

OFFICE OF
CAMPAIGN
and
POLITICAL
FINANCE

Commonwealth
of Massachusetts

REPORT OF
CAMPAIGN FINANCE
ACTIVITY BY
CANDIDATES FOR
THE MASSACHUSETTS
HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES
IN 1992

December 1993

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction/Scope 1

Highlights of Findings 2

Overview of Campaign Finance Activity for
State House of Representative Candidates 3

Candidates Raising and Spending
Greatest Amounts in 1992 4

Analysis of Receipts and Expenditures
By Party Affiliation 5

Analysis of Receipts and Expenditures
By Incumbency. 6

Analysis of Receipts and Expenditures
For Successful Candidates. 6

Analysis of Receipts and Expenditures
For Unopposed Candidates 7

Most Expensive House Races by District 7

Analysis of Beginning Balances for
Incumbents and Non-Incumbents. 8

INTRODUCTION

This report examines campaign finance activity undertaken by candidates for the Massachusetts House in 1992. It is the second time the Office of Campaign and Political Finance has issued such a report.

The Office of Campaign and Political Finance was established in 1973 to administer and enforce M.G.L. Chapter 55 (the Massachusetts Campaign Finance Law), which provides disclosure and regulation of campaign finance activity on the state, county and municipal levels. Based on the purpose for which they were organized, political committees are categorized as follows:

- (1) political committees organized on behalf of an individual candidate for public office in Massachusetts;
- (2) political committees promoting or opposing ballot questions;
- (3) political committees registered on behalf of political parties (ward, town, city and state committees); and
- (4) multi-candidate political committees (so-called PACs).

SCOPE

The statistical information contained in this report is based on information received by the office in campaign finance reports filed by candidates or treasurers of political committees organized on behalf of candidates for the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1992. This information does not take into account any corrections, additions or deletions which will occur as a result of audits conducted by the office.

Under section 18 of Chapter 55, campaign finance reports are required to be filed by candidates and their committees in order to provide disclosure of their campaign finance activity. House candidates and their committees are required to file reports once during a non-election year and three times during an election year. The campaign finance law requires that those reports be filed with OCPF eight days prior to the primary election, eight days prior to the general election, and a year-end report on January 10.

On those reports, candidates and treasurers are required to disclose their account balance at the beginning of a reporting period; aggregate receipts for a reporting period; aggregate expenditures for a reporting period; in-kind contributions for a reporting period; itemized receipts over \$50; itemized expenditures of \$25 or more; and all liabilities until they are satisfied.

FINDINGS

Some highlights from the findings of the report which follows include:

-- The cost of campaigning for a seat in the Massachusetts House in 1992 fell as compared to 1990, but the average amounts of money raised by candidates increased during the same time. In 1990, 401 candidates raised an average of \$ 16,927, while in 1992, 361 candidates raised an average of \$ 17,568, an increase of 4 percent. However, candidates in 1992 spent less of that money on average than in 1990. In 1990, 401 candidates spent an average of \$ 17,779, while in 1992, 361 candidates spent an average of \$ 17,314, a decrease of 3 percent. (Page 3).

-- Democrats held a significant advantage over Republicans in both total amounts of monies raised and spent and average amounts of monies raised and spent. Democrats raised more than three times the total monies of Republicans, and spent more than three times the total monies of Republicans. In terms of average amounts raised and spent, Democrats also held a significant advantage over Republicans. The average Democratic House candidate in 1992 raised 38 percent more than the average Republican, and spent 34 percent more. (Page 5).

-- In general, the candidates who raised the most money were successful in winning House seats. The 160 successful candidates raised an average of \$ 25,734 in 1992, and spent an average of \$ 25,568 in that same time period. Out of 113 contested races, the candidate who spent the most money won 92 of those races. (Page 6).

-- The report lists the 10 House candidates who raised the most money in 1992, as well as the 10 House candidates who spent the most money in 1992. (Page 4).

-- Incumbent candidates held a decided edge in terms of beginning balances of campaign accounts. The 135 incumbent candidates began 1992 with more than 20 times the amount of cash on hand than the 226 non-incumbents. (Page 8).

-- The most expensive House race took place in the 36th Middlesex district, where six candidates spent a total of \$ 150,069 during 1992. The least expensive contested campaign took place in the 28th Middlesex district, where two candidates spent a total of \$ 4,136. (The ten most expensive contested races by district can be found on Page 7.)

-- Even though 47 of the 160 House seats were uncontested, those unopposed candidates still spent a total of \$646,434 in 1992. (Page 7).

OVERVIEW OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY
OF HOUSE CANDIDATES IN 1992

361 Total candidates

\$ 1,816,471 Cash balances available at beginning of 1992

\$ 6,342,000 Total receipts for all candidates

\$ 8,158,471 Total monies available to candidates in 1992

\$ 6,250,385 Total expenditures for all candidates

\$ 17,568 Average receipts per candidate

\$ 17,314 Average expenditures per candidate

COMPARISON TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY
OF HOUSE CANDIDATES IN 1990

401 Total candidates

\$ 2,217,037 Cash balances available at beginning of 1990

\$ 6,787,691 Total receipts for all candidates

\$ 9,004,728 Total monies available to candidates in 1990

\$ 7,129,457 Total expenditures for all candidates

\$ 16,927 Average receipts per candidate

\$ 17,779 Average expenditures per candidate

CANDIDATES RAISING AND SPENDING THE MOST MONEY IN 1992

RECEIPTS

<u>No.</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>Total Receipts</u>
1.	Y	Charles Flaherty (D)	Y	\$ 156,479
2.	Y	Thomas M. Finneran (D)	Y	\$ 121,770
3.	Y	Joan M. Menard (D)	Y	\$ 110,380
4.	Y	Emanuel Gus Serra (D)	Y	\$ 81,800
5.	Y	Mark Roosevelt (D)	Y	\$ 76,817
6.	Y	Kevin W. Fitzgerald (D)	Y	\$ 73,238
7.	Y	Robert Correia (D)	Y	\$ 64,326
8.	Y	Francis G. Mara (D)	Y	\$ 62,390
9.	Y	Raymond A. Jordan (D)	Y	\$ 61,817
10.	Y	John F. Cox (D)	Y	\$ 60,903

EXPENDITURES

<u>No.</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>Total Expenditures</u>
1.	Y	Kevin W. Fitzgerald (D)	Y	\$ 119,994
2.	Y	Joan M. Menard (D)	Y	\$ 107,905
3.	Y	Charles Flaherty (D)	Y	\$ 101,470
4.	Y	Emanuel Gus Serra (D)	Y	\$ 83,927
5.	Y	John F. Cox (D)	Y	\$ 83,295
6.	Y	Richard A. Voké (D)	Y	\$ 79,985
7.	Y	Robert Correia (D)	Y	\$ 70,397
8.	Y	Paul E. Caron (D)	Y	\$ 67,873
9.	Y	Thomas M. Finneran (D)	Y	\$ 66,231
10.	Y	Raymond A. Jordan (D)	Y	\$ 63,358

E - Elected to state House in 1992

I - Incumbent (For the purposes of this report, incumbents are defined as individuals holding the office sought in the 1992 House election.)

ANALYSIS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY PARTY AFFILIATION

	<u>1992</u>		
	Republicans	Democrats	Others (1)
Number of Candidates	111	235	16
Total Receipts	\$ 1,416,915	\$ 4,851,528	\$ 73,556
Average Receipts	\$ 12,765	\$ 20,645	\$ 4,597
Total Expenditures	\$ 1,471,101	\$ 4,706,593	\$ 72,691
Average Expenditures	\$ 13,253	\$ 20,028	\$ 4,543

	<u>1990</u>		
	Republicans	Democrats	Others
Number of Candidates	144	226	31
Total Receipts	\$ 1,577,337	\$ 5,039,445	\$ 170,909
Average Receipts	\$ 10,954	\$ 22,298	\$ 5,513
Total Expenditures	\$ 1,589,386	\$ 5,376,631	\$ 163,440
Average Expenditures	\$ 11,037	\$ 23,790	\$ 5,272

(1) For the purpose of this report, "Other" affiliations include unenrolled, independents and other party affiliations.

**ANALYSIS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY INCUMBENCY (1)
1992 HOUSE CANDIDATES**

	<u>Incumbents</u>	<u>Non-Incumbents</u>
Number	135	226
Total Receipts	\$ 3,374,328	\$ 2,967,672
Average Receipts	\$ 24,995	\$ 13,131
Total Expenditures	\$ 3,400,407	\$ 2,849,978
Average Expenditures	\$ 25,188	\$ 12,611

**ANALYSIS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR SUCCESSFUL
1992 HOUSE CANDIDATES**

	<u>Successful</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>
Number	160	201
Total Receipts	\$ 4,117,467	\$ 2,224,533
Average Receipts	\$ 25,734	\$ 11,067
Total Expenditures	\$ 4,090,994	\$ 2,159,391
Average Expenditures	\$ 25,569	\$ 10,743

* - Out of 113 contested races for House seats in 1992, the candidate who spent the most money won the seat in 92 of those races.

(1) For the purpose of this report, incumbents are defined as individuals holding the office sought in the 1992 House election.

**ANALYSIS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR
HOUSE CANDIDATES WHO WERE UNOPPOSED IN 1992**

Number	47
Total Receipts	\$ 649,710
Average Receipts	\$ 13,824
Total Expenditures	\$ 646,434
Average Expenditures	\$ 13,754

CANDIDATES WITHOUT OPPOSITION WHO SPENT THE MOST IN 1992

<u>Number</u>	<u>Incumbent</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Beginning Balance</u>
1.	Y	Richard A. Voke (D)	\$ 79,985
2.	Y	Paul E. Caron (D)	\$ 67,873
3.	Y	James T. Brett (D)	\$ 36,417
4.	Y	Joseph F. Wagner (D)	\$ 29,701
5.	Y	Edward M. Lambert (D)	\$ 24,466
6.	Y	Michael P. Walsh (D)	\$ 24,366
7.	Y	Marc D. Draisen (D)	\$ 20,460
8.	Y	Robert A. DeLeo (D)	\$ 20,356
9.	Y	Jeffrey J. Hayward (D)	\$ 19,428
10.	Y	Warren Tolman (D)	\$ 17,447

MOST EXPENSIVE HOUSE RACES BY DISTRICT IN 1992

<u>Number</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Total spent</u>	<u>No. of candidates</u>
1.	36th Middlesex	\$ 150,069	6
2.	16th Suffolk	\$ 120,726	3
3.	5th Bristol	\$ 120,525	2
4.	1st Norfolk	\$ 115,231	7
5.	27th Middlesex	\$ 104,960	2
6.	17th Essex	\$ 102,666	4
7.	15th Essex	\$ 99,458	7
8.	1st Barnstable	\$ 98,141	3
9.	26th Middlesex	\$ 97,195	3
10.	5th Norfolk	\$ 97,128	3

**ANALYSIS OF BEGINNING BALANCES
FOR INCUMBENTS AND NON-INCUMBENTS**

	<u>Incumbents</u>	<u>Non-Incumbents</u>
Number	135	226
Total Beginning Balances	\$ 1,759,928	\$ 56,543
Average Beginning Balance	\$ 13,037	\$ 250

CANDIDATES WITH HIGHEST BEGINNING BALANCES (AS OF JAN. 1992)

<u>Number</u>	<u>Elected</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Beginning Balance</u>
1.	Y	Richard A. Voke (D)	\$ 428,975
2.	Y	Kevin W. Fitzgerald (D)	\$ 75,737
3.	Y	Salvatore F. DiMasi (D)	\$ 75,489
4.	Y	Mark Roosevelt (D)	\$ 69,161
5.	Y	Thomas M. Finneran (D)	\$ 54,988
6.	Y	Paul E. Caron (D)	\$ 47,557
7.	Y	Charles Flaherty (D)	\$ 46,456
8.	Y	Kevin O'Sullivan (D)	\$ 44,784
9.	Y	John F. Cox (D)	\$ 40,021
10.	Y	Thomas P. Kennedy (D)	\$ 37,521

Considerable effort has been made to insure the accuracy of the data contained in this report. However, for numerous reasons, the detailed information may contain errors. In addition, none of the data is adjusted for inflation.

Anyone wishing further information on this report or about the Massachusetts campaign finance laws may contact the Office of Campaign and Political Finance at (617) 727-8352 or (800) 462-OCPF.