



A Smack Upside the Head: *No, we're serious. This really is Senate candidate Tom Campbell kissing a baby.*

candidate in either of California's contested 1992 Senate races—except for Bay Area Democrat Barbara Boxer. With more than \$3.9 million in gross receipts, Campbell's campaign war chest is nearly twice that of his dead-heat opponent in the Republican primary race, Bruce Herschensohn, the reactionary Southern California TV commentator. Except for PAC-man incarnate John Seymour, the appointed U.S. senator seeking a return to his seat in the other California race, Campbell has raised more of his cash from political action committees (\$396,000) than has any other candidate. He also has \$612,000 in leftover money, both from PACs and individuals, from his 1990 House reelection campaign.

Ask Campbell if special-interest money influences his voting and, like any incumbent, he'll vehemently, albeit politely, deny that it does. "The maximum contribution is \$1,000 for an individual," he says. "I would not switch my vote for any amount of money, but it's highly unlikely that I would switch a vote because of a \$1,000 contribution—or series of them."

Though Campbell emphasizes that 90 percent of his donors are individual contributors, an analysis of the loot's origins reveals that about one-third of the non-PAC contributors work in fields that have big-money lobbying agendas: communications and electronics, construction, finance

and insurance, manufacturing, commerce, lawyers and lobbyists—many of them writing checks bearing out-of-state addresses. Called "bundling," the industry strategy of encouraging employees, friends and relatives to contribute to a preferred candidate has become a popular, discreet way to hurdle limits on federal campaign donations (\$1,000 per person per election and \$5,000 per PAC).

ACCORDING TO an analysis by the nonprofit National Library on Money & Politics in Washington, Campbell's biggest contributors in 1991 worked in the finance, insurance and real estate industries (\$71,353 from PACs and \$290,478 from individuals); big money is one of the perks to legislators who sit on desirable cash committees like the House Bank Committee, as Campbell does.

As the *San Francisco Examiner* reported last week, consumer lobbying groups are accusing Campbell of siding with banking lobbies—and against consumers—on four recent House Banking Committee votes. One measure sought to delay the expansion of bank powers that deregulation would bring. Campbell voted against two other measures intended to require banks to invest in local communities should interstate banking be approved. Campbell cast another "no" vote against a mea-

sure to require that banks offer low-cost banking services to consumers.

In March, Campbell failed to vote on a fifth consumer protection measure to tighten up credit bureau reporting standards.

"This, in our view, was the key consumer vote that's going to occur in 1992," says Edmund Mierzwinski, lobbyist at the U.S.

Not only has Tom Campbell

never met a payroll, outside

of government and academia,

he's rarely been on one.

Campbell's charmed career

makes even silver spoon king

George Bush look like a well-

rounded, self-made man.

Public Interest Research Group. "The congressman decided that not voting was easier than taking the heat from his PACs," he

charges. "We lost very narrowly on a vote that has tied a bill up in a legislative limbo. If Campbell and one other person had voted with us, we would have moved this important credit bureau bill."

Campbell's legalese response: "There was no previous position that I switched. The implicit suggestion that I did switch therefore has no foundation." Campbell, who has voted for consumers on past S&L bailout and bank deregulation legislation, says he voted against the recent consumer safeguards because they were "unnecessary and worse than unnecessary—costly."

To be fair, Campbell's pro-business (and occasionally anti-consumer) votes in Congress have a lot to do with his unswerving faith in free-market economics. His moderate positions on the environment, abortion rights and civil rights aren't campaign innovations, either: His *Harvard Law Review* article on using statistics to help plaintiffs win sex-discrimination suits has been cited in court cases; his opposition to offshore oil drilling and other green votes in Congress have earned him accolades from environmental groups like the California League of Conservation Voters; he voted for the 1990 civil rights bill; he's also been active in a group of pro-choice Republicans since his first term in Congress. All of this, plus his support for gun control and his desire to whittle \$28 bil-

lion more from the military budget than the Bush administration has proposed, makes him the most liberal of the state's 19 congressional Republicans. Campbell bills himself as "a new kind of conservative."

Still, what the *San Jose Mercury News* has called his "tendency to slice issues so thin that he seems too clever by half" undercuts some of his self-touted postures. If asked, he will lament the short shrift given to the inner cities (after sternly calling for law and order in L.A., of course), while at the same time opposing the infusion of \$1.2 billion for Head Start and extending unemployment benefits. Like Gov. Wilson, he blames California's alleged business flight in part on high taxes created by the state's welfare programs; he offers only the Jack Kemp/George Bush measures (business tax breaks) as a means of reinvesting in the underclass.

As a champion of civil rights, his record is blemished by his support for amendments to undermine the Americans with Disabilities Act. His answer to the Endangered Species Act: "A very careful cost-benefit analysis, because there's no way to say a species is worth x dollars." But there's no way to avoid price-indexing nature in a cost-benefit analysis. He also suggests an improbable compromise for conserving Shasta Dam water without decimating

Continued on next page