

**NEW MEXICO:  
THE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS  
AND LOBBYING EXPENDITURES OF  
THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY AND ITS ALLIES**

**June 2003**

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The principal author of *New Mexico: The Campaign Contributions and Lobbying of the Tobacco Industry and Its Allies* was Mike Surrusco. Common Cause Education Fund (CCEF) would like to give special thanks to Linda Doran and Sally Davis, executive director of Common Cause New Mexico, for their help in completing this report. CCEF would also like to thank Linda Siegel, legislative director of the American Lung Association for her help. The National Institute on Money in State Politics provided the data for this report.

**ABOUT COMMON CAUSE EDUCATION FUND**

Established by Common Cause in February 2000 as a separately chartered (501)(c)(3) organization, the Common Cause Education Fund (CCEF) seeks to promote open, honest and accountable government through research, public education and innovative programs.

This report is the fifth in a series of reports made possible through a grant from The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation was established as a national philanthropy in 1972 and today it is the largest US foundation devoted to improving the health and health care of all Americans.

COMMON CAUSE EDUCATION FUND  
1250 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW #600  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036  
202/833-1200

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Smoking costs the state of New Mexico roughly \$757 million every year in health care costs and lost productivity – equivalent to 19 percent of the state’s annual budget. For the first time in 10 years, New Mexico’s legislature approved an increase in cigarette taxes, a move public health advocates have long argued would decrease the state’s tobacco-related healthcare costs. The U.S. Surgeon General reported in 2000, for example, that increasing the cost of tobacco products would decrease the prevalence of tobacco use and lead to “substantial long-term improvements in health.”

The tax increase, however, was part of an overall compromise. While taxes collected on cigarettes will go up, for the next four years money from the tobacco settlement will go into the state’s general fund rather than into a permanent fund established expressly to finance health and education programs. Even prior to the compromise, the American Lung Association (ALA) graded the states that were part of the 1998 tobacco lawsuit on, among other things, their use of the settlement money. New Mexico was one of 10 states to receive an “F” in all areas.

Allies of the tobacco industry in New Mexico include the New Mexico Retail Association, New Mexico Retail Grocers, and the New Mexico Restaurant Association. All of these groups have lobbied alongside the tobacco companies to defeat legislation that would likely reduce the availability and use of cigarettes. These groups are also a powerful force in the state, creating a more favorable legislative environment for the tobacco industry.

Of 112 total members in the House and the Senate, there are only 23 members who have not received any contributions from either the tobacco industry or its allies. Since 1995, the tobacco industry has given a total of \$247,435, to candidates running for public office in New

Mexico. The allies of the tobacco industry have given an additional \$87,575 in campaign contributions to all candidates during the same period.

This Common Cause Education Fund report seeks to increase public awareness of the tobacco industry's influence in the New Mexico State Legislature by showing the link between the tobacco industry's campaign contributions and lobbying efforts and the specific actions that the legislature has taken on measures that are relevant to tobacco interests.

**INTRODUCTION**

Few people are aware of the degree to which tobacco companies influence the state legislature in New Mexico. The use of tobacco products costs the economy in New Mexico hundreds of millions of dollars every year in health care costs and lost productivity; yet the State Legislature rarely takes actions to curb or prevent smoking. Tobacco companies have made their case effectively in Santa Fe by giving large campaign contributions to legislators who are willing to support their interests. Tobacco companies also employ many lobbyists to personally carry their message to the legislators who determine the fate of tobacco-related bills.

A more subtle method employed by the tobacco industry to increase its influence in the legislature involves partnering with subsidiary firms, such as Kraft Foods and Miller Brewing (both owned by Philip Morris), and trade associations from other industries that are willing to support Big Tobacco's cause. Subsidiary firms offer legislators political cover by allowing them to accept contributions that do not come directly from the tobacco companies, even though tobacco subsidiaries are financially tied to the success of their parent companies.

Many restaurants and convenience stores also align themselves with tobacco companies because they view clean indoor air laws and tobacco taxes as threats to their businesses. Restaurant and retail associations also allow legislators to distance themselves from Big Tobacco by leading the opposition to increased tobacco taxes and clean indoor air laws. In this way, legislators do not appear to be helping only the tobacco companies if they vote against these measures. By doing so, trade associations from other industries create a favorable environment for tobacco companies in the state legislature.

Most lobbyists have working relationships with specific legislators and, in some cases, may have personal ties that give them special access. It is not unusual for tobacco company

lobbyists y to also lobby on behalf of the trade associations that ally themselves with the tobacco industry. The amount tobacco companies and their allies spend on campaign contributions and lobbying to promote a specific legislative agenda dwarfs the amount that public interest groups working to oppose the tobacco companies can afford.

This Common Cause Education Fund report seeks to increase public awareness of the tobacco industry's influence in the New Mexico State Legislature by showing the link between industry campaign contributions and lobbying and specific actions that the legislature has taken on legislation relevant to tobacco interests.

#### **COSTS OF TOBACCO USE IN NEW MEXICO**

Smoking costs the state of New Mexico roughly \$757 million every year in health care costs and lost productivity, which is equivalent to 19 percent of the state's annual budget. New Mexico's Medicaid program spends \$144 million every year treating people who are suffering from smoking-related illnesses. Each pack of cigarettes sold in New Mexico contributes \$3.49 to the state's economy, while at the same time costing New Mexico's taxpayers \$7.75 in related health care expenses. Each taxpaying household in New Mexico spends \$477 annually to cover smoking-caused health care costs. None of these estimates, however, include other costs associated with smoking, such as second-hand smoke, smokeless tobacco, or cigar or pipe smoking. In short, smoking is an expensive habit for New Mexico.

According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), roughly 42,000, or 36 percent, of high school students smoke in New Mexico – which exceeds the smoking rate of 24 percent among New Mexico adults. According to the *American Journal of Public Health*, each year roughly 5,200 minors in New Mexico take up smoking. Children under

18 buy or consume 8.1 million packs of cigarettes each year in the state. One in five 14-year-olds in New Mexico is addicted to tobacco. More than 2,100 adults in New Mexico who smoke die from a smoking-caused illness every year, and 44,000 minors who smoke now will die prematurely if they do not quit, according to the CDC.

The tobacco industry spends roughly \$11.4 billion on marketing nationwide. The Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids estimates that tobacco companies spend more than \$72.3 million annually on promotional advertising in New Mexico alone. Much of tobacco companies' advertising affects children. Although tobacco companies are now prohibited from advertising directly to children through the use of cartoons or advertisements in children's magazines, several leading cigarettes and smokeless tobacco brands have increased their advertising in magazines such as *Rolling Stone* and *Sports Illustrated*. While these publications are not geared explicitly toward children, they are still popular among younger audiences. The presence of such ads may have serious consequences. In fact, the *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* and *Journal of the American Medical Association* have reported that minors are three times more sensitive to tobacco advertising than adults. Nationwide, the majority of children who smoke prefer the three most heavily advertised brands, while less than half of adults who smoke chose those brands.

#### **CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOBBYING**

Since 1995, the current members of the New Mexico Legislature have received a total of \$136,360 from the tobacco companies. During the same period, subsidiary companies of tobacco firms and trade associations from industries that share many of the same interests as Big Tobacco have given \$56,025 to current House and Senate members.

Of the 112 total members of the House and Senate, there are only 23 who have not received any contributions from either the tobacco industry or its allies. Since 1995, the tobacco industry has given a total of \$247,435, to officials running for public office in New Mexico. The allies of the tobacco industry have given an additional \$87,575 in campaign contributions to candidates during the same period.

Over the last four election cycles, the tobacco companies have given proportionally more to Democrats, who control both chambers. Although Democrats control 61 percent of the total number of seats in the State House, the tobacco industry contributed \$68,350, or 72 percent of their total House contributions, to Democrats. In the Senate, the difference was even more pronounced. The Democrats control 24 seats in the New Mexico State Senate, or 57 percent of the total seats, and the tobacco industry gave 87 percent of its total Senate contributions to Democrats. Since 1995, the tobacco companies have donated \$36,290 to current Senate Democrats and \$5,250 to Senate Republicans.

Among tobacco companies, Philip Morris has been by far the largest contributor, donating \$170,210 since 1995, or 69 percent of total donations from the tobacco industry. Among the trade groups that share several legislative goals with the tobacco companies, the Retail Association and the Restaurant Association together have given \$83,875, or 96 percent of the total given by tobacco allies.

In addition to campaign contributions, tobacco companies have also paid for trips or gifts for key state legislators. For example, the *Santa Fe New Mexican* mentioned a five-day junket in Costa Rica that was taken by former Senate President Pro Tempore Manny Aragon (D-Albuquerque) in June 1997 and paid for by Philip Morris. The New York Society for International Affairs officially funded the trip, but as was widely reported, Philip Morris was the

principal supporter of the group. It is not uncommon for tobacco companies to create coalitions or front groups in order to reduce their public visibility.

Allies of the tobacco industry, chiefly the New Mexico Restaurant Association and the New Mexico Retail Association, have lobbied alongside the tobacco companies on a number of tobacco-related bills. Lobbyists for the New Mexico Restaurant Association oppose restrictions on smoking in bars and restaurants. They also have fought cigarette tax increases on behalf of restaurant owners who furnish tobacco vending machines. Restaurant and bar owners argue that clean indoor air laws and increases in tobacco taxes hurt their business. Lobbyists for the New Mexico Retail Association oppose increases in cigarette taxes, claiming they will impact overall sales. Retailers also oppose tougher policing of and penalties for tobacco sales to minors.

#### **SPECIFIC TOBACCO-RELATED LEGISLATION IN NEW MEXICO**

##### ***Use of Tobacco Settlement Money***

In 1998, the attorneys-general of 46 states and the District of Columbia sued the tobacco companies to compensate for taxpayer money spent treating people who became sick from using tobacco products. The case produced the Master Settlement Agreement (MSA), a plan for tobacco companies to bear some of the costs of treating people with tobacco-caused illnesses or to restrict certain tobacco marketing practices. The settlement also was seen as a way to fund smoking prevention and cessation programs for state residents. New Mexico's share of the settlement amounted to roughly \$40 million in annual payments from the tobacco companies.

Despite the original intent of the lawsuit, many states are not using the money for programs to prevent youth smoking and to help smokers quit. On the national level, according to a Yale University study, "almost none of the tobacco settlement money has been spent for health

care or prevention-cessation programs.” The study reported that nationwide less than six percent of the money was directed to such programs, with a high of nine percent of the money spent in 1999 that dropped to four percent spent in 2002. Although most states initially committed a substantial portion of future settlement proceeds to health- and education-related programs, many state legislatures subsequently have passed laws to allow the money to be used for other purposes, such as covering budget shortfalls. According to the *Wall Street Journal*, for the current fiscal year, 21 of the 46 states that originally signed onto the tobacco settlement have applied the settlement money toward budget deficit reductions.

In January 2003, the American Lung Association (ALA) graded the states that were part of the 1998 Master Settlement Agreement lawsuit on their use of the settlement money. The ratings were based on four criteria believed to affect smoking rates:

- Funding for tobacco-control programs
- The amount of taxes charged on cigarettes
- Regulations to provide citizens with smoke-free air
- Restrictions on youth access to cigarettes

New Mexico was one of only 10 states to receive a grade of “F” in all four areas. Some of the State Legislature’s failures cited by ALA include the absence of smoking restrictions in childcare facilities, restaurants or retail stores. Despite laws that prohibit sales to minors, there currently is no requirement for sales clerks to check photo identification for the purchase of tobacco products in New Mexico.

In 1999, New Mexico received approximately \$53 million from the MSA, of which only \$2.2 million went toward tobacco cessation and prevention programs. The CDC estimates that an effective smoking prevention and cessation program in New Mexico would require funding in the range of \$14 million to \$32 million annually. New Mexico’s 2003 budget allocates \$5

million, or 36.5 percent of the CDC's minimum recommended amount, for smoking prevention and cessation, ranking it 28 in 2003 for prevention funding among all states. In addition to the settlement money, New Mexico earns an estimated \$22 million a year in tobacco taxes. For the next four years, proceeds from tobacco settlement litigation are projected to be \$38 million to \$40 million a year. When the settlement money and tobacco taxes are combined, New Mexico spends only eight percent of its total tobacco revenues on smoking prevention and cessation

As seen in other states, prevention and quitting programs have proven cost-effective, even in the short term, because of the immediate savings they generate. The director of the Massachusetts Tobacco Control Program testified before the Pennsylvania State Legislature that its program quickly began paying for itself, largely due to reduced healthcare costs that stemmed from fewer pregnant women using tobacco. California's prevention program generated \$11 million in similar savings during the first two years, according to the journal *Pediatrics*. The cumulative healthcare savings in California over seven years reached \$100 million. Many health advocates in New Mexico see the chronic under-funding of smoking prevention and cessation programs as missed opportunities.

### ***Tobacco Taxes in New Mexico***

The U.S. Surgeon General reported in 2000 that increasing the cost of tobacco products would decrease the prevalence of tobacco use and lead to "substantial long-term improvements in health." The tobacco companies are well aware of the impact that increased taxes have on the prevalence of smoking. According to internal documents issued by Philip Morris and made public under the terms of the MSA, "A high cigarette price, more than any other cigarette attribute, has the most dramatic impact on the share of the quitting population ... price, not tar

level, is the main driving force for quitting.” As far back as 1982, an R.J. Reynolds executive reported that a 10 percent increase in prices would reduce smoking among youth by 11 percent.

In 2003, for the first time in 10 years, New Mexico’s legislature approved an increase in cigarette taxes, moving the state from 40 nationwide to 18 in the amount of taxes charged per pack of cigarettes. Gov. Bill Richardson (D) said he wanted to eliminate New Mexico’s gross receipts tax – comparable to sales taxes in other states – on groceries. To make up for the resulting loss in state revenue, he proposed raising cigarette taxes by 70 cents per pack. The state’s legislature approved the 70-cent tax increase on cigarettes but did not eliminate its gross receipts tax on groceries. When the governor signs the legislation, New Mexico’s previous tobacco tax of 21 cents— one of the lowest in the country after being set in 1993— will rise to 91 cents in 2003.

However, the tax increase was part of an overall compromise. While taxes collected on cigarettes will go up, over the next four years money from tobacco settlement legislation will go into the state’s general fund rather than into a permanent fund established expressly for health and education programs. Settlement money originally intended for tobacco cessation programs will now be used for unrelated expenses. Also, a provision of the MSA that prohibited tobacco lobbyists from lobbying on the use of tobacco settlement money will be effectively eliminated. By diverting the settlement money into the state’s general revenues, the legislature is allowing the tobacco companies to now lobby on how it will be spent. Although Governor Richardson has reportedly said he would like smoking prevention and cessation program funding to increase to \$6 million in the next fiscal year, that amount is still less than half of the CDC’s minimum recommended funding.

It took several years of failed attempts to get New Mexico's lawmakers to raise taxes on cigarettes. In 2002, Senators Manny Aragon (D-Albuquerque) and Ramsay Gorham (R-Albuquerque) offered a similar proposal that would have eliminated New Mexico's tax on groceries while raising taxes on cigarettes. The legislation gradually would have phased out the state's tax on groceries, while raising cigarette taxes by 60 cents a pack and leaving intact municipal and county taxes on groceries. House leader Ben Lujan (D-Nambe) effectively derailed the legislation when he assigned the Senate bill to three House committees with 10 days remaining in the legislative session. Rep. Lujan has received \$5,100 from tobacco companies since 1995.

### ***Preemption of Local Boards of Health***

Many of the battles the tobacco industry is fighting in New Mexico mirror those in other states. A favorite tactic of the tobacco industry is to introduce state-level legislation commonly known as "Preemption" or, as it is known in New Mexico, the proposed "Smoking Accommodation Act," which would prevent local governments from passing smoke-free ordinances that are more stringent than those passed at the state level. In 1997, one such bill passed the Senate and died in the House. In 1999, a similar bill lost in the Senate by only one vote. State Sen. Shannon Robinson (R-Albuquerque), who is a longtime supporter of the tobacco industry, has vowed to reintroduce state-level legislation along the lines of a "Smoking Accommodation Act" but held off from doing so in 2003. Sen. Robinson has received \$4,600 from the tobacco companies since 1995.

State law prevents smoking only in state buildings. If the Smoking Accommodation Act becomes law, it would prevent local communities from making workplaces smoke-free. It would

impact cities that already have clean-air ordinances, such as Santa Fe and Las Cruces, , as well as Albuquerque, the state's largest city, which recently passed a clean-air ordinance. In late 2002 and early 2003, Albuquerque mayor Martin Chávez, vetoed two attempts by the City Council to move ahead with anti-smoking measures— one to put the issue before voters and another to ban smoking in restaurants and in bars with attached restaurants. In March, Chávez signed a compromise bill that eliminates smoking in restaurants and gives restaurants with attached bars one year to either ban smoking in the attached bar or install a ventilation system to keep second-hand smoke out of the rest of the establishment.

New Mexico's Capitol building in Santa Fe, known as the roundhouse, first became smoke-free in 2002 after years of dispute, during which the Capitol was the only state building where people could smoke wherever they wished. Legislators smoked on the floors of the House and Senate, in their offices, and in the halls. A bill to eliminate smoking in the Capitol was first introduced in 1999. Key legislators, including the former Senate president pro tem, helped thwart passage of the entire bill, opting instead to ban smoking in some parts of the building while allowing it in others. A bill approved in 2002 finally banned smoking everywhere in the roundhouse.

### **SUMMARY**

As the New Mexico Legislature continues to struggle with a mounting deficit and increased health costs caused by tobacco use, it is more important than ever that state residents are fully aware of the information provided in this report. Through initiative campaigns, campaign contributions and lobbying, the tobacco companies, together with their subsidiaries and allies, have worked to create an environment that is favorable to tobacco interests. The

continued under-funding of New Mexico's tobacco prevention, education, and cessation programs will likely increase cigarette sales in the state. Unless this historic pattern is changed, New Mexicans will continue to suffer the health and financial consequences of tobacco use.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The National Institute on Money in State Politics has collected contribution and expenditure reports for the New Mexico 2002 election cycle through the Dec. 5, 2002, filings. We checked the report schedule 25 days after the filing deadline, and have all reports filed by candidates by that day. We will collect any reports filed by candidates later shortly.

The Institute's 2002 file is complete but preliminary, pending further review for candidates who did not comply as required by law with the reporting schedule and filed their contribution reports more than three weeks after the final deadline.

**TOTAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS FROM TOBACCO COMPANIES,  
THEIR SUBSIDIARIES AND ALLIES TO  
CANDIDATES FOR NEW MEXICO ELECTIVE OFFICE**

**Tobacco Companies**

<b>Contributor</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>Total</b>
Brown & Williamson Tobacco			\$900	\$2,500	<b>\$3,400</b>
Philip Morris*	\$35,740	\$47,120	\$49,650	\$37,700	<b>\$170,210</b>
R.J. Reynolds	\$10,550	\$10,050	\$10,950	\$5,600	<b>\$37,150</b>
Smokeless Tobacco Council	\$1,325	\$2,000			<b>\$3,325</b>
The Tobacco Institute	\$3,350	\$2,500		\$500	<b>\$6,350</b>
US Tobacco/UST Public Affairs	\$1,750	\$3,650	\$14,000	\$7,600	<b>\$27,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$52,715</b>	<b>\$65,320</b>	<b>\$75,500</b>	<b>\$53,900</b>	<b>\$247,435</b>

**Tobacco Allies\***

<b>Contributor</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>Total</b>
Andys Discount Cigarettes			\$1,000		<b>\$1,000</b>
Discount Smoke Shop	\$500				<b>\$500</b>
Montes Pueblo Pipe Shop		\$200			<b>\$200</b>
NM Restaurant Assoc	\$4,600	\$9,100	\$17,600	\$13,850	<b>\$45,150</b>
NM Retail Assoc Pac	\$6,050	\$6,650	\$19,525	\$6,500	<b>\$38,725</b>
NM Retail Grocers Assoc				\$2,000	<b>\$2,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$11,150</b>	<b>\$15,950</b>	<b>\$38,125</b>	<b>\$22,350</b>	<b>\$87,575</b>

Source: National Institute on Money in State Politics.

\* The legislative interests of these companies are not limited to tobacco issues.

**TOTAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS FROM TOBACCO COMPANIES,  
THEIR SUBSIDIARIES AND ALLIES TO  
MEMBERS OF THE NEW MEXICO HOUSE**

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Tobacco Companies</b>	<b>Tobacco Allies*</b>	<b>Total</b>
Taylor, Thomas	R	1	\$1,050	\$300	<b>\$1,350</b>
Tinnin, Nick	R	2			<b>\$0</b>
Townsend, Sandra	R	3	\$3,450	\$850	<b>\$4,300</b>
Begaye, Ray	D	4	\$300	\$200	<b>\$500</b>
Harrison, Irvin	D	5			<b>\$0</b>
Lundstrom, Patricia	D	5	\$1,050	\$200	<b>\$1,250</b>
Hanosh, George	D	6	\$300	\$100	<b>\$400</b>
Luna, Fred	D	8	\$8,350	\$2,250	<b>\$10,600</b>
Cordova, Kandy	D	9		\$300	<b>\$300</b>
Saavedra, Henry	D	10	\$4,700	\$1,350	<b>\$6,050</b>
Miera, Rick	D	11	\$300	\$650	<b>\$950</b>
Taylor, James	D	12	\$4,100	\$1,450	<b>\$5,550</b>
Silva, Daniel	D	13	\$6,550	\$2,550	<b>\$9,100</b>
Garcia, Miguel	D	14		\$100	<b>\$100</b>
Zanetti, Teresa	R	15			<b>\$0</b>
Ruiz, Raymond	D	16	\$950		<b>\$950</b>
Sandoval, Edward	D	17	\$1,250	\$300	<b>\$1,550</b>
Beam, Gail	D	18		\$100	<b>\$100</b>
Stapleton, Sheryl	D	19	\$500	\$100	<b>\$600</b>
Hobbs, Ted	R	20	\$3,350	\$6,050	<b>\$9,400</b>
Stewart, Mimi	D	21	\$300	\$550	<b>\$850</b>
Godbey, Ron	R	22	\$1,300	\$700	<b>\$2,000</b>
Youngberg, Eric	R	23		\$200	<b>\$200</b>
Arnold-Jones, Janice	R	24			<b>\$0</b>
Picraux, Danice	D	25		\$600	<b>\$600</b>
Park, Al	D	26			<b>\$0</b>
Larranaga, Larry	R	27	\$1,000	\$800	<b>\$1,800</b>
Ogle, Rory	R	28			<b>\$0</b>
Anderson, Thomas	R	29			<b>\$0</b>
White, Robert	R	30			<b>\$0</b>
Thompson, Joe	R	31	\$2,700	\$500	<b>\$3,200</b>
Irwin, Dona	D	32	\$1,500	\$500	<b>\$2,000</b>
Taylor, J.	D	33	\$700	\$500	<b>\$1,200</b>
Garcia, Mary	D	34	\$3,000	\$600	<b>\$3,600</b>
Lujan, Antonio	D	35			<b>\$0</b>
Nunez, Andy	D	36	\$1,200	\$300	<b>\$1,500</b>
Boykin, William	R	37			<b>\$0</b>
Hamilton, Dianne	R	38	\$1,100	\$500	<b>\$1,600</b>
Herrera, Manuel	D	39	\$1,000	\$300	<b>\$1,300</b>

Salazar, Nick	D	40	\$700	\$300	<b>\$1,000</b>
Rodella, Debbie	D	41	\$7,500	\$1,250	<b>\$8,750</b>
Gonzales, Roberto	D	42	\$2,750	\$200	<b>\$2,950</b>
Wallace, Jeannette	R	43	\$970	\$300	<b>\$1,270</b>
Powdrell-Culbert, Jane	R	44	\$500	\$300	<b>\$800</b>
Trujillo, Jim	D	45			<b>\$0</b>
Lujan, Ben	D	46	\$5,100	\$1,650	<b>\$6,750</b>
Varela, Luciano	D	48	\$3,050	\$900	<b>\$3,950</b>
Coll, Max	D	49	\$1,000	\$600	<b>\$1,600</b>
Tripp, Don	R	49			<b>\$0</b>
King, Rhonda	D	50	\$1,400	\$300	<b>\$1,700</b>
Vaughn, Gloria	R	51	\$550	\$700	<b>\$1,250</b>
Cervantes, Joseph	D	52	\$500	\$300	<b>\$800</b>
Marquardt, Terry	R	53	\$2,700	\$500	<b>\$3,200</b>
Stell, Joe	D	54		\$500	<b>\$500</b>
Heaton, John	D	55		\$500	<b>\$500</b>
Williams, W.	R	56	\$300	\$100	<b>\$400</b>
Foley, Daniel	R	57	\$2,150	\$800	<b>\$2,950</b>
Ponce, Pauline	D	58	\$500	\$300	<b>\$800</b>
Wilson, Avon	R	59			<b>\$0</b>
Swisstack, Thomas	D	60	\$500	\$200	<b>\$700</b>
Whitaker, Donald	D	61	\$3,700	\$800	<b>\$4,500</b>
Bratton, Donald	R	62			<b>\$0</b>
Campos, Jose	D	63			<b>\$0</b>
Crook, Anna	R	64	\$3,700	\$750	<b>\$4,450</b>
Madalena, James	D	65	\$1,600	\$100	<b>\$1,700</b>
Roberts, Earlene	R	66	\$650	\$500	<b>\$1,150</b>
Moore, Brian	R	67	\$1,000		<b>\$1,000</b>
Regensberg, Bengie	D	68	\$500	\$200	<b>\$700</b>
Martinez, W. Ken	D	69	\$2,900	\$600	<b>\$3,500</b>
Vigil, Richard	D	70	\$600	\$500	<b>\$1,100</b>
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$94,820</b>	<b>\$36,050</b>	<b>\$130,870</b>

Source: National Institute on Money in State Politics.

\* The legislative interests of these companies are not limited to tobacco issues.

**TOTAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS FROM TOBACCO COMPANIES,  
THEIR SUBSIDIARIES AND ALLIES TO  
MEMBERS OF THE NEW MEXICO SENATE**

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Tobacco Companies</b>	<b>Tobacco Allies*</b>	<b>Total</b>
Sharer , William	R	1		\$300	<b>\$300</b>
Hurt , Allen	R	2			<b>\$0</b>
Pinto , John	D	3	\$400		<b>\$400</b>
Rainaldi , Lidio	D	4			<b>\$0</b>
Martinez, Richard	D	5	\$400		<b>\$400</b>
Cisneros , Carlos	D	6	\$1,500	\$400	<b>\$1,900</b>
Harden , Clinton	R	7			<b>\$0</b>
Campos , Pete	D	8	\$700	\$600	<b>\$1,300</b>
Komadina , Steve	R	9			<b>\$0</b>
Gorham , Ramsay	R	10		\$700	<b>\$700</b>
Lopez , Linda	D	11	\$1,400	\$100	<b>\$1,500</b>
Romero , Richard	D	12	\$1,950	\$1,000	<b>\$2,950</b>
Feldman , Dede	D	13		\$400	<b>\$400</b>
Aragon , Manny	D	14	\$7,640	\$3,025	<b>\$10,665</b>
Snyder , H.	R	15	\$400	\$200	<b>\$600</b>
McSorley , Cisco	D	16		\$400	<b>\$400</b>
Robinson , Shannon	D	17	\$4,600	\$1,000	<b>\$5,600</b>
Boitano , Mark	R	18		\$300	<b>\$300</b>
Beffort , Sue	R	19			<b>\$0</b>
Payne , William	R	20	\$850	\$300	<b>\$1,150</b>
Cravens , Kent	R	21		\$100	<b>\$100</b>
Tsosie , Leonard	D	22		\$100	<b>\$100</b>
Carraro , Joseph	R	23	\$600	\$800	<b>\$1,400</b>
Rodriguez , Nancy	D	24	\$600		<b>\$600</b>
Maes , Roman	D	25	\$1,400	\$700	<b>\$2,100</b>
Sanchez , Bernadette	D	26	\$500	\$300	<b>\$800</b>
Ingle , Stuart	R	27	\$1,100	\$1,500	<b>\$2,600</b>
Altamirano , Ben	D	28	\$3,700	\$1,800	<b>\$5,500</b>
Sanchez , Michael	D	29	\$1,500	\$1,000	<b>\$2,500</b>
Fidel , Joseph	D	30	\$450	\$600	<b>\$1,050</b>
Nava , Cynthia	D	31			<b>\$0</b>
Jennings , Timothy	D	32	\$950	\$800	<b>\$1,750</b>
Adair, Rod	R	33	\$300	\$200	<b>\$500</b>
Kidd , Don	R	34	\$500	\$500	<b>\$1,000</b>
Smith , John	D	35			<b>\$0</b>
Garcia , Mary	D	36	\$1,550	\$900	<b>\$2,450</b>
Rawson , Leonard	R	37		\$750	<b>\$750</b>
Papen , Mary	D	38			<b>\$0</b>
Griego , Phil	D	39	\$7,050	\$500	<b>\$7,550</b>

Duran , Dianna	R	40	\$1,200	\$500	<b>\$1,700</b>
Leavell , Carroll	R	41	\$300	\$200	<b>\$500</b>
Kernan , Gay	R	42			<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$41,540</b>	<b>\$19,975</b>	<b>\$61,515</b>

Source: National Institute on Money in State Politics.

\* The legislative interests of these companies are not limited to tobacco issues.

**CONTRIBUTIONS FROM TOBACCO COMPANIES, THEIR SUBSIDIARIES  
AND THEIR ALLIES TO STATEWIDE ELECTED OFFICIALS  
AND POLITICAL PARTIES**

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Office</b>	<b>Tobacco Companies</b>	<b>Tobacco Allies*</b>	<b>Total</b>
Madrid, Patricia A	D	Attorney General		\$1,000	<b>\$1,000</b>
Richardson, Bill	D	Governor		\$1,500	<b>\$1,500</b>
Denish, Diane D	D	Lt. Governor			<b>\$0</b>
Lyons, Patrick H	R	Public Lands	\$800	\$450	<b>\$1,250</b>
Vigil, Robert E	D	Treasurer			<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$800</b>	<b>\$2,950</b>	<b>\$3,750</b>

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Office</b>	<b>Tobacco Companies</b>	<b>Tobacco Allies*</b>	<b>Total</b>
Democratic Party of New Mexico	D	Party		\$1,000	<b>\$1,000</b>
New Mexico Democratic Legislative Campaign Committee	D	Party	\$1,000		<b>\$1,000</b>
Republican Campaign Committee of New Mexico	R	Party	\$19,000		<b>\$19,000</b>
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$20,000</b>	<b>\$1,000</b>	<b>\$21,000</b>

Source: National Institute on Money in State Politics.

\* The legislative interests of these companies are not limited to tobacco issues.