The Best Solution is Also the Most Popular:  
*The bipartisan case for regular cash payments lasting through the crisis*

- Voters in both parties agree that we need to do more, supporting direct payments and prioritizing "big bold changes" and doing "whatever it takes" over deficit concerns.
- Even Republican economists agree that robust stimulus is necessary and low-risk.
- The economic pain is overwhelming and undeniable.
- It’s good government to create automatic stabilizers to account for future unknowns.
- Congress may not agree on piecemeal relief, particularly as the election approaches.

**Voters -- across the political spectrum -- overwhelmingly support ongoing direct payments.**
- About three-quarters of likely voters in 2020 election battleground states (Arizona, Florida, Michigan, North Carolina, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin) support sustained direct payments to Americans during the coronavirus pandemic: 74% support, 22% opposed, including 74% of independents and 53% of Republicans.  
  CNBC/Change Research poll, 5/6/20
- 88% of voters support direct cash payments: 91% of Democrats, 83% of Independents, and 87% of Republicans.  
  Navigator Research poll, 4/9/20

**Voters also agree** that we need to do more, not less, to support people during this crisis, prioritizes “big bold changes” and doing “whatever it takes” over deficit concerns.
- Polling shows double-digit shifts toward “big, bold changes in Washington...so working people can get ahead,” including Trump voters.  
  Navigating Coronavirus | Navigator

---

**Increased Demand for Bold Economic Changes to Help Working People**

Since January, there has been a double digit increase in the share of Americans who agree that we need big economic changes so working people can get ahead.

- Republicans are largely driving this shift, with a net increase of 16 points toward agreeing more that we need big economic changes rather than keeping taxes low and getting the government out of the way.
- Among 2016 Trump voters, there has been a 17-point shift in the same direction.

Even if neither is completely right, which do you agree with more?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NET Bold Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>GOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picking winners</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Nationwide survey of registered voters. Each view is representative of roughly 1,000 interviews taken over the prior three days.
3. Latest wave conducted April 24-29, 2020. For more info, visit navigatorresearch.org
"Americans by double-digit margins say the federal government is doing too little – not too much – to deal with the health and economic repercussions of the deadly pandemic that has now infected more than one million people across the country, a new USA TODAY/Suffolk University Poll finds."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there too much federal government involvement, too little, or the right amount of federal involvement in helping to solve the economic fallout from coronavirus?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Majorities support a future approach doing “whatever it takes” to provide needed assistance, and do not want Congress to focus on debt. ... Seven in ten (70%) agree ‘We should do whatever it takes to provide Americans the economic support they need during this very difficult time. Providing Americans with more money means they will spend more money in their communities buying goods and services’ over more of a concern about adding ‘to the federal debt by spending money on a laundry list of government programs.’ Support for “whatever it takes” transcends party lines, with 82% of Democrats, 67% of independents, and 59% of Republicans in agreement. GBAO/Groundwork Collaborative poll memo

Even Republican economists agree that robust stimulus is necessary and low-risk.

“There are times to worry about the growing government debt. This is not one of them.” -- Harvard economist Gregory Mankiw, former chairman of Council of Economic Advisors

● “I’m a fiscal hawk from way back, and all of my heebie-jeebies are going off when I see these numbers … but then I look at the scale of the problem, and I think, yeah, that’s that. Gotta do it…. One way or another, you pay a price…. But if you take care of the budget at the expense of the economy, you’re making a mistake.” -- Former CBO Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin (Victoria Guida and Marianne LeVine, “Economists urge Republicans to ignore the deficit,” Politico, April 28, 2020)

● Economic analysis of the Great Recession, as well as commentary on the current economic crisis, align on the view that in a recession, robust fiscal stimulus actually helps the economy recover, the U.S. economy has room to spend, and immediate concerns about deficits and debt are short-sighted. (Report from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, citing former Federal Reserve Chair Janet Yellen, former International Monetary Fund (IMF) Chief Economist Olivier Blanchard, Former CEA chair Jason Furman, current CBO Director, Phillip Swagel, former CBO Director Douglas Elmendorf, Former CEA Chair Greg Mankiw, among others.)

● Even Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin recently said, “‘[T]he good news is, interest rates are very low, so the cost of carrying the debt to the American taxpayer is quite low. But I think we’re all sensitive to that this is a war and we need to win this war and we need to spend what it takes to win the war.” (Richard Rubin, “Mnuchin Says ‘We Need to Spend What It Takes’ to Overcome Coronavirus Crisis,” Wall Street Journal, April 22, 2020)

The economic pain is overwhelming and undeniable -- stressing our emergency response network like never before.

● Across six 2020 battleground states, “37% of respondents said they or a member of their household lost a job or were furloughed because of the outbreak. Half of likely voters said they or someone in their household has lost wages or seen their salary cut due to the pandemic.” CNBC/Change Research poll 5/6/20

● Lines at food pantries across the country are staggering and attest to the dire circumstances millions of Americans find themselves suddenly facing. “We’re looking at an increase of 17.1 million people over the course of the next six months,” Claire Babineaux-Fontenot, CEO of Feeding America, one of the country’s largest hunger-relief organizations, told NBC News. Babineaux-Fontenot highlighted a 98 percent increase in demand for free food. (Photographs and citations from this Mother Jones photo essay)
● San Antonio, TX: Distribution doubled from 60,000 per week to 120,000
● Phoenix, AZ: Distribution has tripled.
● Massachusetts: Distribution has increased eightfold--849%

● Unemployment rates are historically high, and state unemployment offices are overwhelmed. It wasn’t until April 28 that all states began paying out the new federal pandemic unemployment insurance benefits.

● 12.7 million workers have likely lost employer-provided health insurance since the coronavirus shock began, according to the Economic Policy Institute, pointing to the limitations of employment-tied aid alone.

● State tax revenue collections are projected to decrease dramatically and are already sliding in Florida, Texas, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and others.

It’s good government to get the job done now with automatic stabilizers to account for future unknowns.

● Policies with automatic triggers to last until the economy recovers help federal agencies like the IRS plan for the future and improve efficiency, instead of reacting to political fits and starts.

● As economist Claudia Sahm notes, “Making the payments automatic and setting the structure in advance would allow for administrative systems to be designed in advance. This would be especially important if the start of the recession coincided with the annual processing of tax returns, when administrative demands on the IRS are high.”

Finally, we cannot count on Congress being able to agree on piecemeal relief, particularly as the election approaches.