

Campaign Finance Activity by Candidates for the Massachusetts General Court

2002

One Ashburton Place, Room 411 Boston, Massachusetts 02108 (617) 727-8352 (800) 462-OCPF

INTRODUCTION

This study examines campaign finance activity undertaken by candidates for the Massachusetts Senate and House of Representatives (known collectively as The General Court) in calendar year 2002. The Office of Campaign and Political Finance has issued such a biennial study since the 1990 election.

The Office of Campaign and Political Finance (OCPF) is an independent state agency that administers Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 55, the Campaign Finance Law. The law provides for disclosure and regulation of campaign finance activity on the state, county and municipal levels. Candidates who report directly to OCPF include those running for state and county office and some citywide offices in Boston, Cambridge, Lowell, Springfield and Worcester, as well as state and local party committees, political action committees, people's committees and state ballot question committees. The reports filed by these candidates and committees are available for public inspection at OCPF's office at the John W. McCormack Building, One Ashburton Place, Boston. Reports from some of the above candidates and committees are also available on the office's web site at *www.mass.gov/ocpf*.

The information contained in this legislative spending study is based on data for 2002 compiled from campaign finance reports filed by candidates and treasurers of political committees organized on behalf of candidates for the Massachusetts Senate and House. The campaign finance law defines a "candidate" as a person who takes steps to advance himself or herself for nomination or election to an office, whether by gathering signatures to get on the ballot or mounting a write-in or sticker campaign. In 2002, a total of 372 candidates sought legislative office and filed disclosure reports with OCPF: 61 running for the Senate and 311 running for the House. The total number of legislative candidates in 2002 is an increase of 42 over the 2000 election.

Legislative candidates and their committees are required to file three campaign finance reports for an election year. The reports are due with OCPF eight days prior to the September state primary election; eight days prior to the November general election; and on January 20. Reports were due from the candidates in this study on Sept. 9 and Oct. 28, 2002, and Jan. 21, 2003. (Only one report is due for a non-election year, such as 2003.)

Starting in 2002, legislative candidates were also required to file their campaign finance reports in electronic form to an OCPF server, which then posted the information on the office web site. Electronic filing was required for candidates whose receipts or expenditures exceeded certain thresholds as set forth in M.G.L. Chapter 55, Section 18C. The thresholds were \$9,740 for candidates for the Senate and \$3,240 for candidates for the House.

Candidates and committee treasurers are required to disclose on those reports their account balances at the beginning of each reporting period; receipts and expenditures for the reporting period; in-kind contributions for the reporting period; and all liabilities.

The campaign finance law allows legislative candidates and committees to make expenditures for "the enhancement of the political future of the candidate," as long as the expenditure is not primarily for the personal use of a candidate or any other person. Some of the expenditures that are included in the totals contained in this report, especially expenditures by incumbents, may not have been directly related to campaigning. For example, candidates may use campaign funds for purposes such as constituent or legislative services, opening or maintaining a legislative district office, charitable contributions, transportation and other activity that is for an identifiable political or governmental purpose.

In addition, some data may also reflect activity related to a municipal office also held or sought by some legislative candidates in 2002 (e.g., a city councilor or selectman running for the Senate or House). The campaign finance law does not allow the formation of more than one political committee by a candidate. A candidate holding or seeking elected positions on both the state and municipal levels has dual filing requirements with OCPF and his or her local election official, but the candidate's reports reflect activity by only one committee.

OCPF has taken steps to ensure that the information contained in this study is accurate as of the time of its compilation, the summer of 2003. This study takes into account many corrections, additions or deletions made by candidates as a result of any review conducted by OCPF or amendments filed by candidates or political committees. Nevertheless, the information used for this study does not reflect subsequent amendments. In addition, the information provided by candidates and committees may include some mathematical errors and balance inconsistencies. Finally, comparative data are not adjusted for inflation.

This study was compiled and written by Denis Kennedy, OCPF's Director of Public Information, based on information filed by candidates and committees. Anyone wishing further information on the study or any other facet of the Massachusetts campaign finance law may contact the Office of Campaign and Political Finance, McCormack Building, One Ashburton Place, Room 411, Boston, MA 02108, or call (617) 727-8352 or (800) 462-OCPF. This study and other data are also available on the office's web site, at *www.mass.gov/ocpf*.

September 2003

OVERVIEW

A total of 372 candidates sought election to the House or Senate in 2002. Of that number, 61 ran for the 40 seats in the Senate and 311 for the 160-seat House. The number of candidates in 2002 is a net increase of 42 from the total posted in 2000: 46 more in the House, four fewer in the Senate. The 2000 total was the lowest ever recorded since OCPF started publishing the first of its legislative campaign finance studies after the 1990 election. (The highest number of candidates ever recorded in an OCPF study was 507 in 1990.)

Of the 200 legislative seats, 102 were contested by more than one candidate. That 51 percent rate is up seven points from 2000 and is comparable to the rate in 1998.

Of the 372 candidates for the General Court, 183, or 49 percent, were incumbents and 189, or 51 percent, were non-incumbents. Of the 183 incumbents, 177, or 96 percent, were re-elected, 98 after running unopposed. Twenty-three non-incumbents were elected: one new senator and 22 new representatives.

The finding for each of the two chambers of the Legislature are broken down in each of the two sections that follow this introduction. A few points, however, can be noted in the aggregate figures for both chambers:

o **Total raised and spent**: Changes in total receipts and expenditures from 2000 were mixed. House and Senate candidates combined raised a total of \$11,566,192, a decrease of 5 percent from two years before. Total expenditures were \$11,976,712, up almost 9 percent. The total legislative spending figure is third all-time, behind the high of \$12.3 million recorded in 1992 and the \$12.2 million from 1990.

Totals in the individual chambers also went in opposite directions. Total receipts by Senate candidates dropped 31 percent from 2000, while expenditures went down 4 percent. In the House, where the number of candidates rose significantly from 2000, total receipts were up 15 percent and expenditures rose 17 percent. Both aggregate figures for House candidates were all-time highs.

o Average receipts and expenditures: In both chambers, average receipts were down from 2000, while average expenditures rose to all-time highs. Average receipts in the Senate were \$62,619, a drop of 26 percent, while average expenditures were \$68,482, a rise of 2 percent to an all-time high. In the House, average receipts fell 2 percent to \$24,908 and average expenditures rose less than 1 percent to \$25,078, marking a new all-time high for the House.

- o **Top Spender:** In 2002, the legislative candidate spending the most money won 90 of the 102 contested races, for a success rate of 88 percent. That is an increase of seven percentage points from 2000 and is identical to the 1998 rate.
- o **Types of candidates and races**: As in past years, Democrats and incumbents showed significantly more campaign finance activity than their opponents. Candidates who won their races in 2002 usually started and finished the year with more money than their opponents. The lists of the top ten most active individual candidates in terms of fundraising and spending was made up mostly of incumbents and candidates for open or hotly contested seats.
- Public funds: The 2002 election marked the first time public funding was made available to legislative candidates. A total of \$200,205 was given to 11 candidates, all for the House, in the Clean Elections program, which offered public funds to candidates who agreed to statutory contribution and spending limits. This was the first election covered by the program and the last: the Clean Elections Law was repealed in June 2003. Further information on the program may be found in the House section of this study.

Aggregate Campaign Finance Activity by Legislative Candidates 1990-2002

SENATE	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002
Candidates	106	111	85	63	71	65	61
Total received	\$4,530,863	\$5,674,643	\$4,829,019	\$3,510,827	\$3,809,576	\$5,504,933	\$3,819,774
Average received	\$42,744	\$51,123	\$56,812	\$55,727	\$53,656	\$84,691	\$62,619
Total spent	\$5,060,968	\$6,086,061	\$5,044,959	\$3,211,808	\$3,806,032	\$4,369,766	\$4,177,425
Average spent	\$47,745	\$54,829	\$59,352	\$50,981	\$53,606	\$67,227	\$68,482

HOUSE	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002
Candidates	401	361	323	280	296	265	311
Total received	\$6,787,691	\$6,342,000	\$5,662,804	\$5,165,929	\$6,765,000	\$6,718,138	\$7,746,418
	+-, -,	+-,- ,	+-,,	+-,,	+-,,	+-, -,	+ , -, -
Average received	\$16,927	\$17,568	\$17,532	\$18,450	\$22,855	\$25,351	\$24,908
T . ()	\$7,400,457	#0.050.005	\$5,400,774	# E 005 005	\$0.075.004	* 0.040.000	¢7 700 000
Total spent	\$7,129,457	\$6,250,385	\$5,488,771	\$5,065,065	\$6,875,821	\$6,643,626	\$7,799,288
Average spent	\$17,779	\$17,314	\$16,993	\$18,090	\$23,229	\$25,070	\$25,078

SECTION I: THE SENATE

The race for the Senate in 2002 featured a decline in both the number of candidates and in aggregate campaign finance activity from two years before. Total expenditures dipped slightly from 2000, and total receipts were down more significantly from that year, returning to a level more in line with previous election years. The average expenditure figure for a Senate candidate, however, rose to an all-time high.

The 61 candidates in 2002 represented a drop of four from 2000 and the lowest number of Senate candidates since OCPF began issuing studies on legislative campaign finance activity after the 1990 election.¹

Of the 40 races for a Senate seat, 23 featured candidates who were unopposed for election, all of them incumbents. The other 17 races featured 38 candidates, including 16 incumbents. All of the incumbents who were opposed were re-elected. Therefore, 39 Senate incumbents were returned to office in the 2002 election. The single new senator, who was elected to an open seat, also had some legislative experience: he was a member of the House in 2002. Thirty-four Democrats and six Republicans were elected, an increase of one for the Democrats.

OVERVIEW OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY FOR SENATE CANDIDATES 2000 & 2002

	2000	2002
Number of candidates	65	61
Total on hand at start	\$3,763,841	\$3,261,677
Total receipts	\$5,504,933	\$3,819,774
Total expenditures	\$4,369,766	\$4,177,425
Average receipts per candidate	\$84,691	\$62,619
Average expenditures per candidate	\$67,227	\$68,482
Total on hand at end	\$4,895,953	\$2,919,457.13

Expenditures do not include debts incurred that had not been paid at the end of 2002. Also, total receipts do not include in-kind contributions, which are things of value other than money. Senate candidates reported receiving \$44,893 in in -kind contributions in 2002, down about \$650 from 2000.

¹ This study does not include campaign finance activity in special elections for three vacated Senate seats that occurred in early 2002: the 3rd Essex (won by Steven Baddour), 1st Suffolk (John Hart) and 1st Essex (Thomas McGee) districts. Each of those senators ran for re-election in the fall; figures for those candidates in this report reflect activity after the closing date for their post-special-election reports. Figures for the special elections are available from OCPF.

Aggregate fundraising and spending by Senate candidates dropped in 2002 from the previous election year in 2000. Total receipts were down about \$1.7 million, or 31 percent, while expenditures were down more slightly, by just under \$200,000, or 4 percent. One reason for the decrease was undoubtedly a drop in total candidates of five from 2000; however, it should be noted that it is difficult to compare election years because each election year presents different roster of candidates and variety of races.

The receipt and expenditure totals are far from the records for each category, which were both set in 1992. In that year 111 candidates (almost twice the number that ran in 2002) reported \$5.67 million in receipts and \$6.1 million in expenditures.

The \$68,642 spent by the average candidate is the highest ever recorded in an OCPF study, exceeding the previous high of \$67,227 posted in 2000. The average receipt figure, however, represented a decline of 26 percent.

The significant drop in both total and average receipts from 2000 represents a "correction" from a figure that could be considered anomalous and was fueled chiefly by one candidate. Thomas Birmingham, who was Senate president in 2000, set a record for fundraising by amassing about \$1.4 million that year. (Most of the money was not used in the Senate race; in early 2001 Birmingham , who had been unopposed for re-election in 2000, announced his candidacy for governor and subsequently used funds on hand for his gubernatorial campaign.) The receipt totals for 1996 and 1998 had not exceeded \$3.8 million, making the \$5.5 million posted in 2000 stand out. The 2002 receipts total is only a few thousand dollars more than the 1998 figure.

The 2002 figures reflect the absence of Birmingham in other receipt categories as well, with decreases in totals for Democrats, incumbents and winners. Nevertheless, those categories once again showed significant amounts of campaign finance activity in 2002. As a whole, incumbents once again outspent non-incumbents, Democrats outspent Republicans and those who spent the most in a race usually won. The 2002 election also saw the most expensive Senate race ever recorded in an OCPF study, with a total of \$809,637 in expenditures for a single open seat. The winner of that seat, Jarrett Barrios, also set a new record for expenditures by a single Senate candidate.

The findings in greater detail:

I. Success of Campaigns

Winners in Senate campaigns almost always outspent their opponents in 2002, continuing a trend from recent years. The candidate who spent the most money won in 16 of the 17 races for contested seats, or 94 percent of the time. (The percentage was down slightly from 2000, when the top spender won 84 percent of the time, or 16 of 19 races).

The only exception was in the Plymouth and Norfolk District, where Robert Hedlund won re-election despite being outspent by Theodore LeClair by about \$15,000.

In the aggregate, the 40 successful candidates, including the 23 unopposed incumbents, outspent the 20 losing candidates almost four -to-one, \$3.3 million to \$875,487 in 2002. (The ratio was three-to-one in 2000.) The difference in total funds raised was more than three-to-one, a reduction from the four-to-one difference in 2000.

The average amount raised and spent by both winners and losers in 2002 showed little change over two years before, with one exception. The average amount raised by a winner dropped by 33 percent (a reflection of Birmingham's presence in the 2000 numbers), while the average raised by an unsuccessful candidate dropped about 4 percent. The average spending by both types of candidates showed little change: the average spent by a successful candidate increased by less than 1 percent and the average for an unsuccessful candidate dropped almost 3 percent.

(Some candidates were able to spend more than they raised due to existing balances with which they began the year.)

SENATE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY SUCCESS OF CAMPAIGNS 2002

	Successful (40)	Unsuccessful (21)
Total receipts	\$3,007,702	\$812,072
Average receipts	\$75,193	\$38,670
Total expenditures	\$3,301,937	\$875,487
Average expenditures	\$82,548	\$41,690

II. Incumbency

Once again, incumbents accounted for the bulk of campaign finance activity in 2002. The 39 incumbent senators on the ballot accounted for 65 percent of all candidates, but their share of the fundraising and spending was slightly larger: 73 and 69 percent, respectively. Incumbents as a group, both opposed and unopposed, once again outspent and outraised non-incumbents more than two to one. (For the purposes of this report, incumbents are defined as those individuals holding the office of senator at the time of the 2002 election and seeking re-election.)

SENATE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY INCUMBENCY 2002

	Incumbents (39)	Non-Incumbents (22)
Total Receipts	\$2,773,344.00	1,046,429.41
Average Receipts	\$71,111.38	47,564.97
Total Expenditures	\$2,892,797.43	1,284,627.11
Average Expenditures	\$74,174.29	58,392.14

The average raised by an incumbent dropped about 36 percent from 2000 (due largely to the Birmingham factor) while the average raised by a non-incumbent rose 3 percent. The changes were also mixed on the expenditure side of the ledger: average expenditures by an incumbent dropped 6 percent, while the average expenditures by a non-incumbent rose significant ly, about 17 percent.

Historically, much of the expenditures by incumbents are not necessarily related directly to their election campaigns (such as bumper stickers or advertisements), but are geared toward constituent or legislative expenses. The campaign finance law allows campaign funds to be used for such expenditures as maintaining a district office, charitable contributions and official or political travel that is not otherwise paid for by the Commonwealth.

III. Party Affiliation

Once again, Democrats accounted for a substantial majority of the candidates and of those who won in 2002. This predominance was also illustrated in campaign finance activity, where as a whole they outspent Republicans almost five to one.

The 42 Democrats running in 2002 represented 69 percent of the candidates but accounted for 83 percent of funds raised and 83 percent of those spent. The fundraising percentage is virtually identical to 2000, but the spending figure is 7 percentage points higher. The 17 Republic an candidates (28 percent of the total) accounted for just under 17 percent of the fundraising and about 17 percent of the spending. The drop in total Republican spending directly reflects the Democratic rise, 7 percentage points.

SENATE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY PARTY AFFILIATION 2002

	Democrats (42)	Republicans (17)	Libertarian (1)	Unenrolled (1)
Total receipts	3,176,353.74	\$641,046	\$1,660	\$714
Average receipts	75,627.47	\$37,709		
Total expenditures	3,460,841.68	\$714,151	\$1,718	\$714
Average expenditures	82,400.99	\$42,009		

The averages amounts raised and spent by the two major party candidates declined from 2000, with one exception. On the fundraising side, the average Democrat raised 29 percent less while the average Republican raised 26 percent less. On the spending side, the average Democrat spent 7 percent more and the average Republican spent 31 percent less.

IV. Contested and Uncontested Races

Opposed candidates have traditionally outspent those who were unopposed, both in total and on average.² While the average unopposed candidate raised slightly more than an opposed candidate in 2002, the average opposed candidate led in spending by a substantial margin. The average amount raised by an opposed candidate was virtually unchanged from 2000 while the average spent by an opposed candidate rose 9 percent, respectively; one the other hand, the 2002 figures for unopposed candidates showed decreases of 52 percent and 9 percent. (The substantially higher receipt figures in 2000 reflected activity by Thomas Birmingham.)

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY SENATE CANDIDATES OPPOSED AND UNOPPOSED 2002

	Opposed (38)	Unopposed (23)
Total Receipts	2,370,277.69	1,449,496.12
Average receipts	62,375.72	63,021.57
Total Expenditures	2,817,755.32	1,359,669.22
Average Expenditures	74,151.45	59,116.05

² Some studies of legislative races have used other criteria in determining whether a race was "contested" or whether an incumbent was "opposed," looking at such factors as whether the winner exceeded a certain margin of victory or whether an opponent had any campaign finance activity. This study considered a race contested if there were two or more candidates for the seat, regardless of the outcome or the level of campaign finance ac tivity.

CONTESTED SEATS

Seventeen of the 40 races for the Senate in 2002 were contested, featuring more than one candidate. Those 17 races can be grouped in two categories: contests for open seats being vacated by incumbents (1) and those featuring an incumbent facing opposition (16). Of the two types of races, the race for the single open seat was the most active in terms of average amounts spent and raised, with its contenders setting records in both categories.

The sole contest for an *open seat* was in the Middlesex, Suffolk and Essex District, where three candidates -- Jarrett Barrios, Carlo DeMaria Jr. and Anthony Galluccio -- were vying to succeed Thomas Birmingham.

The three candidates raised a total of \$634,612, or \$211,537 each, and spent \$809,637, or \$269,879 each. As detailed below, this contest was the most expensive ever recorded in an OCPF study.

* * * * *

District	Candidates		
Berkshire, Hampshire &	Andrea Nuciforo*, William Foley		
Franklin			
Cape & Islands	Robert O'Leary*, Mark Boardman		
1 st Essex & Middlesex	Bruce Tarr*, Andrew Armata, Mark Caggiano		
2 nd Essex & Middlesex	Susan Tucker*, Maria Marasco		
2 nd Hampden & Hampshire	Michael Knapik*, Daniel Szostkiewicz		
1 st Middlesex	Steven Panagiotakos*, Brooks Lyman		
Middlesex & Worcester	Pamela Resor*, Mary Jane Hillery		
Norfolk, Bristol & Middlesex	Cheryl Jacques*, Earl Sholle y		
Norfolk, Bristol & Plymouth	Brian Joyce*, Peri O'Connor		
Plymouth & Barnstable	Therese Murray*, Christopher Fava		
Plymouth & Norfolk	Robert Hedlund*, Theodore LeClair		
1 st Suffolk	John Hart*, Walter Campbell, Althea Garrison,		
	Carol Mallory-Causey		
1 st Suffolk & Middlesex	Robert Travaglini*, Vincent Managnello		
1 st Worcester	Harriette Chandler*, Robert Amorello		
Worcester, Hampden,	Stephen Brewer*, Carolyn McMahon		
Hampshire & Franklin			
Worcester & Norfolk	Richard Moore*, Ralph Perez		

Sixteen seats saw *contested races featuring incumbents*, who won each time:

* Winner.

In these 16 contested races featuring the incumbent, the 35 candidates raised a total of \$1,735,666, or \$49,590 per candidate, and spent \$2,006,748, or \$57,375 per candidate.

V. Starting Balances

Senate candidates reported having \$3,261,677 on hand at the beginning of 2000. That figure is about \$500,000 less than the comparable figure in 2000.

Once again, a sizeable majority of the funds on hand was held by incumbents. Those who were in office at the start of the election year and later ran for re-election reported having 93 percent of the total available at the start of the election year. The comparable percentage for the incumbents' share in 2000 was 97 percent. The average starting balance on hand in an incumbent's account in 2002 was \$77,488 versus the non-incumbent's average of \$11,412.

It should be noted that many challengers are first-time candidates who begin their campaign with zero balances. Sixteen Senate candidates reported having no funds on hand at the beginning of 2002; in fact, many ha ve not even organized campaign committees by then. The starting balance figures therefore have traditionally favored incumbents.

The other candidate categories with greater activity also showed larger starting balances. For example, Democrats showed an average starting balance of \$75,121 versus an average of \$10,688 for Republicans (the two unenrolled or minor party candidates reported no starting cash on hand). The average winner had \$80,198 on hand at the start of 2002, compared to \$2,688 for those who did not win. Unopposed candidates reported having an average of \$91,283 to start, versus \$31,410 for those who were opposed.

All of the 10 candidates with the largest starting balances in 2002 were incumbents and Democrats. Six of those 10 ultimately had no opposition that year. All were reelected.

SENATE CANDIDATES WITH THE HIGHEST STARTING BALANCES

	Candidate	District	Balance	Opposed	Elected
1.	Mark C. Montigny (D) (I)	2nd Bristol & Plymouth	\$766,744	No	Yes
2.	Cheryl A. Jacques (D) (I)	Norfolk, Bristol & Middlesex	\$206,501	Yes	Yes
3.	Jarrett T. Barrios (D)*	Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex	\$185,896	Yes	Yes
4.	Michael W. Morrissey (D) (I)	Norfolk & Plymouth	\$180,794	No	Yes
5.		Worcester, Hampden, Hampshire & Franklin	\$161,002	Yes	Yes
6.	Marc R. Pacheco (D) (I)	1st Plymouth & Bristol	\$131,233	No	Yes
7.	Frederick E. Berry (D) (I)	2nd Essex	\$126,849	No	Yes
8.	Guy W. Glodis (D) (I)	2nd Worcester	\$112,541	No	Yes
9.	Linda J. Melconian (D) (I)	Hampden	\$111,325	No	Yes
	Robert E. Travaglini (D) (I)	1st Suffolk & Middlesex	\$101,715	Yes	Yes

(As of Jan. 1, 2002)

I = Incumbent D=Democrat

* Barrios was a member of the House in 2002.

VI. Most Active Candidates and Races

Of the 17 contested races in 2002, the most expensive was in the Middlesex, Suffolk and Essex District, where three candidates sought the seat being vacated by Thomas Birmingham. The winner, state Rep. Jarrett Barrios, defeated the other two candidates in the Democratic primary and was unopposed in the general election. The three candidates reported raising a total of \$634,612 and spending \$809,637. Both figures are the highest for a contest Senate race ever recorded in an OCPF study. The previous single-race spending record was \$505,056, set in 1990.

Of the top 10 most expensive contested Senate races in 2002, nine were won by incumbents and one by a non -incumbent seeking an open seat.

SENATE RACES WITH THE HIGHEST SPENDING 2002

	District	Total spent	Number of candidates	Winner
1.	Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex (O)	\$809,637	3	Jarrett Barrios
2.	Plymouth & Norfolk	\$289,882	2	Robert Hedlund (I)
3.	Norfolk, Bristol & Plymouth	\$251,981	2	Brian Joyce (I)
4.	1st Suffolk	\$172,940	4	John Hart (I)
5.	1st Worcester	\$171,610	2	Harriette Chandler (I)
6.	1st Essex & Middlesex	\$169,017	3	Bruce Tarr (I)
7.	1st Suffolk & Middlesex	\$135,171	2	Robert Travaglini (I)
8.	Worcester & Norfolk	\$124,779	2	Richard Moore (I)
9.	Plymouth & Barnstable	\$124,484	2	Therese Murray (I)
10.	2nd Essex & Middlesex	\$121,821	2	Susan Tucker (I)

(O) = Open seat (I) = Incumbent

The least expensive Senate race was in the Worcester, Hampden and Hampshire District, where two candidates -- incumbent Stephen Brewer and challenger Carolyn McMahon – spent a total of \$33,282.

* * * * *

The list of candidates who raised the most money in 2002 includes four non incumbents who were in some of the most expensive races, as well as six incumbents who were re-elected. All of the top ten were Democrats. Seven were in contested races; four of whom were elected.

The top fundraiser among Senate candidates in 2002 was Anthony Galluccio, who raised \$246,029 in his unsuccessful attempt to win the vacant Middlesex, Suffolk and Essex seat. The winner of that race, Jarrett Barrios, was second. Galluccio's figure falls well short of the \$1.358 million raised by Thomas Birmingham in 2000. However, Birmingham was unopposed that year; Galluccio's fundraising total is the highest of any candidate in a contested race recorded in an OCPF study, eclipsing the previous record of \$243,048 raised by William Bulger in 1990.

SENATE CANDIDATES RAISING THE MOST MONEY IN 2002

	Candidate	District	Receipts	Opposed	Elected
1.	Anthony D. Galluccio (D)	Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex (O)	\$246,029	Yes	No
2.	Jarrett T. Barrios (D)	Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex (O)	\$234,358	Yes	Yes
3.	Brian A. Joyce (D)(I)	Norfolk, Bristol & Plymouth	\$229,809	Yes	Yes
4.	Robert E. Travaglini (D)(I)	1st Suffolk & Middlesex	\$176,222	Yes	Yes
5.	Mark C. Montigny (D)(I)	2nd Bristol & Plymouth	\$155,517	No	Yes
6.	Carlo DeMaria Jr. (D)	Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex	\$154,225	Yes	No
7.	Guy W. Glodis (D)(I)	2nd Worcester	\$143,504	No	Yes
8.	Theodore LeClair (D)	Plymouth & Norfolk	\$133,812	Yes	No
9.	Linda J. Melconian (D)(I)	Hampden	\$108,179	No	Yes
10.	John A. Hart Jr. (D)(I)	1st Suffolk	\$106,613	Yes	Yes

*O=Open seat. I = Incumbent. D= Democrat. R=Republican

All 61 Senate candidates reported raising some funds in 2002. The winning candidate who raised the least amount of money was incumbent Jo Ann Sprague of the Bristol and Norfolk District, who reported receipts totaling \$977. Sprague was unopposed for re-election. The winning opposed candidate who raised the least was incumbent Cheryl Jacques of the Norfolk, B ristol and Middlesex District, who reported receipts of \$24,071.

* * * * *

The top ten list for spending in 2002 included candidates from several of the most expensive races, listed above, including all three candidates from the most exp ensive. All of the candidates were in contested races; seven were elected. Six of the candidates on the list were incumbents, and nine were Democrats.

SENATE CANDIDATES SPENDING THE MOST MONEY IN 2002

	Candidate	District	Expenditures	Opposed	Elected
1.	Jarrett T. Barrios (D)	Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex (O)	\$409,140	Yes	Yes
2.	Anthony D. Galluccio (D)	Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex (O)	\$245,811	Yes	No
3.	Brian A. Joyce (D)(I)	Norfolk, Bristol & Plymouth	\$229,977	Yes	Yes
4.	John A. Hart Jr. (D)(I)	1st Suffolk	\$162,852	Yes	Yes
5.	Carlo DeMaria Jr. (D)	Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex (O)	\$154,686	Yes	No
6.	Theodore LeClair (D)	Plymouth & Norfolk	\$152,223	Yes	No
7.	Robert L. Hedlund (R)(I)	Plymouth & Norfolk	\$137,658	Yes	Yes
8.	Robert E Travaglini (D)(I)	1st Suffolk & Middlesex	\$133,551	Yes	Yes
9.	Harriette L. Chandler (D)(I)	1st Worcester	\$126,173	Yes	Yes
10.	Richard T. Moore (D)(I)	Worcester & Norfolk	\$124,743	Yes	Yes

*O=Open seat. I = Incumbent. D= Democrat. R=Republican

Barrios' spending figure is the highest ever recorded for a Senate candidate in an OCPF study, surpassing the previous high of \$311,862 posted by William Bulger in 1990. Like Barrios, Bulger was also opposed for election. Unlike Barrios, however, Bulger was an incumbent senator seeking re-election.

All of the 61 Senate candidates reported spending some money, ranging from \$36.75 to \$409,140. The successful candidate who spent the least overall was unopposed incumbent Jo Ann Sprague of the Bristol and Norfolk District, whose expenditures were \$265. As noted above, Sprague also raised the least of any successful candidate. The winning opposed candidate spending the least amount of money in 2002 was incumbent Robert O'Leary of the Cape and Islands District, who reported expenditures of \$27,738.

VII. Ending Balances

Senate candidates reported finishing 2002 with a total of \$2,919,457, or about \$342,000 less than their total at the start of the year.³ The \$2.9 million figure is almost \$2 million less than the balance at the end of 2000; however, Thomas Birmingham's record \$2.2 million balance significantly affected the 2000 total. The 2002 figure is more comparable to the ending balance in 1998, which was \$2.5 million. Birmingham also posted the highest ending balan ce that year, but his total was only \$422,961.

³ This ending balance may not correspond exactly with the aggregate starting balance, total receipts and total expenditures.

The types of candidates that were dominant in other categories also accounted for the bulk of cash on hand at year-end: the largest shares were held by incumbents (99.3 percent), winners (99.6 percent), Democrats (96.2 percent), and unopposed candidates (75 percent). The average incumbent reported a war chest of \$74,301 at the close of the year.

As was the case in 1998 and 2000, all of the candidates with the ten highest ending balances in 2002 were incumb ents and all had been re-elected. All were Democrats. Seven had not been opposed for re-election.

SENATE CANDIDATES WITH THE HIGHEST ENDING BALANCES

	Candidate	District	Balance	Opposed	Elected
1.	Mark C. Montigny (D)(I)	2nd Bristol & Plymouth	\$829,830	No	Yes
2.	Michael W. Morrissey (D)(I)	Norfolk & Plymouth	\$207,340	No	Yes
3.	Guy W. Glodis (D)(I)	2nd Worcester	\$197,643	No	Yes
4.	Cheryl A. Jacques (D)(I)	Norfolk, Bristol and Middlesex	\$188,195	Yes	Yes
5.	Stephen M. Brewer (D)(I)	Worcester, Hampden, Hampshire & Franklin	\$180,054	Yes	Yes
6.	Robert E. Travaglini (D)(I)	1st Suffolk & Middlesex	\$144,385	Yes	Yes
7.	Marc R. Pacheco (D)(I)	1st Plymouth & Bristol	\$139,617	No	Yes
8.	Linda J. Melconian (D)(I)	Hampden	\$110,645	No	Yes
9.	Frederick E. Berry (D)(I)	2nd Essex	\$73,635	No	Yes
	Charles E. Shannon Jr. (D)(I)	2nd Middlesex	\$70,610	No	Yes

(As of Dec. 31, 2002)

I = Incumbent. D= Democrat. R=Republican

Seven Senate candidates reported having no money at the end of 2002; all were non-incumbents who were not elected. The incumbent (and the winning candidate) with the least amount on hand was Brian Joyce of the Norfolk, Bristol and Plymouth District, who reported a balance of \$469. Joyce was opposed for re-election and had spent \$229,977 in 2002.

A table of campaign finance activity by all Senate candidates may be found immediately following this section.

Campaign Finance Activity by Candidates for the Senate 2002

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
Berkshire, Ha	mpshire & Frank	lin							
William	n P. Foley		U		L	\$0.00	\$714.00	\$714.00	\$0.00
Andrea	a F. Nuciforo, Jr.		D	I	W	\$43,053.19	\$30,175.59	\$41,048.05	\$32,180.73
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$43,053.19	\$30,889.59	\$41,762.05	\$32,180.73
Bristol & Norf	olk								
Jo Ann	Sprague		R	I	W	\$2,234.95	\$976.59	\$265.08	\$2,946.46
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$2,234.95	\$976.59	\$265.08	\$2,946.46
1st Bristol & F	Plymouth								
Joan M	1. Menard		D	I	W	\$45,141.96	\$41,900.00	\$30,161.71	\$54,859.04
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$45,141.96	\$41,900.00	\$30,161.71	\$54,859.04
2nd Bristol &	Plymouth								
Mark C	C. Montigny		D	I	W	\$766,743.82	\$155,516.63	\$92,430.50	\$829,829.95
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$766,743.82	\$155,516.63	\$92,430.50	\$829,829.95

1

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
Cape &	Islands								
I	Mark Boardman		R		L	\$4,875.00	\$26,286.22	\$30,558.82	\$602.40
	Robert O'Leary		D	I	W	\$0.00	\$36,765.00	\$27,738.25	\$9,832.94
	Total candidates for seat:	2				\$4,875.00	\$63,051.22	\$58,297.07	\$10,435.34
1st Esse	ex								
	Steven A. Baddour		D	I	W	\$1,777.32	\$59,530.82	\$34,545.63	\$26,762.51
	Total candidates for seat:	1				\$1,777.32	\$59,530.82	\$34,545.63	\$26,762.51
2nd Ess	sex								
	Frederick E. Berry		D	I	W	\$126,848.63	\$39,250.70	\$92,464.22	\$73,635.11
	Total candidates for seat:	1				\$126,848.63	\$39,250.70	\$92,464.22	\$73,635.11
1st Esse	ex & Middlesex								
	Andrew F. Armata		D		L	\$0.00	\$34,245.00	\$33,921.00	\$324.00
	Mark Caggiano		D		L	\$19,503.63	\$6,320.00	\$44,941.45	\$0.00
	Bruce Tarr		R	I	W	\$19,034.52	\$78,723.00	\$90,154.63	\$7,602.89
	Total candidates for seat:	3				\$38,538.15	\$119,288.00	\$169,017.08	\$7,926.89
2nd Ess	sex & Middlesex								
	Maria Marasco		R		L	\$0.00	\$37,886.18	\$36,111.47	\$1,774.71
	Susan C. Tucker		D	I	W	\$70,417.58	\$57,125.04	\$85,709.42	\$41,833.20
	Total candidates for seat:	2				\$70,417.58	\$95,011.22	\$121,820.89	\$43,607.91

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
3rd Essex & I	Middlesex								
Thoma	as M. McGee		D	I	W	\$38,695.65	\$18,120.00	\$20,565.40	\$36,250.25
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$38,695.65	\$18,120.00	\$20,565.40	\$36,250.25
Hampden									
Linda	J. Melconian		D	I	W	\$111,325.32	\$108,179.19	\$108,859.30	\$110,645.21
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$111,325.32	\$108,179.19	\$108,859.30	\$110,645.21
1st Hampden	N& Hampshire								
Brian I	Lees		R	I	W	\$66,031.88	\$94,830.09	\$110,047.01	\$50,814.96
Tota	I candidates for seat:	1				\$66,031.88	\$94,830.09	\$110,047.01	\$50,814.96
2nd Hampde	n & Hampshire								
Micha	el R. Knapik		R	I	W	\$21,941.00	\$76,931.02	\$88,377.18	\$10,494.84
Daniel	J. Szostkiewicz		D		L	\$6,010.00	\$13,450.00	\$19,326.40	\$25.00
Tota	al candidates for seat:	2				\$27,951.00	\$90,381.02	\$107,703.58	\$10,519.84
Hampshire &	Franklin								
Stanle	ey C. Rosenberg		D	I	W	\$22,022.72	\$45,666.42	\$42,568.44	\$25,120.70
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$22,022.72	\$45,666.42	\$42,568.44	\$25,120.70
1st Middlesex	x								
Brooks	s T. Lyman		R		L	\$0.00	\$1,857.75	\$1,948.39	\$245.44
Stever	n C. Panagiotakos		D	I	W	\$15,021.65	\$49,627.07	\$61,132.67	\$3,516.05
Tota	al candidates for seat:	2				\$15,021.65	\$51,484.82	\$63,081.06	\$3,761.49

Senate Candidates 2002

3

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
2nd Middlese	x								
Charles	s E. Shannon Jr.		D	I	W	\$82,093.40	\$83,910.00	\$95,393.52	\$70,609.88
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$82,093.40	\$83,910.00	\$95,393.52	\$70,609.88
3rd Middlesex	(
Susan	C. Fargo		D	I	W	\$19,039.09	\$23,262.19	\$21,855.18	\$20,446.10
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$19,039.09	\$23,262.19	\$21,855.18	\$20,446.10
4th Middlesex	(
Robert	A. Havern III		D	I	W	\$18,117.98	\$35,250.00	\$21,393.49	\$31,974.49
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$18,117.98	\$35,250.00	\$21,393.49	\$31,974.49
Middlesex & E	Essex								
Richard	d R. Tisei		R	I	W	\$24,128.55	\$91,646.02	\$88,876.98	\$26,897.59
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$24,128.55	\$91,646.02	\$88,876.98	\$26,897.59
1st Middlesex	& Norfolk								
Cynthia	a S. Creem		D	I	W	\$49,391.18	\$8,018.54	\$5,779.99	\$51,629.73
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$49,391.18	\$8,018.54	\$5,779.99	\$51,629.73
2nd Middlesex	x & Norfolk								
David	P. Magnani		D	I	W	\$92,301.04	\$37,586.81	\$88,561.43	\$41,326.42
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$92,301.04	\$37,586.81	\$88,561.43	\$41,326.42

District Candi	date	Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
Middlesex, Suffolk & Esse	ex							
Jarrett T. Barrios		D		W	\$185,895.88	\$234,357.51	\$409,140.03	\$11,113.36
Carlo DeMaria Jr.		D		L	\$0.00	\$154,225.46	\$154,685.85	\$0.00
Anthony D. Galluccio		D		L	\$0.00	\$246,029.30	\$245,811.36	\$217.94
Total candidates for se	eat: 3				\$185,895.88	\$634,612.27	\$809,637.24	\$11,331.30
Middlesex & Worcester								
Mary Jane Hillery		R		L	\$0.00	\$20,145.40	\$16,442.72	\$3,702.68
Pamela P. Resor		D	I	W	\$16,311.73	\$56,967.29	\$61,347.35	\$11,931.67
Total candidates for se	eat: 2				\$16,311.73	\$77,112.69	\$77,790.07	\$15,634.35
Norfolk, Bristol & Middles	ex							
Cheryl Ann Jacques		D	I	W	\$206,501.29	\$24,071.01	\$42,377.34	\$188,194.96
Earl Henry Sholley		R		L	\$2,280.00	\$20,128.98	\$22,140.95	\$268.03
Total candidates for se	eat: 2				\$208,781.29	\$44,199.99	\$64,518.29	\$188,462.99
Norfolk, Bristol & Plymout	th							
Brian A. Joyce		D	I	W	\$636.17	\$229,809.02	\$229,976.59	\$468.60
Peri J. O'Connor		D		L	\$650.00	\$21,356.38	\$22,004.07	\$2.31
Total candidates for se	eat: 2				\$1,286.17	\$251,165.40	\$251,980.66	\$470.91
Norfolk & Plymouth								
Michael W. Morrissey		D	I	W	\$180,794.40	\$69,534.63	\$42,988.74	\$207,340.29
Total candidates for se	eat: 1				\$180,794.40	\$69,534.63	\$42,988.74	\$207,340.29

Senate Candidates 2002

5

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
Plymouth & Barns	table								
Christopher L	. Fava		R		L	\$0.00	\$36,110.33	\$35,758.20	\$352.13
Therese Murr	ay		D	I	W	\$32,291.00	\$75,140.00	\$88,725.31	\$18,705.69
Total candi	dates for seat:	2				\$32,291.00	\$111,250.33	\$124,483.51	\$19,057.82
1st Plymouth & Br	ristol								
Marc R. Pach	есо		D	I	W	\$131,232.82	\$96,578.85	\$88,194.35	\$139,617.32
Total candi	dates for seat:	1				\$131,232.82	\$96,578.85	\$88,194.35	\$139,617.32
2nd Plymouth & B	ristol								
Robert S. Cre	edon Jr.		D	I	W	\$63,329.56	\$37,060.95	\$39,116.50	\$61,274.01
Total candi	dates for seat:	1				\$63,329.56	\$37,060.95	\$39,116.50	\$61,274.01
Plymouth & Norfo	lk								
Robert L. Heo	dlund		R	I	W	\$41,175.87	\$99,049.90	\$137,658.28	\$2,567.49
Theodore Le0	Clair		D		L	\$20,438.98	\$133,812.31	\$152,223.25	\$1,804.14
Total candi	dates for seat:	2				\$61,614.85	\$232,862.21	\$289,881.53	\$4,371.63
1st Suffolk									
Walter R. Ca	mpbell		R		L	\$0.00	\$6,227.77	\$6,227.77	\$0.00
Althea Garris	on		R		L	\$0.00	\$2,490.07	\$2,490.07	\$0.00
John A. Hart	Jr.		D	I	W	\$75,091.75	\$106,612.78	\$162,851.73	\$19,352.79
Carol Y. Mallo	ory-Causey		D		L	\$0.00	\$1,370.00	\$1,370.00	\$0.00
Total candi	dates for seat:	4				\$75,091.75	\$116,700.62	\$172,939.57	\$19,352.79

6

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
2nd Suffolk									
Dianr	ne Wilkerson		D	I	W	\$11,419.00	\$97,715.00	\$102,295.34	\$8,296.00
Tot	al candidates for seat:	1				\$11,419.00	\$97,715.00	\$102,295.34	\$8,296.00
1st Suffolk 8	Middlesex								
Vince	ent J. Manganello		R		L	\$0.00	\$1,620.00	\$1,620.00	\$0.00
Robe	rt E. Travaglini		D	I	W	\$101,714.92	\$176,221.54	\$133,551.36	\$144,385.10
Tot	al candidates for seat:	2				\$101,714.92	\$177,841.54	\$135,171.36	\$144,385.10
2nd Suffolk	& Middlesex								
Steve	en A. Tolman		D	I	W	\$53,151.79	\$40,180.00	\$46,410.31	\$41,381.19
Tot	al candidates for seat:	1				\$53,151.79	\$40,180.00	\$46,410.31	\$41,381.19
Suffolk & No	orfolk								
Maria	an Walsh		D	I	W	\$27,602.23	\$88,811.69	\$89,676.88	\$26,737.04
Tot	al candidates for seat:	1				\$27,602.23	\$88,811.69	\$89,676.88	\$26,737.04
1st Worceste	ər								
Robe	rt Amorello		R		L	\$0.00	\$46,100.00	\$45,436.75	\$1,263.25
Harrie	ette L. Chandler		D	I	W	\$58,022.25	\$90,245.66	\$126,173.12	\$22,046.79
Tot	al candidates for seat:	2				\$58,022.25	\$136,345.66	\$171,609.87	\$23,310.04
2nd Worcest	ter								
Guy \	William Glodis		D	I	W	\$112,541.00	\$143,504.00	\$58,402.01	\$197,642.99
Tot	al candidates for seat:	1				\$112,541.00	\$143,504.00	\$58,402.01	\$197,642.99

Senate Candidates 2002

7

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
Worcester, H Franklin	lampden, Hamps	hire &							
Stephe	en M. Brewer		D	I	W	\$161,001.89	\$50,615.99	\$31,564.28	\$180,053.60
Caroly	n McMahon		Li		L	\$0.00	\$1,660.00	\$1,717.81	\$0.00
Tota	al candidates for seat:	2				\$161,001.89	\$52,275.99	\$33,282.09	\$180,053.60
Worcester &	Middlesex								
Robert	t A. Antonioni		D	I	W	\$53,556.11	\$32,467.00	\$38,817.21	\$47,205.90
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$53,556.11	\$32,467.00	\$38,817.21	\$47,205.90
Worcester &	Norfolk								
Richar	rd T. Moore		D	I	W	\$60,288.79	\$85,768.37	\$124,742.65	\$21,314.51
Ralph	Perez		R		L	\$0.00	\$36.75	\$36.75	\$36.75
Tota	al candidates for seat:	2				\$60,288.79	\$85,805.12	\$124,779.40	\$21,351.26
Tota	al candidates:	61				\$3,261,677.49	\$3,819,773.81	\$4,177,424.54	\$2,919,457.13

SECTION II: THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The race for the House in 2002 featured a significant increase in campaign finance activity, fueled by the largest field of candidates in eight years.

A total of 311 candidates ran for the House in 2002, an increase of 46 from two years before.¹ The 2000 figure had been the lowest figure ever recorded in an OCPF study and the third consecutive time the number of candidates was below 300. (The largest number of House candidates recorded in an OCPF study was the 401 contenders in 1990.)

Of the 160 races for a House seat, 75 featured only one candidate, who in all cases was the incumbent. The remaining 85 races were contested, featuring more than one candidate (an increase of 15 contested races from 2000). Of the 236 candidates in contested races, 69 were incumbents. Of that number, 63 were re-elected and 6 were defeated. (Another 12 incumbents did not seek re-election to their seats.) Incumbents were therefore re-elected in 138 of the 144 races in which they ran, for a success rate of 93 percent. That figure is four percentage points lower than the rate in 2000. The new House that was seated in January 2003 was therefore made up of 138 returning incumbents and 22 new members. The party breakdown was 136 Democrats, 23 Republicans and 1 member who was not enrolled in a political party.

OVERVIEW OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY FOR HOUSE CANDIDATES 2000 & 2002

	2000	2002
Number of candidates	265	311
Total cash on hand at start	\$3,589,700	\$3,872,269
Total receipts	\$6,718,138	\$7,746,418
Total expenditures	\$6,643,626	\$7,799,288
Average receipts per candidate	\$25,351	\$24,908
Average expenditures per candidate	\$25,070	\$25,078
Total on hand at end	\$3,661,609	\$3,853,255

Expenditures do not include debts incurred that had not been paid at the end of 2002. Also, total receipts do not include in-kind contributions, which are things of value other than money. House candidates reported a total of \$187,724 in in-kind contributions in 2002, an increase of almost 12 percent over 2000.

¹ This study does not include campaign finance activity in the special election for a vacated House seat in the 1st Hampshire District in early 2002. Two candidates who ran in the special election, Michael Aleo and Peter Kocot, the winner, also ran in the regular election later that year. The figures for those candidates in this report reflect activity after the closing d ate for the post-special election report, which was April 29, 2002. Figures for the special election are available from OCPF.

House candidates as a whole broke records for total fundraising and spending in 2002, though their average receipts and expenditures did not exceed previous highs.

The \$7.7 million raised by candidates in 2002 is the largest House total ever recorded in an OCPF study and the first time the aggregate receipts have exceeded \$7 million.² The previous record high was \$6.787 million, set in 1990. The receipts total was an increase of 15 percent over 2000.

The \$7.8 million spending total was an increase of 17 percent over 2000 and is also the highest aggregate ever recorded, exceeding the previous record of \$7.129 million from 1990. The 2002 and 1990 totals mark the only time the aggregate House spending figure has cracked \$7 million.

In comparing the 1990 and 2002 totals, the later year is even more noteworthy in that the record amounts were set by significantly fewer candidates than in 1990. The new record totals were set by 311 candidates, 90 fewer than the number that set the previous records 12 years before.

In addition to all-time aggregate levels, four additional records were set by House candidates in 2002. The average amount spent by a candidate rose to a record \$25,078, a rise of \$8 from the previous record set in 2000. (The average amount raised by a candidate was \$24,908, which was a drop of \$443, or 2 percent, from the record high posted in 2000.) Spending by candidates for a single seat reached a new high of \$347,148. The final two records were for individual fundraising and spending: one candidate, House Speaker Thomas Finneran, set a new all-time mark in each category.

Contests for House seats were once again usually won by the candidates who had spent more than their opponents. The candidate who spent the most money in a race won over three quarters of the time.

As in the Senate, the groups that dominated campaign finance activity in the House in 2000 were Democrats, incumbents and winners. Incumbents accounted for more than half of fundraising and spending, down from their two -thirds share in 2000. Democrats expanded their advantage over Republicans, outspending them as a whole almost five to one.

The findings in greater detail:

² As of this writing (July 2003), four candidates had not filed any of the three required reports: Richard Costin (11th Essex District), Larry Lawson (11th Hampden), Richard McClure (14th Middlesex) and Shirley Owens-Hicks (6th Suffolk). The candidates are included in the roster of candidates in this report, though their figures are listed as zero. Each of the candidates was fined the statutory civil penalty of \$10 for each day a report was overdue, and each was subsequently referred to the Attorney General for further action.

I. Winners vs. Losers

Those who ultimately won their races continued to account for most of the total fundraising and spending in House campaigns. In 2000, the 160 successful candidates raised and spent two-thirds of the money, down about six percentage points from 2000. As a whole, winners in 2002 once again outraised and outspent their opponents two-to-one.

In the 85 contested races for a House seat in 2002, the candidate who spent the most money 74 times, for a success rate of 87 percent. That rate is up seven points from 2000 and the same as the 1998 rate.

HOUSE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY SUCCESS OF CAMPAIGNS 2002

	Successful (160)	Unsuccessful (151)
Total Receipts	\$5,225,058	\$2,521,361
Average Receipts	\$32,657	\$16,698
Total Expenditures	\$5,151,200	\$2,648,088
Average Expenditures	\$32,195	\$17,537

Average receipts and expenditures for successful candidates rose from their 2000 levels by 6 percent and 7 percent, respectively. For those who were not elected, the average amount raised declined about 1 percent, while the average spent rose 2 percent.

II. Incumbents vs. Challengers

Once again, incumbents had a total fundraising and spending advantage over their challengers in 2002. The 144 incumbents seeking re -election accounted for 56 percent of the total funds raised and 55 percent of total expenditures. The incumbents' shares in 2000 were slightly higher, 64 and 63 percent. (Incumbents are defined as those ind ividuals holding the office of Representative at the time of the 2002 election and seeking re -election to the seat.)

Compared to 2000, average receipts and expenditures went in different directions for incumbents and non-incumbents in 2002. Average receipts by an incumbent rose 4 percent from their 200 levels and average expenditures rose 7 percent. The trend was reversed among non-incumbents, who saw average receipts and expenditures each drop 2 percent.

HOUSE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY INCUMBENCY 2002

	Incumbents (144)	Non-Incumbents (167)
Total Receipts	\$4,327,606	\$3,418,813
Average Receipts	\$30,053	\$20,472
Total Expenditures	\$4,312,601	\$3,486,686
Average Expenditures	\$29,949	\$20,878

Six House incumbents were defeated in bids for re-election: David Bunker (1st Worcester District), Maryanne Lewis (11th Norfolk), Ruth Provost (5th Barnstable), George Rogers (12th Bristol), Jose Santiago (16th Essex) and Paul Tirone (1st Essex). All but Rogers were outspent by their successful challengers. (Of the five defeated incumbents in 2000, three outspent their opponents but still lost.)

Historically, much of the expenditures by incumbents, both unopposed and opposed, are not necessarily related directly to their campaigns (such as bump er stickers or advertisements), but were geared toward constituent or legislative expenses. The campaign finance law allows campaign funds to be used for such expenses as maintaining a district office, charitable contributions and official or political tr avel that is not otherwise paid for by the Commonwealth.

As with the Senate figures, spending by incumbents, especially those who were not opposed for re-election, may not have been all directly related to their campaigns.

III. Party Affiliation

Democrats continued their domination of campaign finance activity in 2002. The 208 Democrats running accounted for two-thirds of the candidates (the same proportion as in 2000), but the party accounted for 81 percent of total fundraising and 80 percent of total spending.

The predominance of Democrats is also reflected in the fundraising and spending averages, where they once again led Republicans by significant margins. In fact, the averages in both categories rose for Democrats, while they fell for Republicans. Average receipts for a Democrat rose five percent, while the Republican average dropped 29 percent. The average spending figures have gone in different directions since 2000, when they were both in the mid-\$20,000s, separated by about \$2,000: the Democratic spending average rose 9 percent and the Republican average declined 30 percent.

Candidates who were not Democrats or Republicans, such as members of the Libertarian or Green parties or those who were not members of any party, had a greater

presence in 2002. The 24 such candidates accounted for less than 2 percent of receipts and expenditures in 2000. Two years later there were 32 such candidates, representing 3.3 percent of the totals in each category. The increase in "other" candidates has been a continuing trend: the number of House candidates who were not Democrats or Republicans has almost tripled from the 11 recorded in 1998. The 2002 election saw ballots for four parties: Democratic, Republican, Libertarian and, for the first time, Green. As noted later in this study, some such candidates were aided by eligibility to receive public funding for their campaigns.

HOUSE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY PARTY AFFILIATION 2002

	Democrats (208)	Republicans (71)	Unenrolled (14)
Total Receipts	\$6,267,694	\$1,221,124	\$154,566
Average Receipts	\$30,133	\$17,199	\$11,040
Total Expenditures	\$6,265,809	\$1,275,689	\$155,362
Average Expenditures	\$30,124	\$17,967	\$11,097

	Libertarian (13)	Green (5)	
Total Receipts	\$22,040	\$80,995	
Average Receipts	\$1,695	\$16,199	
Total Expenditures	\$22,528	\$79,900	
Average Expenditures	\$1,733	\$15,980	

IV. Contested and Uncontested Races

Of the 160 contests for House seats, 75 featured single candidates who were unopposed for election. The number of unopposed candidates was down 15 from the 2000 election and represented the lowest total since 1994, when the figure was also 75.

The remaining 85 races were contested, featuring two or more candidates. (Three incumbents had a single opponent who reported no campaign finance activity. Those candidates are still considered opposed in this study.)³

Once again in 2002, the average unopposed candidate raised slightly more than an opposed candidate, but the average opposed candidate spent more.

³ Some studies of legislative races have used other criteria in determining whether a race was "conteste d" or whether an incumbent was "opposed," looking at such factors as whether the winner exceeded a certain margin of victory or whether an opponent had any campaign finance activity. This study considered a race contested if there were two or more candidates for the seat, regardless of the outcome or the level of campaign finance activity.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY HOUSE CANDIDATES OPPOSED AND UNOPPOSED 2002

	Opposed (236)	Unopposed (75)
Total Receipts	\$5,719,232	\$2,027,187
Average receipts	\$24,234	\$27,029
Total Expenditures	\$6,044,198	\$1,755,089
Average Expenditures	\$25,614	\$23,401

The changes in the averages for the two types of candidates were mixed. Average receipts and expenditures by opposed candidates each rose 1 percent from 2000. The same figures for unopposed candidates each declined by 4 percent.

CONTESTED SEATS

The 85 contested House races in 2002 can be grouped in two categories: contests for open seats and contests featuring an incumbent facing opposition. As in previous years, the contested races involving incumbents featured a substantially higher total of candidates and therefore the higher receipts and expenditures totals. Unlike previous years, however, these races also featured the higher average receipts and spending, exceeding the averages for races for open seats.

There were contests for 16 open House seats, listed below. Four of the seats had no returning incumbent because of recent redistricting of legislative districts :

District	Previous incumbent	Winner
4 th Berkshire	Christopher Hodgkins	William Pignatelli
6 th Essex	Michael Cahill	Mary Grant
11 th Essex	Thomas McGee	Steven Walsh
12 th Essex	John Slattery	Joyce Spiliotis
18 th Essex		Barbara L'Italien
2 nd Franklin	John Merrigan	Christopher Donelan
4 th Hampden	Celia Hahn	Donald Humason
2 nd Hampshire	Nancy Flavin	John Scibak
37 th Middlesex		James Eldridge
14 th Norfolk	John Locke	Alice Peisch
2 nd Plymouth		Susan Williams Gifford
6 th Plymouth	Francis Marini	Daniel Webster
4 th Suffolk	John Hart	Brian Wallace
10 th Suffolk	David Donnelly	Michael Rush
15 th Suffolk	Kevin Fitzgerald	Jeffrey Sanchez
18 th Worcester		Jennifer Callahan

The 71 candidates for these open seats report raising a total of \$1,954,203.40, or an average of \$27,524 each, and spending \$1,981,754.11, or an average of \$27,912 each. The top spender in a race won 13 of the 16 races, or 81 percent of the time.

The most expensive race for an open seat was in the 4th Suffolk District, where three candidates spent a total of \$196,910 to win the seat vacated by Rep. John Hart, who had won a special election to the state Senate. The winner, Brian Wallace, led the other candidates in spending with \$92,393.

The four districts above with no previous incumbent were newly created due to the decennial redistricting based on the federal census. In those races, the 18 candidates raised a total of \$537,586,10, or an average of \$29,866, and spent a total of \$583,425.00, or an average of \$32,412. The top spender in each race win three of the four times.

The most expensive race for a new seat was in the 18th Worcester District, where four candidates spent a total of \$165,308. The winner, Jennifer Callahan, was top spender in the race with a total of \$51,351.

* * * * *

There were 69 *contested races featuring an incumbent*, in which the incumbent won 63 times. In those races, the 154 candidates reported raising a total of \$5,719,232, for an average of \$37,137 each, and spending a total of \$6,044,198, for an average of \$39,248 each. Both averages are about 60 percent higher than the comparable figures in 2000, due to an increase in both contested races and candidates from two years before.

The top spender won in 61 of the 69 races involving an opposed incumbent. The most expensive such race was in the 11th Norfolk District, where incumbent Maryanne Lewis was defeated. The top spender in that race was the winner, Robert Coughlin, whose expenditures were \$179,573.

V. Starting Balances

House candidates reported having a total of \$3,872,269 on hand at the start of 2002, a figure that was about \$283,000 more than the total at the start of 2000. As a rule, incumbents and well-established or returning challengers usually have money on hand at the start of an election season. Generally, new candidates do not organize their campaigns until the year in which the election is held, accounting for significantly lower beginning balances among non-incumbents. A head start in fundraising is often accompanied by success at the polls: of the total amount on hand at the start of the year, 95 percent was held by eventual winners. (The eventual winners' share of funds at the start of 2000 was 74 percent.) Incumbents held 96 percent of the cash on hand, or an average of \$25,737 each.

A total of 114 candidates, or 36 percent, started the year with no funds on hand and/or no organized committee. Ten of those candidates, all non-incumbents, were ultimately elected.

The list of the candidates with the 10 highest starting balances consists entirely of incumbent Democrats, all of whom subsequently won re-election in 2002. Nine were unopposed.

HOUSE CANDIDATES WITH HIGHEST STARTING BALANCES

	Candidate	District	Balance	Opposed	Elected
1.	Thomas M. Finneran (D)(I)	12th Suffolk	\$508,922	No	Yes
2.	John J. Binienda, Sr. (D)(I)	17th Worcester	\$148,033	No	Yes
3.	Joseph C. Sullivan (D)(I)	5th Norfolk	\$147,146	No	Yes
4.	Salvatore F. DiMasi (D)(I)	3rd Suffolk	\$132,841	No	Yes
5.	Ronald Mariano (D)(I)	3rd Norfolk	\$113,761	No	Yes
6.	Antonio F. D. Cabral (D)(I)	13th Bristol	\$111,533	Yes	Yes
7.	Rachel Kaprielian (D)(I)	29th Middlesex	\$106,528	No	Yes
8.	Peter J. Koutoujian (D)(I)	10th Middlesex	\$102,000	No	Yes
9.	John H. Rogers (D)(I)	12th Norfolk	\$95,381	No	Yes
10.	John F. Quinn (D)(I)	9th Bristol	\$89,385	No	Yes

(As of Jan. 1, 2002)

I=Incumbent D=Democrat

VI. Most Active Candidates and Races

On the list of the 10 most expensive House races in 2000, seven of the winners were non-incumbents. However, all but one of them won open seats; the other defeated an incumbent. Nine of the 10 winners were Democrats.

The most expensive race was in the 11th Norfolk District, where Rep. Maryanne Lewis was defeated by fellow Democrat Robert Coughlin. The \$347,148 spent by the four candidates is the highest expenditure total for a contested House race ever recorded in an OCPF study. The previous record was \$291,406, set in 1994. Coughlin accounted for 52 percent of the total spending for the seat.

HOUSE RACES WITH THE HIGHEST SPENDING 2002

	District	Total spent	Number of candidates	Winner
1.	11th Norfolk	\$347,148	4	Robert Coughlin (D)
2.	7th Norfolk	\$244,268	4	Walter Timilty (D)(I)
3.	8th Suffolk	\$215,766	2	Paul Demakis (D)(I)
4.	4th Suffolk (O)	\$196,910	3	Brian Wallace (D)
5.	10th Suffolk (O)	\$167,806	6	Michael Rush (D)
6.	18th Worcester (O)	\$165,308	4	Jennifer Callahan (D)
7.	18th Suffolk	\$163,819	3	Brian Golden (D)(I)
8.	37th Middlesex (O)	\$162,102	5	James Eldridge (D)
9.	2nd Plymouth (O)	\$159,057	5	Susan Williams Gifford (R)
10.	14th Norfolk (O)	\$157,774	3	Alice Peisch (D)

O=Open seat. I = Incumbent. D=Democrat. R=Republic an

The least expensive contested race was in the 3rd Worcester District, where incumbent Emile Goguen and challenger Ronald Dionne spent a total of \$5,247.

TOP FUNDRAISERS AND SPENDERS

The list of top House fundraisers in 2000 contains five incumben ts and nine Democrats. Seven candidates were in contested races; of that number, six were elected. Three of the opposed candidate were seeking open seats.

	Candidate	District	Total	Opposed	Elected
1.	Thomas M. Finneran (D)(I)	12th Suffolk	\$370,641	No	Yes
2.	Robert Coughlin (D)	11th Norfolk	\$171,950	Yes	Yes
3.	Walter F. Timilty Jr. (D)(I)	7th Norfolk	\$110,215	Yes	Yes
4.	Maryanne Lewis (D)(I)	11th Norfolk	\$99,863	Yes	No
5.					
	Marjorie C. Decker (D)	8th Suffolk	\$99,644	Yes	No
6.	Martin J. Walsh (D)(I)	13th Suffolk	\$94,974	Yes	Yes
7.	Brian P. Wallace (D)	4th Suffolk	\$92,640	Yes	Yes
8.	Paul C. Demakis (D)(I)	8th Suffolk	\$88,674	Yes	Yes
9.	David S. Friedman (D)	18th Suffolk	\$87,063	Yes	No
10.	Alice Hanlon Peisch (D)	14th Norfolk (O)	\$85,032	Yes	Yes

HOUSE CANDIDATES RAISING THE MOST MONEY IN 2002

O=Open seat. I = Incumbent. D=Democrat. R=Republican

Finneran and Demakis are the only candidates who also appeared on this list in 2000. Finneran, who is Speaker of the House, has topped the receipts list for three consecutive election years, since 1998. However, this is the highest total he has posted and the highest ever recorded by a House candidate in an OCPF study. The previous record was the \$266,082 posted by Finneran in 2000.

Eleven candidates reported no receipts in 2002 (including the four who failed to file reports). Two of the eleven, incumbents William Greene (22nd Middlesex) and Shirley Owens-Hicks (6th Suffolk), were both unopposed for re-election. (Greene spent \$3,442 already on hand at the start of 2002; as noted earlier, Owens-Hicks is one of the four candidates who had not filed any reports.) The winning opposed candidate who raised the least was incumbent Shaun Kelly (2nd Berkshire), who raised \$1,989.

* * * * *

The top ten list of candidates in terms of spending included six incumbents and four non-incumbents. Nine candidates were opposed, of whom six were elected. All the candidates on the list were Democrats. One candidate was seeking an open seat.

	Candidate	District	Total	Opposed	Elected
1.	Thomas M. Finneran (D)(I)	12th Suffolk	\$407,232	No	Yes
2.	Robert Coughlin (D)	11th Norfolk	\$179,573	Yes	Yes
3.	Maryanne Lewis (D)(I)	11th Norfolk	\$156,303	Yes	No
4.	Walter F. Timilty Jr. (D)(I)	7th Norfolk	\$150,767	Yes	Yes
5.	Paul C. Demakis (D)(I)	8th Suffolk	\$119,811	Yes	Yes
6.	David S. Friedman (D)	18th Suffolk	\$96,915	Yes	No
7.	Marjorie C. Decker (D)	8th Suffolk	\$95,956	Yes	No
8.	Martin J. Walsh (D)(I)	13th Suffolk	\$94,225	Yes	Yes
9.	Brian P. Wallace (D)	4th Suffolk (O)	\$92,393	Yes	Yes
10.	Garrett J. Bradley (D)(I)	3rd Plymouth	\$89,159	Yes	Yes

HOUSE CANDIDATES SPENDING THE MOST MONEY IN 2002

O=Open seat. I = Incumbent. D=Democrat. R=Republican

Finneran and Bradley are the only two candidates who also appear ed on the 2000 list. As was the case with his expenditures, Finneran was also first in spending in 1998 and 2000. His most recent figure, however, is the highest annual expenditure total recorded by a House candidate in an OCPF study. Coughlin's spending is the highest ever recorded by an opposed candidate, surpassing the old record of \$161,813.

Eleven candidates reported no expenditures in 2002; two were incumbents who were unopposed: Owens-Hicks and Frank Hynes (4th Plymouth). Aside from Hynes, none of the other candidates reporting zero expenditures reported any receipts. The winning candidate in a contested race who spent the least was Emile Goguen of the 3rd Worcester District, who reported expenditures of \$5,188.

VII. <u>Public Financing</u>

The 2002 legislative elections marked the first time candidates for the House and Senate were eligible to receive public funds for their campaigns. A system of public financing for statewide candidates had been in effect since the late 1970s, but it had never applied to legislative candidates.

In 1998, however, voters approved a statewide ballot question establishing the Clean Elections Law, which provided public funds to eligible candidates for statewide office, the Governor's Council and the Legislature who agreed to observe contribution and spending limits, starting with the 2002 state election. Candidates applied for certification to receive funds by collecting a specified number of contributions from voters in their districts and submitting an application to O CPF.

A total of 11 legislative candidates, all for the House, were certified by OCPF as eligible to receive public funds. (An additional candidate, running for governor, was also certified.) Nine of the certified House candidates ultimately received funds totaling \$200,205, as detailed below. The other two certified House candidates, Douglas Petersen (8th Essex) and Ellen Story (3rd Hampshire), ultimately did apply for any public funds.

	Candidate	District	Total payout	Opposed	Elected
1.	Michael Aleo (G)	1st Hampshire	\$17,800	Yes	No
2.	William Allan (D)	15th Suffolk	\$16,200	Yes	No
3.	Kathryn Brookins (D)	15th Suffolk	\$16,200	Yes	No
4.	Robert Collamore (R)	12th Hampden	\$16,200*	Yes	No
5.	James Eldridge (D)	37th Middlesex	\$43,878	Yes	Yes
6.	Kathleen Grady (D)	2nd Hampden	\$17,800	Yes	No
7.	Paul Lachelier (G)	26th Middlesex	\$17,800	Yes	No
8.	Jonathan Leavitt (G)	14th Essex	\$29,676	Yes	No
9.	Thomas Stokes (U)	4th Berkshire	\$24,652	Yes	No

HOUSE CANDIDATES RECEIVING PUBLIC FUNDS IN 2002

(D) = Democrat (R) = Republican (G) = Green (U) = Unenrolled (I) = Incumbent

* OCPF decertified Collamore as a Clean Elections participant on Sept. 26, 2002. He was ordered to return the \$16,200 he received for the primary campaign plus interest and ruled ineligible to receive general election funds. Collamore subsequently appealed the decision in Superior Court. As of this writing, the case was still pending.

As noted above, the 2002 election was the first, and only, one in which the Clean Elections Law was implemented. The law was repealed by the Legislature in June 2003. Chapter 26 of the Acts of 2003 reinstituted the previous public financing program for statewide candidates only.

VIII. <u>Ending Balances</u>

House candidates reported a total ending balance of 3,853,255 at the end of 2003. The ending balance is only about 19,000 less than the amount on hand at the start of the election year.⁴

For each category, the largest shares of cash on hand at the end of 2002 were held by incumbents (96 percent), Democrats (88 percent), winners (97 percent) and unopposed candidates (77 percent). Each of the figures was almost exactly comparable to those posted in 2000.

All of the candidates with the ten highest ending balances were incumbents who, with only one exception, had been unopposed for re-election. All were Democrats.

HOUSE CANDIDATES WITH THE HIGHEST ENDING BALANCES

(As of Dec. 31, 2002)

	Candidate	District	Balance	Opposed	Elected
1.	Thomas M. Finneran (D)(I)	12th Suffolk	\$472,331	No	Yes
2.	John J. Binienda, Sr. (D)(I)	17th Worcester	\$181,017	No	Yes
3.	Ronald Mariano (D)(I)	3rd Norfolk	\$148,184	No	Yes
4.	Salvatore F. DiMasi (D)(I)	3rd Suffolk	\$142,099	No	Yes
5.	Joseph C. Sullivan (D)(I)	5th Norfolk	\$137,293	No	Yes
6.	Antonio F. D. Cabral (D)(I)	13th Bristol	\$125,863	Yes	Yes
7.	Rachel Kaprielian (D)(I)	29th Middlesex	\$119,423	No	Yes
8.	John F. Quinn (D)(I)	9th Bristol	\$117,885	No	Yes
9.	Peter J. Koutoujian (D)(I)	10th Middlesex	\$113,382	No	Yes
10.	John H. Rogers (D)(I)	12th Norfolk	\$101,204	No	Yes

D = Democrat I = Incumbent

⁴ This ending balance may not correspond exactly with the aggregate starting balance, total receipts and total expenditures.

Finneran had also posted the highest ending balance in 2000, with \$304,555 .

A total of 64 candidates reported having no money on hand at the end of 2002, all but four of them all non-incumbents who had not won their races. In addition to Owens-Hicks, two were newcomers who had won a first term by defeating incumbents: Jeffrey Perry (5th Barnstable) and William Lantigua (16th Essex). Lantigua's opponent, Jose Santiago, also reported a zero ending balance.

A table of campaign finance activity by all House candidates may be found immediately following this section.

Campaign Finance Activity by Candidates for the House 2002

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
1st Barnstat	ble								
Thor	mas N. George		R	I	W	\$11,498.19	\$26,287.00	\$35,369.89	\$2,415.30
Cleo	on H. Turner		D		L	\$0.00	\$27,070.81	\$25,963.52	\$0.00
То	otal candidates for seat:	2				\$11,498.19	\$53,357.81	\$61,333.41	\$2,415.30
2nd Barnsta	able								
Dem	netrius J. Atsalis		D	I	W	\$19,301.01	\$37,215.00	\$39,611.87	\$16,904.14
Ann	Canedy		R		L	\$0.00	\$27,849.13	\$26,198.44	\$1,650.69
Pete	er A. White		G		L	\$0.00	\$2,476.00	\$2,255.97	\$220.03
То	otal candidates for seat:	3				\$19,301.01	\$67,540.13	\$68,066.28	\$18,774.86
3rd Barnstal	ble								
Geo	rge R. Costa		D		L	\$0.00	\$2,251.48	\$2,150.05	\$101.43
Matt	hew C. Patrick		D	I	W	\$934.28	\$28,678.00	\$28,396.52	\$1,215.76
Larry	y Wheatley		R		L	\$0.00	\$40,532.13	\$34,422.29	\$6,109.84
То	otal candidates for seat:	3				\$934.28	\$71,461.61	\$64,968.86	\$7,427.03
4th Barnstal	ble								
Shirl	ley A. Gomes		R	I	W	\$12,809.09	\$2,103.08	\$4,296.83	\$10,615.34
То	otal candidates for seat:	1				\$12,809.09	\$2,103.08	\$4,296.83	\$10,615.34

1

District	Candidate	Party	Incumbent	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
5th Barnstable								
Jeffrey Pe	erry	R		W	\$1,500.00	\$45,492.94	\$47,048.25	\$0.00
Ruth W. I	Provost	D	I	L	\$5,680.24	\$35,822.82	\$37,989.61	\$3,513.45
Total ca	andidates for seat: 2				\$7,180.24	\$81,315.76	\$85,037.86	\$3,513.45
Barnstable, Dul	kes & Nantucket							
Eric T. Tu	urkington	D	I	W	\$31,289.23	\$3,695.00	\$5,879.24	\$29,104.99
Total ca	andidates for seat: 1				\$31,289.23	\$3,695.00	\$5,879.24	\$29,104.99
1st Berkshire								
Daniel E.	Bosley	D	I	W	\$9,007.65	\$27,755.00	\$31,574.68	\$5,187.97
Total ca	andidates for seat: 1				\$9,007.65	\$27,755.00	\$31,574.68	\$5,187.97
2nd Berkshire								
Matthew	Goddard	U		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Shaun P.	Kelly	R	I	W	\$20,207.40	\$1,989.38	\$12,381.87	\$9,814.91
Total ca	andidates for seat: 2				\$20,207.40	\$1,989.38	\$12,381.87	\$9,814.91
3rd Berkshire								
Eric Gutte	ormsen	D		L	\$0.00	\$31.30	\$31.30	\$0.00
Peter J. L	arkin	D	I	W	\$2,127.86	\$41,212.25	\$42,171.74	\$1,168.37
Total ca	andidates for seat: 2				\$2,127.86	\$41,243.55	\$42,203.04	\$1,168.37

District	Candidate		Party 1	Incumbent W	Von/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
4th Berkshire	9								
J. Chr	istopher Irsfeld		R		L	\$310.00	\$26,327.88	\$26,637.88	\$0.00
Willia	m Pignatelli		D		W	\$1,056.41	\$30,994.00	\$31,084.82	\$965.59
Kevin	Sherman		D		L	\$0.00	\$18,940.00	\$18,609.07	\$330.93
Thom	as H. Stokes		U		L	\$0.00	\$31,134.95	\$31,134.95	\$0.00
Tota	al candidates for seat:	4				\$1,366.41	\$107,396.83	\$107,466.72	\$1,296.52
1st Bristol									
Micha	el J. Coppola		R	I	W	\$7,469.21	\$441.20	\$629.95	\$7,280.46
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$7,469.21	\$441.20	\$629.95	\$7,280.46
2nd Bristol									
John /	A. Lepper		R	I	W	\$8,874.42	\$7,950.00	\$12,024.34	\$4,800.08
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$8,874.42	\$7,950.00	\$12,024.34	\$4,800.08
3rd Bristol									
James	s H. Fagan		D	I	W	\$3,214.31	\$16,625.00	\$19,368.72	\$470.59
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$3,214.31	\$16,625.00	\$19,368.72	\$470.59
4th Bristol									
Philip	Travis		D	I	W	\$1,107.12	\$5,430.77	\$6,294.32	\$243.57
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$1,107.12	\$5,430.77	\$6,294.32	\$243.57
5th Bristol									
Patrici	ia A. Haddad		D	I	W	\$5,247.31	\$11,190.62	\$5,691.30	\$10,746.63
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$5,247.31	\$11,190.62	\$5,691.30	\$10,746.63

3

District	Candidate		Party	Incumben	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
6th Bristol									
Joseph	h Camara		D		L	\$879.24	\$43,523.00	\$44,335.86	\$776.38
David	B. Sullivan		D	I	W	\$13,837.05	\$41,605.50	\$43,149.48	\$12,293.07
Tota	I candidates for seat:	2				\$14,716.29	\$85,128.50	\$87,485.34	\$13,069.45
7th Bristol									
Robert	t Correia		D	I	W	\$1,128.21	\$46,599.11	\$43,829.32	\$3,898.00
Raymo	ond P. Leary, Jr.		Li		L	\$0.00	\$3,601.58	\$3,896.86	\$1,148.87
Tota	I candidates for seat:	2				\$1,128.21	\$50,200.69	\$47,726.18	\$5,046.87
8th Bristol									
Michae	el J. Rodrigues		D	I	W	\$25,042.50	\$46,769.70	\$38,131.93	\$33,680.27
Tota	l candidates for seat:	1				\$25,042.50	\$46,769.70	\$38,131.93	\$33,680.27
9th Bristol									
John F	Quinn		D	I	W	\$89,385.14	\$51,049.43	\$22,549.31	\$117,885.26
Tota	I candidates for seat:	1				\$89,385.14	\$51,049.43	\$22,549.31	\$117,885.26
10th Bristol									
Williar	m M. Straus		D	I	W	\$25,679.24	\$10,906.04	\$6,176.52	\$30,408.76
Tota	l candidates for seat:	1				\$25,679.24	\$10,906.04	\$6,176.52	\$30,408.76
11th Bristol									
Robert	t M. Koczera		D	I	W	\$32,754.07	\$5,705.43	\$5,617.48	\$32,842.02
Tota	l candidates for seat:	1				\$32,754.07	\$5,705.43	\$5,617.48	\$32,842.02

4

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
12th Bristol									
Mark A	A. Howland		D		W	\$0.00	\$12,310.06	\$11,978.92	\$81.14
Georg	e Rogers		D	I	L	\$2,441.81	\$25,574.00	\$27,811.08	\$204.73
Tota	al candidates for seat:	2				\$2,441.81	\$37,884.06	\$39,790.00	\$285.87
13th Bristol									
Antoni	io F. D. Cabral		D	I	W	\$111,533.45	\$47,224.18	\$32,894.26	\$125,863.37
Duarte	e Silva		D		L	\$957.49	\$4,048.29	\$5,509.28	\$0.00
Tota	al candidates for seat:	2				\$112,490.94	\$51,272.47	\$38,403.54	\$125,863.37
14th Bristol									
Elizab	eth A. Poirier		R	I	W	\$429.15	\$24,609.02	\$19,046.40	\$5,979.77
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$429.15	\$24,609.02	\$19,046.40	\$5,979.77
1st Essex									
Michae	el A. Costello		D		W	\$2,247.24	\$47,320.00	\$48,478.01	\$748.76
Paul E	E. Tirone		D	I	L	\$666.63	\$11,994.92	\$12,547.52	\$114.03
Tota	al candidates for seat:	2				\$2,913.87	\$59,314.92	\$61,025.53	\$862.79
2nd Essex									
James	s Cassidy		R		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Robert	t V. Finneran		R		L	\$0.00	\$3,216.00	\$3,185.66	\$30.34
Harriet	tt L. Stanley		D	I	W	\$2,572.06	\$29,015.00	\$10,997.14	\$20,589.92
Tota	al candidates for seat:	3				\$2,572.06	\$32,231.00	\$14,182.80	\$20,620.26

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
3rd Essex									
Brian S	. Dempsey		D	I	W	\$2,116.36	\$27,082.50	\$20,306.72	\$8,892.14
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$2,116.36	\$27,082.50	\$20,306.72	\$8,892.14
4th Essex									
Bradfor	d R. Hill		R	I	W	\$3,320.53	\$11,975.00	\$9,624.67	\$5,670.86
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$3,320.53	\$11,975.00	\$9,624.67	\$5,670.86
5th Essex									
Charles	s F. Choate		R		L	\$0.00	\$1,633.00	\$1,308.25	\$0.00
Anthon	y J. Verga		D	I	W	\$3,762.18	\$13,683.79	\$12,943.33	\$4,502.64
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$3,762.18	\$15,316.79	\$14,251.58	\$4,502.64
6th Essex									
Ronald	F. Costa		D		L	\$97.47	\$2,255.23	\$2,103.03	\$249.67
Mary G	irant		D		W	\$0.00	\$34,647.12	\$32,380.24	\$2,266.88
F. John	Monahan		D		L	\$0.00	\$32,491.50	\$30,638.46	\$1,853.04
Robert	A. Munroe		D		L	\$0.00	\$4,660.00	\$4,660.00	\$0.00
John W	/. Murray		R		L	\$6,026.07	\$8,015.00	\$9,675.21	\$4,365.86
Donato	Paglia		U		L	\$2.48	\$704.44	\$706.92	\$0.00
Total	candidates for seat:	6				\$6,126.02	\$82,773.29	\$80,163.86	\$8,735.45

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
7th Essex									
Heathe	er B. Pickard		D		L	\$0.00	\$16,145.00	\$15,998.06	\$146.94
J. Mich	ael Ruane		D	I	W	\$10,731.45	\$23,823.54	\$18,014.85	\$16,540.14
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$10,731.45	\$39,968.54	\$34,012.91	\$16,687.08
8th Essex									
Douglas	s W. Petersen		D	I	W	\$8,280.38	\$7,403.22	\$6,441.60	\$9,242.00
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$8,280.38	\$7,403.22	\$6,441.60	\$9,242.00
9th Essex									
Mark V	. Falzone		D	I	W	\$16,853.56	\$45,620.23	\$59,350.40	\$3,123.39
Stepher	n P. Maio		D		L	\$0.00	\$39,290.00	\$36,783.34	\$2,506.66
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$16,853.56	\$84,910.23	\$96,133.74	\$5,630.05
10th Essex									
Robert	F. Fennell		D	I	W	\$55,743.23	\$11,425.00	\$10,055.52	\$57,112.71
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$55,743.23	\$11,425.00	\$10,055.52	\$57,112.71
11th Essex									
Donna	Coppola		D		L	\$12.45	\$19,009.98	\$19,020.49	\$1.94
Richard	d W. Costin, Jr.		D		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
John E.	. Ford, Jr.		D		L	\$0.00	\$26,864.00	\$27,067.28	\$0.00
Steven	M. Walsh		D		W	\$2,600.00	\$45,679.47	\$47,055.78	\$1,040.64
Total	candidates for seat:	4				\$2,612.45	\$91,553.45	\$93,143.55	\$1,042.58

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
12th Essex								
Anne	e Manning		D	L	\$0.00	\$24,796.24	\$19,152.18	\$3,014.53
Pete	r C. McCarthy		D	L	\$0.00	\$23,301.55	\$20,586.81	\$2,714.74
Johr	F. McCarthy		R	L	\$0.00	\$26,871.37	\$26,632.33	\$239.04
Joyc	e Spiliotis		D	W	\$531.50	\$32,383.20	\$28,517.88	\$4,396.82
Rob	ert J. Wood		D	L	\$0.00	\$39,857.99	\$39,857.99	\$0.00
То	tal candidates for seat:	5			\$531.50	\$147,210.35	\$134,747.19	\$10,365.13
13th Essex								
Step	hen Clark		R	L	\$6,667.50	\$32,136.00	\$37,270.80	\$1,532.70
Theo	odore C. Speliotis		D	I W	\$635.40	\$16,046.29	\$15,005.58	\$1,676.11
То	tal candidates for seat:	2			\$7,302.90	\$48,182.29	\$52,276.38	\$3,208.81
14th Essex								
Jona	athan Leavitt		G	L	\$0.00	\$34,746.67	\$34,746.67	\$0.00
Gray	/don McCormick		D	L	\$20.77	\$2,033.81	\$2,054.58	\$0.00
Paul	a Porten		R	L	\$0.00	\$19,403.00	\$24,582.38	\$0.00
Davi	id M. Torrisi		D	I W	\$32,213.57	\$46,212.04	\$54,076.17	\$24,349.44
То	tal candidates for seat:	4			\$32,234.34	\$102,395.52	\$115,459.80	\$24,349.44
15th Essex								
Arth	ur J. Broadhurst		D	I W	\$19,414.22	\$15,720.45	\$23,626.79	\$11,507.88
Rob	ert G. Hazelton		R	L	\$0.00	\$6,314.00	\$5,977.32	\$20.03
То	tal candidates for seat:	2			\$19,414.22	\$22,034.45	\$29,604.11	\$11,527.91

8

District	Candidate		Party 1	ncumbent	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
16th Essex									
	J. Blanchette		D		L	\$1,080.00	\$5,890.00	\$6,664.72	\$305.28
Alfonso	Garcia		D		L	\$0.00	\$14,175.74	\$14,165.09	\$10.64
William	Lantigua		U		W	\$1,253.85	\$11,925.00	\$15,001.30	\$0.00
Jose L.	Santiago		D	Ι	L	\$379.14	\$12,239.37	\$12,406.83	\$0.00
Total	candidates for seat:	4				\$2,712.99	\$44,230.11	\$48,237.94	\$315.92
17th Essex									
Barry R	. Finegold		D	I	W	\$5,822.05	\$37,536.00	\$27,438.80	\$15,919.25
Michae	l Frishman		D		L	\$0.00	\$598.34	\$609.34	\$0.00
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$5,822.05	\$38,134.34	\$28,048.14	\$15,919.25
18th Essex									
Alfred .	I. DePietro		U		L	\$0.00	\$2,660.00	\$1,037.60	\$1,622.42
Barbara	a L'Italien		D		W	\$0.00	\$57,991.37	\$56,188.57	\$1,802.80
Kathy S	Sachs		R		L	\$0.00	\$16,296.13	\$16,486.08	\$0.00
Kevin E	Bryan Shea		D		L	\$0.00	\$26,086.94	\$23,245.86	\$2,841.08
Total	candidates for seat:	4				\$0.00	\$103,034.44	\$96,958.11	\$6,266.30
1st Franklin									
James	A. Gagne		R		L	\$0.00	\$2,451.66	\$2,451.66	\$0.00
Stephe	n Kulik		D	Ι	W	\$13,651.54	\$11,620.50	\$7,752.71	\$17,519.33
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$13,651.54	\$14,072.16	\$10,204.37	\$17,519.33

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent Won/	Lost Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
2nd Franklin								
Christop	oher J. Donelan		D	W	\$7,692.2	\$20,455.00	\$27,685.38	\$461.82
Peter A.	. Ruggeri		D	L	\$2,183.6	\$4 \$14,355.00	\$22,829.63	\$0.00
Total	candidates for seat:	2			\$9,875.8	\$34,810.00	\$50,515.01	\$461.82
1st Hampden								
Reed V.	. Hillman		R	I W	/ \$62,190.6	\$6,609.89	\$12,534.26	\$56,266.26
Total	candidates for seat:	1			\$62,190.6	\$6,609.89	\$12,534.26	\$56,266.26
2nd Hampden								
Kathleer	n Grady		D	L	\$0.0	\$24,300.00	\$24,300.00	\$0.00
Mary S.	Rogeness		R	I W	\$54,269.7	3 \$24,522.73	\$44,689.36	\$34,103.10
Alan L.	Wilcox		Li	L	\$0.0	00 \$832.39	\$832.39	\$0.00
Total	candidates for seat:	3			\$54,269.7	3 \$49,655.12	\$69,821.75	\$34,103.10
3rd Hampden								
Daniel F	Keenan		D	I W	/ \$6,773.2	\$15,627.00	\$15,021.75	\$7,378.54
Total	candidates for seat:	1			\$6,773.2	29 \$15,627.00	\$15,021.75	\$7,378.54
4th Hampden								
Lynn F.	Boscher		R	L	\$0.0	\$14,909.00	\$14,909.00	\$0.00
Donald	F. Humason Jr.		R	W	\$0.0	\$62,126.00	\$58,330.97	\$3,795.03
Bo Sulliv	van		D	L	\$0.0	\$31,415.00	\$33,977.56	\$0.00
Total	candidates for seat:	3			\$0.0	\$108,450.00	\$107,217.53	\$3,795.03

District	Candidate		Party 1	ncumbent	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
5th Hampden									
Michael	Franco		R		L	\$0.00	\$8,098.00	\$7,407.84	\$690.16
Michael	F. Kane		D	Ι	W	\$3,041.57	\$32,829.92	\$35,061.25	\$810.24
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$3,041.57	\$40,927.92	\$42,469.09	\$1,500.40
6th Hampden									
Stephen	a J. Buoniconti		D	I	W	\$8,841.59	\$19,044.02	\$16,601.90	\$11,283.71
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$8,841.59	\$19,044.02	\$16,601.90	\$11,283.71
7th Hampden									
Thomas	M. Petrolati		D	I	W	\$59,666.27	\$60,692.22	\$27,188.90	\$93,169.59
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$59,666.27	\$60,692.22	\$27,188.90	\$93,169.59
8th Hampden									
Joseph	F. Wagner		D	I	W	\$6,724.94	\$20,621.42	\$26,577.88	\$768.48
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$6,724.94	\$20,621.42	\$26,577.88	\$768.48
9th Hampden									
Christop	oher P. Asselin		D	I	W	\$26,461.87	\$43,517.00	\$38,136.35	\$31,842.52
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$26,461.87	\$43,517.00	\$38,136.35	\$31,842.52
10th Hampder	n								
Cheryl F	Rivera		D	I	W	\$21,182.43	\$32,735.00	\$24,515.91	\$29,401.52
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$21,182.43	\$32,735.00	\$24,515.91	\$29,401.52

District	Candidate		Party I	ncumben	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
11th Hampder	ı								
Larry La			D		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Benjami	in Swan		D	I	W	\$3,839.56	\$31,655.00	\$33,326.05	\$2,168.5
Bud L. V	Villiams		D		L	\$4,487.12	\$12,725.00	\$15,752.03	\$1,460.09
Total	candidates for seat:	3				\$8,326.68	\$44,380.00	\$49,078.08	\$3,628.60
12th Hampder	า								
Gale D.	Candaras		D	I	W	\$22,797.04	\$62,870.00	\$83,485.91	\$2,181.13
Robert (Collamore		R		L	\$42.50	\$19,110.00	\$37,867.00	\$0.0
Christop	oher Leisey		R		L	\$0.00	\$1,845.00	\$1,961.08	\$0.0
Total	candidates for seat:	3				\$22,839.54	\$83,825.00	\$123,313.99	\$2,181.1
1st Hampshire)								
Michael	Aleo		G		L	\$6.01	\$18,547.00	\$17,799.45	\$753.50
Peter V.	Kocot		D	I	W	\$2,283.28	\$14,352.00	\$16,440.33	\$194.9
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$2,289.29	\$32,899.00	\$34,239.78	\$948.5
2nd Hampshire	e								
Sue Bar	tone		G		L	\$0.00	\$1,692.65	\$1,661.20	\$0.0
Patricia	A. Duffy		D		L	\$0.00	\$7,291.00	\$7,280.42	\$10.5
Carlene	C. Hamlin		D		L	\$272.70	\$27,114.79	\$27,191.23	\$196.20
Max Pa	ppas		U		L	\$0.00	\$14,702.95	\$15,129.25	\$0.0
John W	. Scibak		D		W	\$0.00	\$58,972.37	\$49,756.11	\$9,216.20
Total	candidates for seat:	5				\$272.70	\$109,773.76	\$101,018.21	\$9,423.10

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
3rd Hampshi	re								
Ellen	Story		D	I	W	\$15,892.50	\$2,814.02	\$1,382.70	\$17,323.82
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$15,892.50	\$2,814.02	\$1,382.70	\$17,323.82
1st Middlesex	x								
Rober	t S. Hargraves		R	I	W	\$24,943.57	\$29,876.26	\$19,780.58	\$35,039.25
Fanett	te Morrison		D		L	\$3,625.00	\$33,963.58	\$37,349.36	\$239.22
Tota	al candidates for seat:	2				\$28,568.57	\$63,839.84	\$57,129.94	\$35,278.47
2nd Middlese	ex								
Geoffr	rey D. Hall		D	I	W	\$5,408.11	\$8,521.18	\$6,392.33	\$7,536.96
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$5,408.11	\$8,521.18	\$6,392.33	\$7,536.96
3rd Middlese	x								
Patrici	ia A. Walrath		D	I	W	\$33,794.98	\$12,272.19	\$8,991.72	\$37,075.45
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$33,794.98	\$12,272.19	\$8,991.72	\$37,075.45
4th Middlese	x								
Williar	m Hagan		R		L	\$0.00	\$1,625.00	\$2,590.51	\$0.00
Steph	en P. LeDuc		D	I	W	\$12,524.33	\$26,739.96	\$34,816.43	\$4,447.86
Mark I	P. Testagrossa		Li		L	\$0.00	\$26.84	\$351.32	\$0.00
Tota	al candidates for seat:	3				\$12,524.33	\$28,391.80	\$37,758.26	\$4,447.86

District	Candidate		Party 1	ncumbent	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
5th Middlesex									
	P. Cashman		R		L	\$0.00	\$5,130.00	\$3,728.76	\$1,401.24
David P	. Linsky		D	I	W	\$2,748.16	\$20,691.48	\$21,910.49	\$1,529.15
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$2,748.16	\$25,821.48	\$25,639.25	\$2,930.39
6th Middlesex									
Deborat	n D. Blumer		D	I	W	\$3,699.57	\$14,844.00	\$14,408.40	\$4,135.17
James I	M. Pillsbury		Li		L	\$0.00	\$2,420.16	\$2,420.16	\$0.00
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$3,699.57	\$17,264.16	\$16,828.56	\$4,135.17
7th Middlesex									
Gregory	Doherty		Li		L	\$0.00	\$5,741.77	\$5,454.53	\$287.24
Karen S	pilka		D	Ι	W	\$14,836.32	\$8,294.00	\$20,064.03	\$3,066.29
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$14,836.32	\$14,035.77	\$25,518.56	\$3,353.53
8th Middlesex									
James F	P. Carboneau		D		L	\$0.00	\$7,719.75	\$8,319.75	\$0.00
Paul J.F	P. Loscocco		R	I	W	\$26,589.90	\$30,035.00	\$30,119.76	\$26,505.14
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$26,589.90	\$37,754.75	\$38,439.51	\$26,505.14
9th Middlesex									
Thomas	M. Stanley		D	Ι	W	\$16,259.03	\$38,810.00	\$34,150.57	\$20,918.46
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$16,259.03	\$38,810.00	\$34,150.57	\$20,918.46

District Can	didate	Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
10th Middlesex								
Peter J. Koutoujian		D	I	W	\$102,000.28	\$63,209.37	\$51,827.97	\$113,381.68
Total candidates fo	r seat: 1				\$102,000.28	\$63,209.37	\$51,827.97	\$113,381.68
11th Middlesex								
Zygmunt Choroszy Jr		D		L	\$0.00	\$11,896.83	\$11,855.73	\$41.10
Danny Fain		Li		L	\$0.00	\$1,916.00	\$1,801.75	\$364.25
Kay S. Khan		D	I	W	\$6,708.91	\$26,791.00	\$27,088.85	\$6,411.06
Total candidates fo	r seat: 3				\$6,708.91	\$40,603.83	\$40,746.33	\$6,816.41
12th Middlesex								
Ruth B. Balser		D	I	W	\$11,142.67	\$18,849.07	\$8,039.13	\$21,952.61
Total candidates fo	r seat: 1				\$11,142.67	\$18,849.07	\$8,039.13	\$21,952.61
13th Middlesex								
Susan W. Pope		R	I	W	\$48,631.04	\$18,098.27	\$13,113.73	\$53,615.58
Total candidates fo	r seat: 1				\$48,631.04	\$18,098.27	\$13,113.73	\$53,615.58
14th Middlesex								
Cory Atkins		D	I	W	\$3,797.78	\$28,815.00	\$32,198.84	\$414.73
Richard P. McClure		R		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Peter J. Unitt III		R		L	\$0.00	\$13,465.87	\$11,550.28	\$1,915.59
Total candidates fo	r seat: 3				\$3,797.78	\$42,280.87	\$43,749.12	\$2,330.32

District	Candidate		Party	Incumben	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
15th Middlesex									
Michael .	J. Dever		U		L	\$0.00	\$5,856.32	\$4,777.80	\$1,078.52
Jay R. Ka	aufman		D	I	W	\$6,069.00	\$50,562.71	\$31,309.46	\$25,322.25
Total ca	andidates for seat:	2				\$6,069.00	\$56,419.03	\$36,087.26	\$26,400.77
16th Middlesex									
Harry H.	Garavanian		R		L	\$0.00	\$2,485.00	\$2,776.02	\$50.00
Thomas	A. Golden Jr.		D	I	W	\$594.48	\$29,112.71	\$17,225.10	\$12,482.09
Total ca	andidates for seat:	2				\$594.48	\$31,597.71	\$20,001.12	\$12,532.09
17th Middlesex									
Eryk C. E	Boston		Li		L	\$0.00	\$480.00	\$480.00	\$0.00
Clifford K	Krieger		R		L	\$0.00	\$4,060.40	\$4,062.91	\$57.49
David M.	Nangle		D	I	W	\$2,408.80	\$35,370.00	\$21,748.23	\$16,030.57
Total ca	andidates for seat:	3				\$2,408.80	\$39,910.40	\$26,291.14	\$16,088.06
18th Middlesex									
John W.	Charow, Jr.		R		L	\$0.00	\$1,961.73	\$1,902.52	\$59.21
Kevin J. I	Murphy		D	I	W	\$7,953.90	\$26,107.00	\$14,632.57	\$19,428.33
Total ca	andidates for seat:	2				\$7,953.90	\$28,068.73	\$16,535.09	\$19,487.54
19th Middlesex	,								
Dan Ballo	Du		R		L	\$0.00	\$5,515.35	\$5,468.44	\$46.91
James R	. Miceli		D	Ι	W	\$841.99	\$19,687.59	\$18,001.98	\$2,527.60
Total ca	andidates for seat:	2				\$841.99	\$25,202.94	\$23,470.42	\$2,574.51

District	Candidate		Party 1	Incumbent	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
20th Middlesex	(
Bradley	S. Jones Jr.		R	Ι	W	\$43,380.57	\$42,658.98	\$34,152.93	\$51,886.62
Total c	andidates for seat:	1				\$43,380.57	\$42,658.98	\$34,152.93	\$51,886.62
21st Middlesex	(
John Ciri	ignano		R		L	\$0.00	\$5,655.00	\$4,412.54	\$1,242.46
Elias Isra	ael		Li		L	\$0.00	\$625.00	\$625.00	\$0.00
Charles	A. Murphy		D	I	W	\$20,288.55	\$41,626.88	\$58,700.60	\$3,459.83
Terrence	Parker		D		L	\$0.00	\$6,330.00	\$5,961.97	\$97.00
Total c	andidates for seat:	4				\$20,288.55	\$54,236.88	\$69,700.11	\$4,799.29
22nd Middlese	x								
William	G. Greene, Jr.		D	Ι	W	\$6,888.78	\$0.00	\$3,442.56	\$3,446.22
Total c	andidates for seat:	1				\$6,888.78	\$0.00	\$3,442.56	\$3,446.22
23rd Middlesex	ĸ								
Richard	Arena		D		L	\$1,017.06	\$11,740.00	\$11,773.07	\$983.99
James M	1arzilli		D	I	W	\$11,690.85	\$17,190.00	\$17,689.66	\$11,191.19
Total c	andidates for seat:	2				\$12,707.91	\$28,930.00	\$29,462.73	\$12,175.18
24th Middlesex	(
Anne M.	Paulsen		D	Ι	W	\$12,990.47	\$10,054.71	\$13,734.18	\$8,811.00
Total c	andidates for seat:	1				\$12,990.47	\$10,054.71	\$13,734.18	\$8,811.00

District Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
25th Middlesex								
Alice K. Wolf		D	I	W	\$54,678.12	\$38,036.64	\$30,659.32	\$62,055.44
Total candidates for seat:	1				\$54,678.12	\$38,036.64	\$30,659.32	\$62,055.44
26th Middlesex								
Paul Lachelier		G		L	\$0.00	\$23,532.19	\$23,436.58	\$95.61
Timothy J. Toomey Jr.		D	I	W	\$14,702.54	\$50,988.78	\$65,667.91	\$23.41
Total candidates for seat:	2				\$14,702.54	\$74,520.97	\$89,104.49	\$119.02
27th Middlesex								
Patricia D. Jehlen		D	I	W	\$2,416.70	\$10,710.89	\$6,082.77	\$7,044.82
John Alan Roderick		Li		L	\$0.00	\$1,312.62	\$1,312.62	\$0.00
Total candidates for seat:	2				\$2,416.70	\$12,023.51	\$7,395.39	\$7,044.82
28th Middlesex								
Barbara J. Auger Collins		D		L	\$2,747.56	\$2,454.70	\$5,202.26	\$0.00
Edward G. Connolly		D	I	W	\$13,643.68	\$27,861.00	\$35,137.06	\$5,997.15
Anthony Ranieri		R		L	\$6,692.29	\$18,656.05	\$18,518.18	\$6,830.16
Total candidates for seat:	3				\$23,083.53	\$48,971.75	\$58,857.50	\$12,827.31
29th Middlesex								
Rachel Kaprielian		D	I	W	\$106,528.50	\$25,472.00	\$12,577.41	\$119,423.09
Total candidates for seat:	1				\$106,528.50	\$25,472.00	\$12,577.41	\$119,423.09

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
30th Middlese	x								
Carol A.	Donovan		D	I	W	\$8,905.51	\$19,308.00	\$23,197.19	\$5,016.24
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$8,905.51	\$19,308.00	\$23,197.19	\$5,016.24
31st Middlese	x								
Paul C.	Casey		D	I	W	\$11,393.24	\$20,389.95	\$20,612.81	\$11,170.38
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$11,393.24	\$20,389.95	\$20,612.81	\$11,170.38
32nd Middlese	ex								
Michael	E. Festa		D	I	W	\$18,933.47	\$44,133.40	\$48,239.89	\$14,776.98
Arthur E	E. Hitchman Jr		R		L	\$2,769.74	\$23,482.00	\$25,592.94	\$658.80
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$21,703.21	\$67,615.40	\$73,832.83	\$15,435.78
33rd Middlese	x								
Christop	oher G. Fallon		D	I	W	\$16,363.44	\$65,390.00	\$60,317.85	\$21,435.59
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$16,363.44	\$65,390.00	\$60,317.85	\$21,435.59
34th Middlese	x								
Vincent	P. Ciampa		D	I	W	\$36,203.43	\$17,253.57	\$12,511.56	\$40,945.44
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$36,203.43	\$17,253.57	\$12,511.56	\$40,945.44
35th Middlese	x								
Paul J. I	Donato		D	I	W	\$17,554.33	\$48,699.37	\$47,263.97	\$18,989.73
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$17,554.33	\$48,699.37	\$47,263.97	\$18,989.73

District	Candidate		Party	Incumben	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
36th Middlesex									
Dennis De	eeb II		R		L	\$0.00	\$12,445.25	\$12,445.25	\$0.00
Colleen M	. Garry		D	I	W	\$12,485.88	\$38,100.00	\$46,619.86	\$3,966.02
Total ca	ndidates for seat:	2				\$12,485.88	\$50,545.25	\$59,065.11	\$3,966.02
37th Middlesex									
James Elc	dridge		D		W	\$3,050.92	\$48,952.57	\$51,583.49	\$420.00
Todd D. F	enniman		R		L	\$0.00	\$34,891.13	\$34,864.32	\$25.81
Ronald La	mothe		D		L	\$0.00	\$6,485.00	\$3,284.00	\$3,201.00
Paul E. Lir	net		D		L	\$8,604.01	\$27,773.33	\$36,130.01	\$247.33
David L.	Westerling		D		L	\$1,330.00	\$34,910.00	\$36,240.00	\$0.00
Total ca	ndidates for seat:	5				\$12,984.93	\$153,012.03	\$162,101.82	\$3,894.14
1st Norfolk									
Bruce J. A	lyers		D	I	W	\$13,830.52	\$20,549.77	\$3,324.70	\$31,055.59
Total ca	ndidates for seat:	1				\$13,830.52	\$20,549.77	\$3,324.70	\$31,055.59
2nd Norfolk									
Arthur Ste	phen Tobin		D	I	W	\$83,301.39	\$21,937.40	\$27,133.67	\$78,105.12
Total ca	ndidates for seat:	1				\$83,301.39	\$21,937.40	\$27,133.67	\$78,105.12
3rd Norfolk									
Ronald Ma	ariano		D	I	W	\$113,761.32	\$55,549.96	\$21,127.63	\$148,183.65
Total ca	ndidates for seat:	1				\$113,761.32	\$55,549.96	\$21,127.63	\$148,183.65

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
4th Norfolk									
James	Murphy		D	I	W	\$5,045.51	\$18,365.00	\$10,300.75	\$13,109.76
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$5,045.51	\$18,365.00	\$10,300.75	\$13,109.76
5th Norfolk									
Joseph	C. Sullivan		D	I	W	\$147,145.86	\$5,930.35	\$15,782.94	\$137,293.27
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$147,145.86	\$5,930.35	\$15,782.94	\$137,293.27
6th Norfolk									
William	C. Galvin		D	I	W	\$10,773.36	\$11,890.00	\$10,880.37	\$11,782.99
Howard	Hansen		R		L	\$0.00	\$3,276.20	\$2,502.10	\$774.10
Richard	I A. Yampell		Li		L	\$0.00	\$793.90	\$793.90	\$0.00
Total	candidates for seat:	3				\$10,773.36	\$15,960.10	\$14,176.37	\$12,557.09
7th Norfolk									
James	J. Aldred		R		L	\$0.00	\$3,424.33	\$2,374.12	\$1,050.21
Jeremia	ah "Jay" Lowney		U		L	\$0.00	\$51,715.00	\$51,715.00	\$0.00
Joseph	McEttrick		D		L	\$4,464.72	\$37,665.00	\$39,411.75	\$2,717.97
Walter	F. Timilty Jr.		D	I	W	\$40,773.35	\$110,214.87	\$150,766.77	\$221.45
Total	candidates for seat:	4				\$45,238.07	\$203,019.20	\$244,267.64	\$3,989.63
8th Norfolk									
Louis L.	. Kafka		D	I	W	\$7,331.99	\$8,590.84	\$14,762.45	\$1,160.38
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$7,331.99	\$8,590.84	\$14,762.45	\$1,160.38

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
9th Norfolk									
Scott P	P. Brown		R	I	W	\$4,671.68	\$5,830.00	\$2,753.20	\$7,748.48
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$4,671.68	\$5,830.00	\$2,753.20	\$7,748.48
10th Norfolk									
James	E. Vallee		D	I	W	\$5,046.46	\$17,176.13	\$17,717.60	\$4,504.99
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$5,046.46	\$17,176.13	\$17,717.60	\$4,504.99
11th Norfolk									
Robert	Coughlin		D		W	\$10,259.30	\$171,950.00	\$179,573.19	\$2,636.11
Maryar	nne Lewis		D	I	L	\$56,499.57	\$99,863.21	\$156,302.70	\$60.08
Joseph	A. Pascarella		R		L	\$0.00	\$11,641.00	\$11,271.92	\$369.08
Daniel	M. Smith		R		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total	candidates for seat:	4				\$66,758.87	\$283,454.21	\$347,147.81	\$3,065.27
12th Norfolk									
John H	I. Rogers		D	I	W	\$95,381.40	\$77,679.68	\$71,857.40	\$101,203.68
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$95,381.40	\$77,679.68	\$71,857.40	\$101,203.68
13th Norfolk									
Lida E.	Harkins		D	I	W	\$15,788.14	\$25,993.46	\$20,623.69	\$21,157.91
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$15,788.14	\$25,993.46	\$20,623.69	\$21,157.91

District	Candidate		Party 1	Incumbent	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
14th Norfolk									
George	P. Field		R		L	\$0.00	\$41,174.14	\$46,342.36	\$61.78
Lawren	ce R. Kaplan		D		L	\$1,629.24	\$26,830.00	\$28,459.24	\$0.00
Alice H	anlon Peisch		D		W	\$0.00	\$85,032.35	\$82,972.25	\$2,060.10
Total	candidates for seat:	3				\$1,629.24	\$153,036.49	\$157,773.85	\$2,121.88
15th Norfolk									
Frank I	. Smizik		D	I	W	\$4,910.72	\$2,811.00	\$7,808.70	\$713.02
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$4,910.72	\$2,811.00	\$7,808.70	\$713.02
1st Plymouth									
Vinny E	DeMacedo		R	I	W	\$15,236.91	\$37,829.00	\$51,678.72	\$1,412.19
Loring	Tripp		D		L	\$600.00	\$25,356.84	\$24,631.70	\$0.00
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$15,836.91	\$63,185.84	\$76,310.42	\$1,412.19
2nd Plymouth									
Samue	l Corbitt		R		L	\$911.46	\$3,363.29	\$4,274.75	\$0.00
Dennis	A. Damata		R		L	\$16.00	\$8,090.00	\$8,039.59	\$66.41
John T.	Donahue		D		L	\$2,300.00	\$53,386.90	\$57,634.19	\$67.71
Susan	D. Williams Gifford		R		W	\$4,495.50	\$37,420.00	\$41,124.23	\$791.27
Rick M	usiol, Jr		D		L	\$13,178.10	\$34,911.00	\$47,984.18	\$104.92
Total	candidates for seat:	5				\$20,901.06	\$137,171.19	\$159,056.94	\$1,030.31

District	Candidate		Party 1	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
3rd Plymout	th								
Garr	rett J. Bradley		D	I	W	\$29,849.86	\$59,586.17	\$89,159.15	\$276.88
Nath	naniel Palmer		R		L	\$0.00	\$38,852.29	\$37,122.52	\$1,729.77
То	otal candidates for seat:	2				\$29,849.86	\$98,438.46	\$126,281.67	\$2,006.65
4th Plymout	th								
Fran	nk M. Hynes		D	I	W	\$34,479.23	\$835.00	\$0.00	\$35,314.23
То	otal candidates for seat:	1				\$34,479.23	\$835.00	\$0.00	\$35,314.23
5th Plymout	th								
Jose	eph E. Mullin		R		L	\$0.00	\$9,376.13	\$8,878.00	\$498.13
Robe	ert J. Nyman		D	Ι	W	\$1,081.15	\$28,525.00	\$28,164.50	\$1,441.65
То	otal candidates for seat:	2				\$1,081.15	\$37,901.13	\$37,042.50	\$1,939.78
6th Plymout	th								
Thor	mas J. Barry		R		L	\$0.00	\$3,091.96	\$3,092.37	\$0.00
Willia	iam Cullity, Jr.		D		L	\$0.00	\$20,950.15	\$17,981.37	\$1,962.23
Bridg	get Simmons		D		L	\$251.64	\$37,660.70	\$37,840.68	\$62.66
Dani	iel K. Webster		R		W	\$0.00	\$41,779.00	\$40,682.47	\$1,096.53
То	otal candidates for seat:	4				\$251.64	\$103,481.81	\$99,596.89	\$3,121.42

District	Candidate		Party 1	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
7th Plymouth									
R. And	Irew Burbine		R		L	\$0.00	\$29,245.73	\$29,903.72	\$342.01
Steven	n P. Olson		Li		L	\$500.00	\$2,270.00	\$2,770.00	\$0.00
Kathlee	en M. Teahan		D	I	W	\$12,902.90	\$29,910.00	\$36,649.20	\$6,163.70
Total	l candidates for seat:	3				\$13,402.90	\$61,425.73	\$69,322.92	\$6,505.71
8th Plymouth									
George	e L. Berdos, Jr.		Li		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
David I	L. Flynn		D	I	W	\$23,075.99	\$6,850.00	\$9,528.01	\$20,397.98
Total	l candidates for seat:	2				\$23,075.99	\$6,850.00	\$9,528.01	\$20,397.98
9th Plymouth									
Thoma	as P. Kennedy		D	I	W	\$46,751.81	\$18,311.55	\$13,148.25	\$51,915.11
Total	l candidates for seat:	1				\$46,751.81	\$18,311.55	\$13,148.25	\$51,915.11
10th Plymout	h								
Christir	ne E. Canavan		D	I	W	\$988.91	\$5,421.48	\$3,533.65	\$2,876.74
Total	l candidates for seat:	1				\$988.91	\$5,421.48	\$3,533.65	\$2,876.74
11th Plymout	h								
Geraldi	line Creedon		D	I	W	\$21,502.52	\$15,200.00	\$13,072.56	\$23,629.96
Total	l candidates for seat:	1				\$21,502.52	\$15,200.00	\$13,072.56	\$23,629.96
12th Plymoutl	h								
Thoma	as J. O'Brien		D	I	W	\$12,991.86	\$37,403.54	\$24,840.38	\$25,555.02
Total	l candidates for seat:	1				\$12,991.86	\$37,403.54	\$24,840.38	\$25,555.02

25

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
1st Suffolk									
Antho	ony W. Petruccelli		D	I	W	\$4,536.69	\$15,325.00	\$13,965.24	\$4,654.38
Tot	al candidates for seat:	1				\$4,536.69	\$15,325.00	\$13,965.24	\$4,654.38
2nd Suffolk									
Gene	e L. O'Flaherty		D	I	W	\$28,304.56	\$55,900.00	\$30,807.80	\$53,396.76
Tot	al candidates for seat:	1				\$28,304.56	\$55,900.00	\$30,807.80	\$53,396.76
3rd Suffolk			5		144	\$ 400.040.74	\$ 04.057.40	* 55.005.00	¢4.40.000 FF
	atore F. DiMasi		D	I	W	\$132,840.74	\$64,857.10	\$55,665.03	\$142,098.55
Tot	al candidates for seat:	1				\$132,840.74	\$64,857.10	\$55,665.03	\$142,098.55
4th Suffolk									
Shaw	n P. Murphy		D		L	\$2,922.38	\$40,309.95	\$42,550.68	\$681.65
Robe	ert G. O'Shea		D		L	\$2,820.00	\$59,901.31	\$61,966.42	\$754.89
Brian	P. Wallace		D		W	\$0.00	\$92,640.00	\$92,393.22	\$246.78
Tot	al candidates for seat:	3				\$5,742.38	\$192,851.26	\$196,910.32	\$1,683.32
5th Suffolk									
Pegg	y Chaparro		U		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Marie	e St. Fleur		D	I	W	\$4,370.63	\$31,673.80	\$35,865.03	\$179.40
Tot	al candidates for seat:	2				\$4,370.63	\$31,673.80	\$35,865.03	\$179.40
6th Suffolk									
Shirle	ey Owens-Hicks		D	I	W	\$2,519.97	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Tot	al candidates for seat:	1				\$2,519.97	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

26

District	Candidate		Party	Incumben	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
7th Suffolk									
Gloria	L. Fox		D	I	W	\$1,692.50	\$4,550.00	\$3,654.58	\$2,799.43
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$1,692.50	\$4,550.00	\$3,654.58	\$2,799.43
8th Suffolk									
Marjo	rie C. Decker		D		L	\$3,991.50	\$99,643.77	\$95,955.83	\$2,094.27
Paul (C. Demakis		D	I	W	\$49,950.92	\$88,674.36	\$119,810.57	\$18,814.71
Tota	al candidates for seat:	2				\$53,942.42	\$188,318.13	\$215,766.40	\$20,908.98
9th Suffolk									
Byron	Rushing		D	I	W	\$15,191.75	\$2,925.00	\$685.09	\$17,431.66
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$15,191.75	\$2,925.00	\$685.09	\$17,431.66
10th Suffolk									
David	B. Estrada		U		L	\$0.00	\$7,961.91	\$7,961.91	\$0.00
Sara I	Hamlen		D		L	\$0.00	\$13,945.00	\$13,762.82	\$257.18
John I	M. Hickey		D		L	\$0.00	\$43,488.00	\$43,266.45	\$221.55
Brian	J. Kenneally		D		L	\$0.00	\$31,329.92	\$29,173.85	\$356.07
Micha	el F. Rush		D		W	\$737.98	\$59,887.26	\$56,961.88	\$3,663.36
Richa	rd Wheeler		R		L	\$0.00	\$17,774.16	\$16,679.38	\$1,094.78
Tota	al candidates for seat:	6				\$737.98	\$174,386.25	\$167,806.29	\$5,592.94

District	Candidate		Party 1	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
11th Suffol	lk								
Eliz	zabeth A. Malia		D	I	W	\$10,521.64	\$22,576.71	\$25,032.78	\$8,065.57
Ra	fael McLaughlin		D		L	\$0.00	\$10,022.72	\$9,821.70	\$201.02
Jac	cquelyne Payne-Thompson		D		L	\$0.00	\$831.00	\$754.32	\$76.68
7	Total candidates for seat:	3				\$10,521.64	\$33,430.43	\$35,608.80	\$8,343.27
12th Suffol	lk								
The	omas M. Finneran		D	I	W	\$508,921.70	\$370,641.37	\$407,232.06	\$472,331.01
Т	Total candidates for seat:	1				\$508,921.70	\$370,641.37	\$407,232.06	\$472,331.01
13th Suffol	lk								
Ed	lward L. Geary Jr.		D		L	\$0.00	\$6,755.00	\$6,646.08	\$108.92
Ma	artin J. Walsh		D	I	W	\$831.75	\$94,973.77	\$94,224.72	\$1,580.80
7	Total candidates for seat:	2				\$831.75	\$101,728.77	\$100,870.80	\$1,689.72
14th Suffol	lk								
An	gelo M. Scaccia		D	I	W	\$23,767.94	\$38,824.73	\$22,784.01	\$39,808.66
7	Total candidates for seat:	1				\$23,767.94	\$38,824.73	\$22,784.01	\$39,808.66

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
15th Suffolk								
William	n F. Allan		D	L	\$0.00	\$22,205.00	\$19,771.79	\$2,433.21
Kathryi	n J. Brookins		D	L	\$0.00	\$17,546.00	\$17,546.00	\$0.00
George	e Chidi		U	L	\$0.00	\$1,915.00	\$1,906.81	\$8.19
John H	I. Clifford		U	L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Richard	d J. Giordano		D	L	\$0.00	\$22,241.65	\$20,043.94	\$4,972.72
Juan L	lopez		D	L	\$0.00	\$15,204.00	\$15,032.23	\$171.77
D. Eva	n Rudall		D	L	\$0.00	\$2,990.00	\$2,990.00	\$0.00
Jeffrey	Sanchez		D	W	\$0.00	\$28,792.16	\$24,678.92	\$8,917.83
Total	candidates for seat:	8			\$0.00	\$110,893.81	\$101,969.69	\$16,503.72
16th Suffolk								
Kathi-A	Anne Reinstein		D	I W	\$22,191.58	\$18,608.03	\$32,828.43	\$7,971.18
Total	candidates for seat:	1			\$22,191.58	\$18,608.03	\$32,828.43	\$7,971.18
17th Suffolk								
Kevin (G. Honan		D	I W	\$37,046.43	\$19,528.16	\$17,639.92	\$38,934.67
Total	candidates for seat:	1			\$37,046.43	\$19,528.16	\$17,639.92	\$38,934.67
18th Suffolk								
Paul Fe	elker		D	L	\$191.00	\$6,700.00	\$6,070.31	\$820.69
David S	S. Friedman		D	L	\$15,750.00	\$87,062.54	\$96,914.74	\$5,897.50
Brian F	P. Golden		D	I W	\$23,915.88	\$59,481.57	\$60,834.08	\$20,947.08
Total	candidates for seat:	3			\$39,856.88	\$153,244.11	\$163,819.13	\$27,665.27

29

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
19th Suffolk									
	rt A. DeLeo		D	I	W	\$59,416.56	\$46,940.00	\$54,145.47	\$52,391.14
Paul	J. Ronukaitus		R		L	\$0.00	\$2,490.00	\$2,490.00	\$0.00
Tota	al candidates for seat:	2				\$59,416.56	\$49,430.00	\$56,635.47	\$52,391.14
1st Worceste	er								
David	d C. Bunker Jr.		D	I	L	\$1,042.22	\$26,644.75	\$28,135.41	\$51.56
Lewis	G. Evangelidis		R		W	\$0.00	\$41,335.13	\$38,965.28	\$2,369.85
	S. Ferguson		R		L	\$6,000.32	\$4,800.00	\$5,505.98	\$5,294.34
Tota	al candidates for seat:	3				\$7,042.54	\$72,779.88	\$72,606.67	\$7,715.75
2nd Worcest	ter								
Willia	am A. Hunt		R		L	\$0.00	\$8,579.11	\$8,579.11	\$0.00
Brian	Knuuttila		D	I	W	\$14,067.13	\$13,589.38	\$23,292.98	\$4,363.53
Tota	al candidates for seat:	2				\$14,067.13	\$22,168.49	\$31,872.09	\$4,363.53
3rd Worceste	er								
Ronal	ld R. Dionne		D		L	\$10.00	\$49.00	\$59.00	\$0.00
Emile	e J. Goguen		D	I	W	\$610.44	\$5,890.00	\$5,187.52	\$1,312.92
Tota	al candidates for seat:	2				\$620.44	\$5,939.00	\$5,246.52	\$1,312.92
4th Worceste	er								
Mary	Jane Simmons		D	I	W	\$2,595.42	\$500.00	\$1,578.80	\$1,516.62
Tota	al candidates for seat:	1				\$2,595.42	\$500.00	\$1,578.80	\$1,516.62

District	Candidate		Party 1	ncumbent	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
5th Worcester									
James F			D		L	\$0.00	\$4,253.84	\$4,253.84	\$0.00
Anne G	obi		D	I	W	\$2,182.28	\$26,765.00	\$27,496.85	\$1,200.43
Ryan J.	Witkos		R		L	\$1,732.88	\$24,310.18	\$25,990.13	\$52.93
Total	candidates for seat:	3				\$3,915.16	\$55,329.02	\$57,740.82	\$1,253.36
6th Worcester									
Mark J.	Carron		D	I	W	\$1,749.08	\$8,265.00	\$8,703.61	\$1,310.47
Jerzy J.	Jachimczyk		R		L	\$996.93	\$9,845.00	\$10,823.71	\$18.22
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$2,746.01	\$18,110.00	\$19,527.32	\$1,328.69
7th Worcester									
Paul K.	Frost		R	I	W	\$11,036.92	\$19,542.48	\$28,487.34	\$2,092.06
James F	F. Murphy		D		L	\$0.00	\$19,350.00	\$19,041.37	\$308.63
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$11,036.92	\$38,892.48	\$47,528.71	\$2,400.69
8th Worcester									
John He	ealey		D		L	\$0.00	\$7,192.95	\$5,783.08	\$1,409.87
Paul Ku	ijawski		D	Ι	W	\$4,609.96	\$64,873.44	\$62,952.32	\$6,531.08
Total	candidates for seat:	2				\$4,609.96	\$72,066.39	\$68,735.40	\$7,940.95
9th Worcester									
George	N. Peterson Jr.		R	I	W	\$3,845.67	\$25,530.63	\$24,193.87	\$5,182.43
Total	candidates for seat:	1				\$3,845.67	\$25,530.63	\$24,193.87	\$5,182.43

District	Candidate		Party	Incumbent	Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
10th Worcest	ter								
Marie	J. Parente		D	I	W	\$8,656.69	\$850.00	\$7,755.22	\$1,751.47
Tota	I candidates for seat:	1				\$8,656.69	\$850.00	\$7,755.22	\$1,751.47
11th Worcest	ter								
Karyn	E. Polito		R	I	W	\$57,453.92	\$42,929.26	\$24,161.14	\$76,222.04
Tota	I candidates for seat:	1				\$57,453.92	\$42,929.26	\$24,161.14	\$76,222.04
12th Worcest	ter								
Harold	P. Naughton Jr.		D	I	W	\$16,227.47	\$26,695.00	\$36,593.18	\$6,329.29
Williar	m D. "Skip" Pacheco		Li		L	\$0.00	\$2,020.00	\$1,789.15	\$230.85
Tota	I candidates for seat:	2				\$16,227.47	\$28,715.00	\$38,382.33	\$6,560.14
13th Worcest	ter								
Robert	t Spellane		D	I	W	\$2,781.83	\$31,680.33	\$32,034.38	\$2,427.78
Tota	I candidates for seat:	1				\$2,781.83	\$31,680.33	\$32,034.38	\$2,427.78
14th Worcest	ter								
James	s B. Leary		D	I	W	\$6,812.81	\$20,485.75	\$17,434.16	\$9,864.40
Tota	I candidates for seat:	1				\$6,812.81	\$20,485.75	\$17,434.16	\$9,864.40
15th Worcest	ter								
Vincer	nt A. Pedone		D	I	W	\$14,829.86	\$7,661.04	\$13,205.96	\$6,395.50
Tota	I candidates for seat:	1				\$14,829.86	\$7,661.04	\$13,205.96	\$6,395.50

District	Candidate	Party	Incumbent	t Won/Lost	Start	Receipts	Expenditures	End
16th Worces	ster							
John	P. Fresolo	D	I	W	\$29,366.50	\$39,679.02	\$21,409.58	\$47,635.94
Aidar	n T. Yeaw	U		L	\$0.00	\$1,382.81	\$1,382.81	\$0.00
Tot	tal candidates for seat: 2				\$29,366.50	\$41,061.83	\$22,792.39	\$47,635.94
17th Worces	ster							
John	J. Binienda, Sr.	D	I	W	\$148,033.37	\$48,005.00	\$15,021.46	\$181,016.91
Tot	tal candidates for seat: 1				\$148,033.37	\$48,005.00	\$15,021.46	\$181,016.91
18th Worces	ster							
Peter	r Amorello	R		L	\$12,210.00	\$30,440.00	\$41,743.57	\$906.43
Robe	ert J. Badzmierowski	U		L	\$0.00	\$24,607.44	\$24,607.44	\$0.00
Jenni	ifer Callahan	D		W	\$10,366.11	\$41,506.00	\$51,350.75	\$521.36
Robe	ert J. Dubois	D		L	\$0.00	\$47,815.00	\$47,606.37	\$208.63
Tot	tal candidates for seat: 4				\$22,576.11	\$144,368.44	\$165,308.13	\$1,636.42
То	otal candidates: 311							
	GRAND TOTALS				\$3,872,269.32	\$7,746,418.26	\$7,799,287.55	\$3,853,255.22