END CITIZENS UNITED PAC

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

2015 CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE

12 Things Voters Deserve To Know

WWW.ENDCITIZENSUNITED.ORG

ABOUT END CITIZENS UNITED PAC

Established March 1st, 2015, End Citizens United is a Political Action Committee funded by grassroots donors. We are dedicated to countering the disastrous effects of *Citizens United* and reforming our campaign finance system. **Already, more than 1,000,000 supporters have joined our movement to fight the unprecedented rise of money polluting our democracy.**

Learn more about End Citizens United PAC at www.endcitizensunited.org.

ABOUT THIS SURVEY

Since the *Citizens United* decision became law, American elections have been inundated by spending, particularly from unregulated "dark" money. End Citizens United, a grassroots effort to reform our campaign finance system, will use this questionnaire and past actions on campaign finance issues to guide our process for selecting candidates to endorse.

There are many avenues to campaign finance reform. We encourage you to use the space provided to explain your answers or ask questions if you so choose. We are, however, unequivocal in our opposition to the Supreme Court's *Citizens United* decision and the opportunities for corruption that it created. We will not stand with any candidate who supports the decision as written.

Kindly return your completed questionnaire by sending an electronic copy to Jessica Adair at jessica@endcitizensunited.org, or a hard copy to End Citizens United PAC, PO Box 66005, Washington, DC, 20035. Your answers to this questionnaire as well as any endorsements made by End Citizens United PAC will be released to the public.

STATEMENT OF AUTHEN	TICITY	House of
I, Salud Carbajal	_ a candidate for office of	Representatives
inCA-24	_ certify that the answers	in this questionnaire
represent my own views.		
SIGNATURE	DATE	
STAFF NAME, PHONE, EMAIL:		



Do you oppose the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United?

✓ YES

NO

OPTIONAL EXPLANATION:

Yes. I believe it is fundamentally wrong that individuals and organizations can spend unlimited amounts of money influencing our elections, often without any disclosure of who is providing the source of the funds. I think it is a direct threat to the health of our democracy.

Would you support a Constitutional Amendment that undoes Citizens United and grants Congress and the states the power to regulate campaign finance?

✓ YES



OPTIONAL EXPLANATION:

Yes. I believe that a Constitutional Amendment that undoes Citizens United is the best path forward for fixing our broken campaign finance system, ultimately preserving our democracy from the corrupting influence of money.



Please indicate if you've co-sponsored or support any of the following campaign finance reform bills:
✓ GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE ACT

✓ DISCLOSE ACT

Disclose No.

✓ KEEPING OUR CAMPAIGNS HONEST (K.O.C.H) ACT

✓ FAIR ELECTIONS NOW ACT

✓ DEMOCRACY FOR ALL AMENDMENT

LIST ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION HERE:

Move to Amend

REQUIRE FULL DISCLOSURE

4

Do you support legislation requiring dark money entities, such as 501(c)(4) groups to disclose their donors and spending when they engage in any political activity that mentions a candidate for federal office and/or is intended to influence a federal election?

✓ YES NO

OPTIONAL EXPLANATION:

It's clear that both the message and the messenger matter. If we are to have a truly informed and educated electorate, individuals need to be empowered with the knowledge of who is spending money on political activities. Without this knowledge, whatever claims made in campaign advertisements cannot be fully evaluated by the voters.



Would you support legislation requiring dark money groups to publicly disclose their top ten donors if they spend money on voter contact?			
YES NO			
OPTIONAL EXPLANATION:			
The public has a right to know who is spending money to influence elections.			
As of July 1st, 2014 the FCC has required that TV stations post their public file (which details political spending) online. Currently this database isn't searchable and doesn't extend to cable providers. Will you support legislation requiring a searchable database and extending coverage to include cable TV spending?			
political spending) online. Currently this database isn't searchable and doesn't extend to cable providers. Will you support legislation requiring a searchable database and extending			
political spending) online. Currently this database isn't searchable and doesn't extend to cable providers. Will you support legislation requiring a searchable database and extending coverage to include cable TV spending?			
political spending) online. Currently this database isn't searchable and doesn't extend to cable providers. Will you support legislation requiring a searchable database and extending coverage to include cable TV spending? YES NO OPTIONAL EXPLANATION:			
political spending) online. Currently this database isn't searchable and doesn't extend to cable providers. Will you support legislation requiring a searchable database and extending coverage to include cable TV spending? YES NO			



Currently a campaign staffer can guit the campaign and work for a SuperPAC supporting the candidate that employed the staffer after just a 120 day cooling off period. Would you support a cycle long cooling off period, preventing that staffer from working for a SuperPAC or 501(C)4 supporting his or her former employer until the next campaign cycle?

✓ YES

NO

OPTIONAL EXPLANATION:

This type of transfer violates the spirit of coordination regulations and this loophole should be closed.

8

Currently the FEC holds that coordination only flows one way. This means that while a campaign is forbidden from sharing its plans, methods, and strategies with a SuperPAC, the SuperPAC can share its plans, methods, and strategies with the campaign. Do you support legislation to end this loophole?

✓ YES



OPTIONAL EXPLANATION:

Again, this type of loophole violates the spirit of prohibitions on coordination.



29 states currently ban lobbyists from donating during legislative sessions. Do you support legislation to extend this ban to Congress?

✓ YES

NO

OPTIONAL EXPLANATION:

Legislators should focus on making good public policy first and fundraising second.

10

A 2012 study found that "the more companies give in campaign contributions, the more they get in contracts, on average."² In fact, the study found that \$200,000 in donations leads to an average addition of 107 government contracts. Would you support legislation that prohibits the executives, lobbyist, and company PAC from donating to federal candidates if the company has or is seeking federal contracts?

✓ YES

NO

OPTIONAL EXPLANATION:

Contractors can and should compete on their ability to execute the contract and legislators should act only in the best interests of taxpayers and towards the desired outcomes of the contract.



ADDITIONAL REFORMS

_

Please share any additional ways you support meaningful campaign finance reform.

EXPLANATION:	

^{2. &}quot;Campaign contributions help companies get more federal contracts, study finds," Drutman, Sunlight Foundation, 6/21/2012



^{1. &}quot;Limits on Campaign Contributions During the Legislative Session," NCSL, 12/6/2011