Polling Memo

To: Interested Parties
From: Ronald A. Faucheux, Ph.D., President, Clarus Research Group
Re: Pratt and Whitney Survey on the Joint Strike Fighter issue
Date: July 11, 2010

Clarus Research Group – a nonpartisan survey research firm based on Washington, D.C. – conducted a 1,000-sample poll covering 19 targeted Congressional Districts in Florida, Virginia, New Jersey, California, West Virginia, Washington State, Alabama, Georgia, and Texas. The survey was commissioned by Pratt & Whitney and interviewing was conducted June 25-28, 2010 by live telephone interviewers. The poll's margin of error was +/- 3.1 percent. The focus of the survey was the Joint Strike Fighter issue now before Congress.

OVERALL TAKE-AWAY: Voters in the 19 districts surveyed have decidedly negative feelings about Congress spending $3 billion on an extra jet engine when explained the circumstances, especially when they learn that the engine is opposed by the nation's top military leaders for being wasteful and unnecessary. Views expressed on the specific issue are clearly aggravated by, and must be understood within, the current political context in which voters believe that a massive amount of federal spending is wasted and that well-connected companies and special interests benefit from Congressional earmarks at taxpayers' expense.

The following are key findings from the survey:

- Voters believe a large amount of federal government spending is wasted: 48% believe that over HALF of all federal spending is wasted – an astounding number that cuts to the core of public dissatisfaction with Washington. Also, 23% believe that over HALF of defense spending is wasted.

- Voters strongly oppose spending money on a defense contract that the **nation's military leaders say is wasteful a**nd unnecessary. The survey found that 87% of voters agree with the statement: "If America's military leaders at the Pentagon determine that a multi-billion dollar defense contract with a private company is wasteful and unnecessary, Congress should NOT spend the money." Of this 87%, 71% said "strongly" agree and 16 percent said "somewhat" agree.

- More than 8 out of 10 voters surveyed agree with the following statements:

    - **"Federal budget earmarks that provide funding to special projects that benefit well-connected companies at taxpayers' expense need to be stopped immediately."** *(86% agree; 69% "strongly" and 17% "somewhat")*

    - **"Congress spends too much money on wasteful programs that primarily benefit well-connected political supporters and special interest groups."** *(86% agree; 64% "strongly" and 22% "somewhat")*

    - **"Unnecessary federal government spending needs to be eliminated, even in the Defense Department."** *(80% agree; 59% "strongly" and 21% "somewhat")*

- When voters are explained both sides of the Joint Strike Fighter engine issue, opposition to the GE/Rolls Royce position is much larger than is support for it. The "pro-competition" argument advanced by GE/Rolls Royce only attracts 16% support while the "back-up engine" argument they also use attracts 17% support. Two-thirds of voters (66% and 69%) opposed the extra jet engine regardless of which argument is used to support it.

- **Even some of the engine's support base may be persuaded otherwise based** on additional information. Of the voters who said they SUPPORT the extra jet engine:

    - 16% to 22% of them say they are less inclined to support it when they learn that the engine "would be manufactured by GE and Rolls Royce."

    - 35% to 41% of them say they are less inclined to support it when they learn that "President Obama, former President Bush, Defense Secretary Robert Gates, and the country's top military leaders are all opposed to spending the money for this extra jet engine because they say it is unnecessary and wasteful."

    - 56% to 61% of them say they are less inclined to support it when they learn that "many of the jobs the manufacture of the extra jet engine would create would be in Great Britain, because Rolls Royce is a British company."

    - 57% to 61% of them say they are less inclined to support it when they learn that "GE and Rolls Royce already have large government contracts and are spending millions of dollars on lobbyists and advertisements trying to put pressure on members of Congress to approve the extra jet engine they would profit from."

- Support for the extra jet engine is more likely to hurt Congressional incumbents seeking re-election than help them: To assess the bottom-line political impact of the issue, the following questioned was asked at the end of each survey interview: *"If your member of Congress voted to spend the three billion dollars for this extra jet engine, would you be more or less inclined to support him or her for re-election in this November's election?"* The result: 7% more inclined, 67% less inclined, 13% volunteered it would make no difference.