. No/90%
  3. Can't Say/0%

7. If you are a Pennsylvania voter who has been voting regularly during the past ten years you probably have had a chance to elect a candidate to one of these three statewide courts. When the candidate runs for judge of the State Supreme Court, Superior Court or Commonwealth Court, their name is listed on the ballot with the county of their residence. When it comes to voting for these judicial candidates how important is that listing of the county where the candidate lives in helping you determine how you'll vote? Is it the MOST important item in determining how you'll vote, a very important item, only somewhat important, not so important or not important at all?

1. The Most Important/8%
2. Very important/28%
3. Only somewhat important/29%
4. Not so important/16%
5. Not important at all/18%
6. Can't Say/1%

8. In politics, they always talk about a candidate's name recognition, meaning how many voters are aware of a candidate's name. Just knowing a candidate's name or just recognizing it when you go into vote; how important is that when it comes to determining how you'd vote for a candidate for statewide judge? Is it the MOST important item in determining how you would vote for these judicial candidates, a very important item, only somewhat important, not so important, or not important at all?

1. The Most Important/18%
2. Very important/28%
3. Only somewhat important/28%
4. Not so important/13%
5. Not important at all/12%
6. Can't Say/1%

9. And how important is it to you to know whether a candidate running for State Supreme Court, State Superior Court or Commonwealth Court is a Republican or a Democrat? Is his or her political party affiliation the MOST important item in determining how you'll vote, a very important item, only somewhat important, not so important, or not important at all?
1. The Most Important/8%
  2. Very important/19%
  3. Only somewhat important/24%
  4. Not so important/17%
  5. Not important at all/33%
  6. Can't Say/0%
10. There has been a lot of talk lately about placing limits on the amount of money that individuals and political action, for committees are allowed to contribute to candidates running for these top three courts. One proposal is to limit contributions and establish public financing of our judicial elections. Public financing for judgeship races would be paid for through voluntary check-off of tax dollars on your Pennsylvania income tax, similar to the check-off on federal tax returns for public financing of the race for President. Would you favor or oppose the public financing of races for judge in the State's top three courts?
1. Favor public financing/45%
  2. Oppose public financing/45%
  3. Can't Say/10%

11. The judicial code of conduct created what is called the gag rule. This gag rule strongly limits those statewide candidates running for judge from talking about their philosophy or how they feel on important legal issues which they might have to rule on if elected to the bench. How do you feel about this gag rule? Do you feel this is a good rule that helps to keep a judge unbiased, lets him keep an open mind to both sides of an argument and we should keep the gag rule OR do you feel it limits, far too much, the public's right to know what a judge stands for and we should remove the gag rule?

1. Keep the gag rule/26%
2. Remove the gag rule/67%
3. Can't Say/11%

12. Have you recently read or heard about some of the problems going on in the State Supreme Court, or not?

1. Yes/47%
2. No/52%
3. Can't Say/2%

Now for the following I'd like you to tell me if you have a great deal of confidence in the way they are doing their jobs; some confidence, or hardly any confidence at how they're doing their job. First: (INTERVIEWER: FOR THE FIRST TWO, REPEAT THE ANSWER SETS)

(ROTATE)

		<u>Great Deal of Confidence</u>	<u>Some Confidence</u>	<u>Hardly Any Confidence</u>	<u>Can't Say</u>
13.	The President	28	43	24	6
14.	The Governor	19	52	25	4
15.	The State Legislature	10	58	24	9
16.	The State Supreme Court	15	51	18	16
17.	The Pennsylvania Attorney General	20	50	16	15
18.	The State Superior Court	11	52	14	23
19.	The Commonwealth Court	13	51	14	22



20. Currently there is a proposal before the State Legislature to hold a Constitutional Convention to change the way judges on the State's Supreme Court, State Superior Court and Commonwealth Court are selected. Right now our state's top judges are elected by the public and the proposal is to appoint them instead. The new method is called "merit selection." What would happen is that there would be a panel of six lawyers and six non-lawyers, all chosen by the Governor and approved by the Senate, and when a judicial vacancy occurs, the panel would recommend qualified people to the Governor. The Governor would then select the judicial appointment and the State Senate would then confirm the appointment. Tell me would you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose this kind of a change in our state's constitution as a new way to select our state's top judges?

- |                       |                        |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Strongly Favor/13% | 3. Somewhat Oppose/27% |
| 2. Somewhat Favor/20% | 4. Strongly Oppose/36% |
| 5. Can't Say/4%       |                        |

21. If your State Legislator voted to change the Constitution of the state so that we would no longer hold elections to choose our state's top judges and he or she supported the new concept of appointing judges, how would you react to this? Would you definitely vote against your state legislator because he or she voted to change to the appointment of judges; would you give serious consideration to voting against them because of this; would it not effect how you'd vote; or would you support them all the more for changing to the appointment process?

1. Definitely vote against them/29%
2. Give serious consideration to voting against them/30%
3. It would not effect how you'd vote/26%
4. Support them all the more/11%
5. Can't Say/3%

22. Many State Legislators are talking about holding a State Constitutional Convention. They want to change the Constitution's articles on how judges are selected. It is estimated that the cost of holding a constitutional convention could run into the millions of dollars. Let me ask you, do you feel it is important enough to change the way we choose our top judges from electing them to appointing them to spend millions of dollars of taxpayers' money? OR, do you feel that holding a Constitutional Convention on this issue is wasting taxpayers' money?

1. It is important enough to change/12%
2. Holding a convention is wasting taxpayer money/82%
3. Can't Say/6%

23. Back to the State Supreme Court situation, two judges on the bench reprimanded one of their colleagues for meeting privately with a trial court judge about a pending case. He then counterattacked, accusing them of unethical and illegal acts including case-fixing and politicking on and off the court to enhance their careers. Have you read or heard of this problem, or not?

1. Yes, have read or heard/40%
2. No, have not read or heard/58%
3. Can't Say/2%

24. Some believe this current mess in the State's Supreme Court makes a very strong case for changing the way we select our judges for the top statewide courts. Some believe we should change the system and stop having public elections to put judges on the State Supreme Court, Superior Court and Commonwealth Court. How do you feel? Do these problems on the State Supreme Court cause you to think that there might be a better way to choose our top judges beside electing them? OR, do you think electing them is still the best way?

1. There might be a better way to choose our top judges besides electing them/25%
2. Electing them is still the best way/66%
3. Can't Say/10%

25. Right now, among the top three courts in the state there are a total of 30 judges. Thirteen are from Allegheny County -- the Pittsburgh area, 5 are from Philadelphia, and 12 are from other counties in the State other than Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. Does this kind of geographical make-up of the courts bother you enough that you'd want to change our Constitution so that judges would no longer run throughout the entire state but would run only in specific geographical areas? OR, should we just leave it alone and let our judges campaign across the whole state?

1. Judges should only run in specific geographical areas/29%
2. Let our judges campaign across the whole state/61%
3. Can't Say/10%

26. There are many who believe the State's top three courts don't have a good enough geographical make-up. That the big population areas get all the judges because that's where all the votes are. To fix this problem some are recommending the state be divided into regions -- for the state Supreme Court, 7 regions because there are 7 judges, for the Superior Court, 15 regions, and the Commonwealth Court, 9 regions. The judges would no longer run statewide but run for office just in one of the specific regions. This way, they feel, we'd have better geographical representation. What do you think? Should we go to geographical representation on the courts, OR, should we keep the courts the way they are now?

1. Geographical representation/41%
2. Keep the courts the way they are/51%
3. Can't Say/8%

27. (IF "GEORGRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION", OPTION 1, IN Q26, ASK:) To be fair, these regions would have to be based upon population. First, you'd have to disband the courts. Then, every ten years, after the census, you'd have to create all new regions through reapportionment just like we do for the Legislature and the Congress. That kind of reapportionment would probably cost around a million dollars of tax money every time we re-draw all these new courts lines. How do you feel about this kind of expense -- do you think it is a worthwhile expense, OR, do you feel it's not worth the expense?

1. Worthwhile expense/45%
2. Not worth the expense/34%
3. Can't Say/21%

(ASK OF EVERYBODY)

Let me read to you the following statements and after each tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with each. The first is:

ROTATE

28. Let's face it, it's nice to think that publically electing our top judges is perfect democracy in action. But the cold hard truth is I don't really know enough about the candidates or the issues to make an honest informed choice about our judges.

1. Strongly Agree/36%	3. Somewhat Disagree/14%
2. Somewhat Agree/37%	4. Strongly Disagree/12%
5. Can't Say/1%	

29. I think there is a greater chance for political corruption or for political pressure on our judges if they are appointed to office -- even by a well-selected committee, than if we keep on electing our judges the way we do now.

1. Strongly Agree/47%	3. Somewhat Disagree/13%
2. Somewhat Agree/27%	4. Strongly Disagree/8%
5. Can't Say/5%	

30. The popular election of judges -- the people electing judges -- is part of our basic democratic tradition. It's our right to vote. That right should not be taken away from us no matter what, even if our judges aren't perfect.

1. Strongly Agree/62%	3. Somewhat Disagree/7%
2. Somewhat Agree/24%	4. Strongly Disagree/5%
5. Can't Say/2%	

31. The only true way Pennsylvania is going to get a first class, qualified, independent and professional judiciary is if we go to a appointive process of our top judges and stop all these crazy political campaigns.

1. Strongly Agree/16%	3. Somewhat Disagree/29%
2. Somewhat Agree/20%	4. Strongly Disagree/33%
5. Can't Say/3%	

32. If we go to an appointive process of picking our judges I don't believe for a minute it'll be less political, it'll just be less public.

1. Strongly Agree/50%	3. Somewhat Disagree/10%
2. Somewhat Agree/31%	4. Strongly Disagree/6%
5. Can't Say/4%	

33. If we go to an appointive process of picking our state's top judges, it'll just mean the lawyers and their Bar Association will pick their friends to be judges; and to tell you the truth I don't like that one bit.

1. Strongly Agree/51%	3. Somewhat Disagree/10%
2. Somewhat Agree/28%	4. Strongly Disagree/7%
5. Can't Say/4%	

34. Statewide political campaigns for judges can be good and educational. Not only can the voters get to see and hear the candidates for judge but the candidates get broad-based exposure to the wants, needs and all the diversity of the state. It forces them to be more in touch with us -- the people.

1. Strongly Agree/56%	3. Somewhat Disagree/6%
2. Somewhat Agree/31%	4. Strongly Disagree/5%
5. Can't Say/2%	

35. Political campaigns for judges sound good in theory but when I think about who they have to see, and how they have to raise the money to run these statewide campaigns, I begin to realize the potential for political corruption. It makes me think maybe the election of judges was for a by-gone era and it's time to move on and start appointing our judges, not electing them.

1. Strongly Agree/17%	3. Somewhat Disagree/27%
2. Somewhat Agree/19%	4. Strongly Disagree/31%
5. Can't Say/5%	

36. If the state Legislators and the Governor feel that the people aren't really qualified to elect our judges, then it must really mean they don't think we're all qualified to elect the Legislature and the Governor, too.

1. Strongly Agree/42%	3. Somewhat Disagree/10%
2. Somewhat Agree/28%	4. Strongly Disagree/13%
5. Can't Say/7%	