

On Jan. 21, the U.S. Supreme Court voted 5 to 4 to overturn limits that had been in place for a century on how much money corporations could spend on influencing voters in federal elections.

The court's conservative bloc ruled that corporations have the same right to free speech as do individuals, so the government cannot place limits on how much corporations spend on helping out their preferred candidates. Democrats and the Obama administration criticized the court's decision, saying it was a victory for big-money special interest groups that allows such interests to spend freely in federal campaigns and "drown out the voices of everyday Americans." How do you view the court's decision?

This decision simply allows corporations the same rights that unions have had for decades. If a union can spend general funds for political purposes without the direct consent of its members, then a corporation should be able to do the same thing without the consent of its shareholders.

In my opinion, it would be fine to require shareholder consent for such expenditures but only if we also require the consent of each union member to spend their dues for political purposes as well. For far too long, federal law has tilted the balance of power in favor of unions unfairly.

This also happens to be the single biggest reason that our state and federal budgets are in such fiscal trouble and deficits.

U.S. Rep. John Campbell

(R-Newport Beach)