
OFFICE OF
CAMPAIGN
and
POLITICAL
FINANCE

Commonwealth
of Massachusetts

REPORT OF
CAMPAIGN FINANCE
ACTIVITY BY
CANDIDATES FOR
THE MASSACHUSETTS
SENATE IN 1994

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction. | 1 |
| Scope | 1 |
| Findings | 2 |
| Overview of Campaign Finance Activity For State Senate Candidates. | 3 |
| Candidates Raising and Spending Greatest Amounts in 1994. | 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 and Unsuccessful Candidates. | 6 |
| Analysis of Balances to Begin Election Year For Incumbents and Non-Incumbents. | 7 |
| Analysis of Spending On Open and Uncontested Seats. | 8 |
| Table of Campaign Finance Activity by District Race. | 13 |

INTRODUCTION

This report examines campaign finance activity undertaken by candidates for the Massachusetts Senate in 1994. It is the third time the Office of Campaign and Political Finance has issued such a report.

The Office of Campaign and Political Finance (OCPF) was established in 1973 to administer and enforce M.G.L. Chapter 55, the campaign finance law, which provides for 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 in Massachusetts 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);
- (4) and political action committees (PACs) and people's committees.

SCOPE

The statistical information contained in this report is based on information received by OCPF in campaign finance reports filed by candidates and treasurers of political committees organized on behalf of candidates for the Massachusetts Senate in 1994. This information does not take into account any corrections, additions or deletions which may occur as a result of any review conducted by OCPF or amendments filed by candidates or political committees.

Section 18 of Chapter 55 requires campaign finance reports to be filed by candidates and their committees in order to provide disclosure of their campaign finance activity. Senate 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 November election; and a year-end report in January.

For the 1994 state elections, Senate candidates and treasurers were required to disclose on those reports their account balances at the beginning of each reporting period; aggregate receipts for the reporting period; aggregate expenditures for the reporting period; in-kind contributions for the reporting period; itemized receipts over \$50; itemized expenditures of \$25 or more; and all liabilities.

FINDINGS

This report lists the beginning balances, total receipts, total expenditures and in-kind contributions for the 85 candidates for state Senate in 1994. Details of these figures are broken down by district. Highlights from the findings of the report include:

- The total monies raised and spent by all candidates for the state Senate in 1994 fell from the totals registered in the 1992 campaign. Part of that decline is clearly attributable to the fact that fewer candidates (85) ran for the Senate in 1994, compared to 111 candidates in 1992. However, all other indicators point to the fact that the cost of campaigning in Massachusetts continues to rise. The average receipts per candidate increased by \$5,689 over 1992 receipts, while the average expenditures per candidate increased by \$4,523 over 1992 expenditures. These increases were evident despite the fact that 15 incumbents were unopposed in their re-election campaigns, as opposed to nine unopposed candidates in 1992. (See Page 3)
- For the most part, money continues to equal success in running for legislative office. Of the 25 contested Senate seats, the candidate who spent the most money won in 19 of the races, or 76 percent of the time. That winning percentage was down slightly from 1992, when the candidates who spent the most money won 81 percent of the contested seats. As a group, successful candidates raised an average of \$79,600, compared to \$36,556 raised by unsuccessful candidates, while successful candidates spent an average of \$83,968, more than doubling the average expenditures of the unsuccessful candidates, who spent \$37,472. (Candidates were able to spend more than they raised due to existing balances with which they began the year.) (See Page 5)
- Democrats reversed a trend seen in the 1992 Senate elections, when Republican candidates recorded higher average receipts and expenditures. In the 1994 elections, the 50 Democrat candidates handily outdistanced their 33 Republican counterparts in both average receipts (\$64,109 to \$48,924) and average expenditures (\$67,048 to \$51,021). (See Page 4)
- OCPF analyzed the spending by candidates for open Senate seats (no incumbent candidate) and compared that to the spending by incumbent candidates who were unopposed in their re-election campaigns. This analysis found that non-incumbent candidates for open seats spent most of their money on printing/mailing and advertising, while incumbents candidates who faced no opposition spent most of their money on administrative expenses, fundraising, charitable contributions and printing/mailing. (See Pages 8-12)
- The most expensive contested Senate race was in the Plymouth & Norfolk district, where six candidates spent a total of \$268,011 during 1994. The least expensive contested race was in the 1st Essex & Middlesex district, where two candidates spent a total of \$39,908.

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

OVERVIEW OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY FOR SENATE CANDIDATES IN 1994

| | | |
|----|-----------|--|
| | 85 | Total Candidates |
| | 54 | Candidates began the year with cash balances |
| | 2 | Candidates raised and spent \$ 0 in 1994 |
| \$ | 2,043,462 | Cash balances available at beginning of 1994 |
| \$ | 4,829,019 | Total receipts for all candidates |
| \$ | 6,872,481 | Total monies available to candidates in 1994 |
| \$ | 5,044,959 | Total expenditures for all candidates |
| \$ | 56,812 | Average receipts per candidate |
| \$ | 59,352 | Average expenditures per candidate |
| \$ | 109,188 | Total in-kind contributions for all candidates |

COMPARISON TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY FOR SENATE CANDIDATES IN 1992

| | | |
|----|-----------|--|
| | 111 | Total Candidates |
| | 61 | Candidates began the year with cash balances |
| | 6 | Candidates raised and spent \$ 0 in 1992 |
| \$ | 2,456,899 | Cash balances available at beginning of 1992 |
| \$ | 5,674,643 | Total receipts for all candidates |
| \$ | 7,793,788 | Total monies available to candidates in 1994 |
| \$ | 6,086,061 | Total expenditures for all candidates |
| \$ | 51,123 | Average receipts per candidate |
| \$ | 54,829 | Average expenditures per candidate |
| \$ | 261,867 | Total in-kind contributions for all candidates |

**CANDIDATES RAISING AND SPENDING
THE MOST MONEY IN 1994**

RECEIPTS

| <u>No.</u> | <u>Elected</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Incumbent</u> | <u>Total Receipts</u> |
|------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Y | Birmingham, Thomas (D) | Y | \$ 170,445 |
| 2. | Y | White, W. Paul (D) | Y | \$ 163,509 |
| 3. | Y | Bulger, William (D) | Y | \$ 144,097 |
| 4. | Y | Durand, Robert (D) | Y | \$ 133,194 |
| 5. | Y | Montigny, Mark (D) | Y | \$ 119,558 |
| 6. | N | McDonald, Brian (D) | Y | \$ 118,135 |
| 7. | N | Flaherty, Michelle (R) | N | \$ 116,250 |
| 8. | Y | Norton, Thomas (D) | Y | \$ 109,308 |
| 9. | Y | Shannon, Charles (R) | Y | \$ 104,785 |
| 10. | Y | Walsh, Marian (D) | Y | \$ 103,695 |

EXPENDITURES

| <u>No.</u> | <u>Elected</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Incumbent</u> | <u>Total Expenditures</u> |
|------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. | Y | Bulger, William (D) | Y | \$ 264,330 |
| 2. | Y | Keating, William (D) | Y | \$ 195,351 |
| 3. | Y | White, W. Paul (D) | Y | \$ 166,806 |
| 4. | Y | Norton, Thomas (D) | Y | \$ 163,763 |
| 5. | N | Lionett, David (R) | N | \$ 159,691 |
| 6. | Y | Berry, Frederick (D) | Y | \$ 124,856 |
| 7. | N | McDonald, Brian (D) | Y | \$ 121,485 |
| 8. | Y | Walsh, Marian (D) | Y | \$ 120,582 |
| 9. | Y | Durand, Robert (D) | Y | \$ 114,869 |
| 10. | N | Flaherty, Michelle (R) | N | \$ 112,368 |

(For the purposes of this report, incumbents are defined as those individuals holding the office of state Senate in 1994.)

**ANALYSIS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES
BY PARTY AFFILIATION**

| | 1994 | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | <u>REPUBLICANS</u> | <u>DEMOCRATS</u> | <u>OTHERS (1)</u> |
| Number of Candidates | 33 | 50 | 2 |
| Total Receipts | \$ 1,614,478 | \$ 3,205,450 | \$ 9,091 |
| Average Receipts | \$ 48,924 | \$ 64,109 | \$ 4,546 |
| Total Expenditures | \$ 1,683,683 | \$ 3,352,410 | \$ 8,865 |
| Average Expenditures | \$ 51,021 | \$ 67,048 | \$ 4,433 |

| | 1992 | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------|
| | <u>REPUBLICANS</u> | <u>DEMOCRATS</u> | <u>OTHERS</u> |
| Number of Candidates | 33 | 75 | 3 |
| Total Receipts | \$ 1,760,394 | \$ 3,893,787 | \$ 20,462 |
| Average Receipts | \$ 53,345 | \$ 51,917 | \$ 6,821 |
| Total Expenditures | \$ 1,976,753 | \$ 4,088,845 | \$ 20,462 |
| Average Expenditures | \$ 59,901 | \$ 54,518 | \$ 6,821 |

(1) For the purpose of this report, "Other" affiliations include unenrolled, independents and other minor party affiliations. All receipts and expenditures by "Other" candidates in 1994 and 1992 were made by single candidates. The other candidates had no campaign finance activity.

**ANALYSIS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY
INCUMBENCY FOR 1994 SENATE CANDIDATES**

| | <u>INCUMBENTS</u> | <u>NON-INCUMBENTS</u> |
|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Number | 35 | 50 |
| Total Receipts | \$ 2,853,837 | \$ 1,975,182 |
| Average Receipts | \$ 81,538 | \$ 39,504 |
| Total Expenditures | \$ 3,048,929 | \$ 1,996,029 |
| Average Expenditures | \$ 87,112 | \$ 39,921 |

**ANALYSIS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR
SUCCESSFUL 1994 SENATE CANDIDATES**

| | <u>SUCCESSFUL</u> | <u>UNSUCCESSFUL</u> |
|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Number | 40 | 45 |
| Total Receipts | \$ 3,183,997 | \$ 1,645,022 |
| Average Receipts | \$ 79,600 | \$ 36,556 |
| Total Expenditures | \$ 3,358,725 | \$ 1,686,234 |
| Average Expenditures | \$ 83,968 | \$ 37,472 |

(For the purposes of this report, incumbents are defined as those individuals holding the office of state Senate in 1994.)

**ANALYSIS OF BALANCES TO BEGIN ELECTION YEAR
FOR INCUMBENTS AND NON-INCUMBENTS**

| | <u>INCUMBENTS</u> | <u>NON-INCUMBENTS</u> |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Number | 35 | 50 |
| Total Beginning Balances | \$ 1,924,165 | \$ 119,296 |
| Average Beginning Balance | \$ 54,976 | \$ 2,386 |

**CANDIDATES WITH HIGHEST BALANCES
(AS OF JANUARY 1, 1994)**

INCUMBENTS

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Elected?</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Beginning Balance</u> |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | Y | Bulger, William (D) | \$ 450,125 |
| 2. | Y | Pines, Lois (D) | \$ 224,703 |
| 3. | Y | Keating, William (D) | \$ 185,036 |
| 4. | Y | Norton, Thomas (D) | \$ 144,086 |
| 5. | Y | Bertonazzi, Louis (D) | \$ 136,012 |
| 6. | Y | Birmingham, Thomas (D) | \$ 118,764 |
| 7. | Y | White, W. Paul (D) | \$ 64,855 |
| 8. | Y | Hicks, Lucile (R) | \$ 51,799 |
| 9. | Y | Montigny, Mark | \$ 47,620 |
| 10. | Y | Shannon, Charles (R) | \$ 47,244 |

NON-INCUMBENTS

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Elected?</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Beginning Balance</u> |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | Y | Tolman, Warren (D)* | \$ 43,488 |
| 2. | N | Lionett, David (R) | \$ 38,688 |
| 3. | N | Palmer, Morgan (R) | \$ 15,642 |
| 4. | N | Colucci, Richard (D) | \$ 5,004 |
| 5. | Y | Hedlund, Robert (R) | \$ 3,857 |
| 6. | Y | Tarr, Bruce (R)* | \$ 2,430 |
| 7. | N | Pini, Anthony (R) | \$ 1,941 |
| 8. | Y | Knapik, Michael (R)* | \$ 1,719 |
| 9. | N | Matson, John (R) | \$ 1,350 |
| 10. | N | Flaherty, Michelle (R) | \$ 1,000 |

(For the purposes of this report, incumbents are defined as those individuals holding the office of state Senate in 1994. * - Indicates held House seat in 1994.)

ANALYSIS OF 1994 SPENDING ON OPEN SENATE SEATS

In 1994, 15 candidates ran for five open Senate seats in the following districts:


- 1st Essex
- 1st Essex and Middlesex
- 2nd Hampden and Hampshire
- Middlesex and Suffolk
- 1st Worcester

Those candidates reported making itemized expenditures (those of \$25 or more) in the following categories for the following amounts:

| <u>CATEGORY</u> | <u>AMOUNT</u> | <u>% OF TOTAL SPENDING</u> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Advertising | \$ 220,349 | 28 |
| Charitable Contributions | \$ 8,078 | 1 |
| Fundraising | \$ 39,841 | 5 |
| Travel | \$ 2,385 | 0 |
| Printing/Mailing | \$ 258,399 | 34 |
| Food/Gifts/Entertainment | \$ 29,263 | 4 |
| Political Contributions | \$ 3,141 | 0 |
| Administrative Expenses | \$ 98,570 | 13 |
| Salaries | \$ 113,717 | 15 |
| Other | <u>\$ 2,312</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total Itemized Expenditures | \$ 776,055 | 100 |

Analysis is depicted in chart on Page 9.

1994 Senate Spending on Open Seats



- Advertising
- Charitable
- Fundraising
- Travel
- Printing
- Entertainment
- Political
- Administrative
- Salaries
- Other

ANALYSIS OF 1994 SPENDING ON UNCONTESTED SENATE SEATS

In 1994, 15 incumbents ran unopposed. Those candidates, and their districts, included:


- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Swift, Jane Maria (R); Berkshire, Hampden, Hampshire & Franklin - Lees, Brian (R); 1st Hampden & Hampshire - Rosenberg, Stanley (D); Hampshire & Franklin - Pines, Lois (D); 1st Middlesex & Norfolk - Pacheco, Marc (D); 1st Plymouth & Bristol - Antonioni, Robert (D); Worcester & Middlesex - Bertonazzi, Louis (D); Worcester & Norfolk - Birmingham, Thomas (D); Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Norton, Thomas (D); 1st Bristol - Montigny, Mark (D); 2nd Bristol - Melconian, Linda (D); Hampden - Tisei, Richard (R); 3rd Middlesex - Hicks, Lucile (R); 5th Middlesex - Bulger, William (D); 1st Suffolk - Amorello, Matthew (R); 2nd Worcester |
|--|--|

These candidates reported making itemized expenditures (those of \$25 or more) in the following categories for the following amounts:

| <u>CATEGORY</u> | <u>AMOUNT</u> | <u>% OF TOTAL SPENDING</u> |
|---------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| Advertising | \$ 66,390 | 6 |
| Charitable Contributions | \$ 145,893 | 14 |
| Fundraising | \$ 157,310 | 15 |
| Travel | \$ 19,672 | 2 |
| Printing/Mailing | \$ 149,042 | 15 |
| Food/Gifts/Entertainment | \$ 130,943 | 13 |
| Political Contributions | \$ 36,330 | 4 |
| Administrative Expenses | \$ 174,597 | 17 |
| Salaries | \$ 142,728 | 14 |
| Other | <u>\$ 615</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total Itemized Expenditures | \$ 1,023,520 | 100 |

Analysis is depicted in chart on Page 11.

1994 Senate Spending in Uncontested Races



CATEGORIES FOR ANALYSIS OF SPENDING BY CANDIDATES FOR OPEN AND UNCONTESTED SENATE SEATS IN 1994

In studying the expenditures by candidates for open and uncontested Senate seats in 1994, OCPF broke the spending down into 10 categories:

Advertising - Includes newspaper, radio, television, cable television, billboards, etc.

Printing/mailing - Includes printing of signs, buttons, leaflets, t-shirts, bumper stickers, etc. Also, distribution of materials, postage, express mail and other delivery services. Also, photography.

Travel - Includes auto lease or rental, auto repair or fuel charges; airplane, train, bus or any transportation charges; also, lodging and other travel-related expenses.

Fundraising - Includes all fundraising expenses as indicated by the candidate or committee's campaign finance reports.

Food/Gifts/Entertainment - Includes entertainment costs not associated with fundraising, such as meals, both in restaurants and catering, or other food or beverages for campaign staff; rental of facilities for campaign parties other than fundraisers; gifts to workers or constituents, including flowers; and dues to organizations or clubs joined for political purposes.

Charitable Contributions - Includes donations to charities or other associations or organizations, such as veterans groups, scholarships, booster clubs, etc. Does not include contributions to other candidates or political committees (see below).

Political Contributions - Includes contributions made under law to other candidates for office or to PACs; or to party committees on the ward, town, city or state levels; or other political organizations.

Administrative Expenses - Includes office rent or lease, payment for utilities, office costs such as answering service, beeper or pager, cellular telephones, etc. Also, supplies, paper, pens, pencils, notebooks, etc. Any bank charges. Also, periodical subscriptions.

Salaries - Payments to individuals for services rendered on behalf of the campaign. Includes payments to consultants and legal costs.

Other - Any other itemized expenditures.

1994 SENATE RACE TOTALS - BY DISTRICT

| DISTRICT NAME | E | CANDIDATE NAME | INCUMBENT YES/NO | BEGINNING BALANCE (On 1/1/94) | TOTAL RECEIPTS 1994 | TOTAL EXPENDITURES 1994 | IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS 1994 |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Berkshire, Hampden, Hampshire & Franklin | * | Swift, Jane Maria (R) | Y | \$ 8,717.60 | \$ 32,121.73 | \$ 26,250.59 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 32,121.73 | \$ 26,250.59 | \$ 0.00 | |
| Bristol, 1st | * | Norton, Thomas C. (D) | Y | \$ 144,085.52 | \$ 109,307.87 | \$ 163,762.71 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 109,307.87 | \$ 163,762.71 | \$ 0.00 | |
| Bristol, 2nd | * | Montigny, Mark (D) | Y | \$ 47,619.84 | \$ 119,558.39 | \$ 66,484.98 | \$ 1,177.50 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 119,558.39 | \$ 66,484.98 | \$ 1,177.50 | |
| Cape & Islands | * | Rauschenbach, Henri (R) Barros, Ricardo M. (R) | Y N | \$ 599.92 \$ 0.00 | \$ 96,592.94 \$ 25,738.32 | \$ 97,108.11 \$ 25,698.42 | \$ 1,800.00 \$ 645.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 122,331.26 | \$ 122,806.53 | \$ 2,445.00 | |
| Essex, 1st | * | Clancy, Edward J. Jr. (D) Colucci, Richard C. (D) Smith Walsh, Deborah (D) Caron, Kathleen E. (R) McCarthy, Paul E. (R) | N N N N N | \$ 782.21 \$ 5,004.00 \$ 553.51 \$ 614.75 \$ 0.00 | \$ 87,024.17 \$ 13,040.00 \$ 45,039.56 \$ 45,555.54 \$ 7,710.00 | \$ 92,924.23 \$ 16,153.97 \$ 43,758.54 \$ 45,708.71 \$ 7,682.52 | \$ 0.00 \$ 0.00 \$ 3,294.96 \$ 1,321.00 \$ 0.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 198,369.27 | \$ 206,227.97 | \$ 4,615.96 | |

| DISTRICT NAME | E | CANDIDATE NAME | INCUMBENT YES/NO | BEGINNING BALANCE | TOTAL RECEIPTS | TOTAL EXPENDITURES | IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Essex, 2nd | * | Berry, Frederick E. (D) | Y | \$ 40,051.25 | \$ 103,665.99 | \$ 124,856.20 | \$ 3,470.10 |
| | | Keenan, John D. (D) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 55,639.43 | \$ 54,845.04 | \$ 660.00 |
| | | Stirgwalt, Jane Brady (R) | N | \$ 192.91 | \$ 49,499.80 | \$ 47,350.18 | \$ 785.54 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | \$ 208,805.22 | \$ 227,051.42 | \$ 227,051.42 | \$ 4,915.64 |
| Essex, 3rd | * | Jajuga, James P. (D) | Y | \$ 16,253.84 | \$ 82,971.94 | \$ 97,809.95 | \$ 2,284.31 |
| | | Florentini, James J. (R) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 61,430.24 | \$ 60,568.87 | \$ 2,210.00 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | \$ 144,402.18 | \$ 156,378.82 | \$ 156,378.82 | \$ 4,494.31 |
| Essex & Middlesex, 1st | | Kubierschky, Klaus (D) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 4,635.00 | \$ 5,041.83 | \$ 119.00 |
| | * | Tarr, Bruce E. (R) | N | \$ 2,430.01 | \$ 35,896.50 | \$ 34,865.72 | \$ 5,744.15 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | \$ 40,531.50 | \$ 39,907.55 | \$ 39,907.55 | \$ 5,863.15 |
| Essex & Middlesex, 2nd | * | O'Brien, John D. Jr. (D) | Y | \$ 19,324.16 | \$ 72,094.53 | \$ 91,241.18 | \$ 966.49 |
| | | Bishop, Edward J. Jr. (D) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 99.33 | \$ 99.33 | \$ 0.00 |
| | | Gorman, Frank J. (D) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 42,028.32 | \$ 41,761.17 | \$ 2,100.00 |
| | | Marasco, Maria (R) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 23,984.38 | \$ 23,856.21 | \$ 1,568.00 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | \$ 138,206.56 | \$ 156,957.89 | \$ 156,957.89 | \$ 4,634.49 |
| Hampden | * | Melconian, Linda J. (D) | Y | \$ 33,592.15 | \$ 55,528.36 | \$ 51,041.76 | \$ 0.00 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | \$ 55,528.36 | \$ 51,041.76 | \$ 51,041.76 | \$ 0.00 |
| Hampden & Hampshire, 1st | * | Lees, Brian P. (R) | Y | \$ 43,591.70 | \$ 78,287.13 | \$ 81,968.96 | \$ 1,000.00 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | \$ 78,287.13 | \$ 81,968.96 | \$ 81,968.96 | \$ 1,000.00 |

| DISTRICT NAME | E | CANDIDATE NAME | INCUMBENT YES/NO | BEGINNING BALANCE | TOTAL RECEIPTS | TOTAL EXPENDITURES | IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Hampden & Hampshire, 2nd | | Bartley, David K. (D) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 43,743.60 | \$ 43,743.60 | \$ 700.00 |
| | | Bissonnette, Michael D. (D) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 96,977.21 | \$ 96,977.21 | \$ 9,682.05 |
| | * | Knapik, Michael R. (R) | N | \$ 1,719.07 | \$ 96,800.66 | \$ 96,101.61 | \$ 6,923.30 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 239,699.40 | \$ 236,822.42 | \$ 17,305.35 | |
| Hampshire & Franklin | * | Rosenberg, Stanley C. (D) | Y | \$ 10,255.43 | \$ 24,112.00 | \$ 25,932.89 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 24,112.00 | \$ 25,932.89 | \$ 0.00 | |
| Middlesex, 1st | * | Leahy, Daniel P. (D) | Y | \$ 90.04 | \$ 64,939.09 | \$ 63,804.58 | \$ 900.00 |
| | | Conway, Michael G. (R) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 51,425.28 | \$ 51,239.27 | \$ 6.84 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 116,364.37 | \$ 115,043.85 | \$ 906.84 | |
| Middlesex, 2nd | | McHugh, Leo A. (D) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 3,130.00 | \$ 3,130.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| | * | Shannon, Charles E. (R) | Y | \$ 47,243.51 | \$ 104,784.56 | \$ 106,878.55 | \$ 490.74 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 107,914.56 | \$ 110,008.55 | \$ 490.74 | |
| Middlesex, 3rd | * | Tisei, Richard R. (R) | Y | \$ 4,152.67 | \$ 76,709.28 | \$ 73,853.18 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 76,709.28 | \$ 73,853.18 | \$ 0.00 | |
| Middlesex, 4th | * | Havern, Robert A. III (D) | Y | \$ 22,679.02 | \$ 35,175.00 | \$ 47,092.24 | \$ 823.09 |
| | | Cangiamila, Brian M. (R) | N | \$ 795.89 | \$ 47,578.00 | \$ 48,285.82 | \$ 1,275.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 82,753.00 | \$ 95,378.06 | \$ 2,098.09 | |
| Middlesex, 5th | * | Hicks, Lucile P. (R) | Y | \$ 51,799.07 | \$ 4,823.18 | \$ 24,449.13 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 4,823.18 | \$ 24,449.13 | \$ 0.00 | |

| DISTRICT NAME | E | CANDIDATE NAME | INCUMBENT YES/NO | BEGINNING BALANCE | TOTAL RECEIPTS | TOTAL EXPENDITURES | IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Middlesex & Norfolk, 1st | * | Pines, Lois G. (D) | Y | \$ 224,702.87 | \$ 53,324.28 | \$ 41,313.69 | \$ 917.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 53,324.28 | \$ 41,313.69 | \$ 917.00 | |
| Middlesex, Norfolk & Worcester | * | Magnani, David P. (D) Zetek, Matthew E. (D) Flaherty, Michelle (R) | Y N N | \$ 10,195.78 \$ 0.00 \$ 1,000.00 | \$ 87,493.23 \$ 29,368.00 \$ 116,250.00 | \$ 90,561.87 \$ 29,284.41 \$ 112,367.76 | \$ 1,039.71 \$ 2,101.00 \$ 983.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 233,111.23 | \$ 232,214.04 | \$ 4,123.71 | |
| Middlesex & Suffolk | * | Tolman, Warren (D) Cote, Mark (D) | N N | \$ 43,487.69 \$ 0.00 | \$ 83,904.53 \$ 0.00 | \$ 58,770.49 \$ 0.00 | \$ 530.00 \$ 0.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 83,904.53 | \$ 58,770.49 | \$ 530.00 | |
| Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex | * | Birmingham, Thomas E. (D) | Y | \$ 118,763.84 | \$ 170,445.28 | \$ 87,333.57 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 170,445.28 | \$ 87,333.57 | \$ 0.00 | |
| Middlesex & Worcester | * | Durand, Robert A. (D) Matson, John J. L. (R) | Y N | \$ 36,780.09 \$ 1,350.00 | \$ 133,193.78 \$ 49,550.85 | \$ 114,868.68 \$ 50,562.02 | \$ 974.25 \$ 387.60 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 182,744.63 | \$ 165,430.70 | \$ 1,361.85 | |
| Norfolk, Bristol & Middlesex | * | Jacques, Cheryl (D) Palmer, Morgan (R) Phillips, Susan (R) | Y N N | \$ 33,441.86 \$ 15,642.00 \$ 0.00 | \$ 96,113.13 \$ 28,963.42 \$ 39,664.00 | \$ 69,030.59 \$ 44,311.38 \$ 39,160.09 | \$ 4,884.89 \$ 500.00 \$ 707.86 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 164,740.55 | \$ 152,502.06 | \$ 6,092.75 | |

| DISTRICT NAME | E | CANDIDATE NAME | INCUMBENT YES/NO | BEGINNING BALANCE | TOTAL RECEIPTS | TOTAL EXPENDITURES | IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS |
|---------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Plymouth & Norfolk | | McDonald, Brian J. (D) | Y | \$ 5,380.06 | \$ 118,135.49 | \$ 121,484.76 | \$ 3,188.31 |
| | | Gage, Timothy E. (D) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 32,028.18 | \$ 31,754.83 | \$ 4,311.44 |
| | * | Hedlund, Robert L. (R) | N | \$ 3,857.29 | \$ 66,749.26 | \$ 70,511.44 | \$ 56.35 |
| | | Hussey, Donald A. (R) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 4,215.04 | \$ 4,143.44 | \$ 726.43 |
| | | Van Tine, Carolyn C. (R) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 31,251.33 | \$ 31,166.82 | \$ 3,166.82 |
| | | Forsyth, William J. (U) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 9,091.20 | \$ 8,864.99 | \$ 1,833.64 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | \$ 251,470.50 | \$ 268,010.79 | \$ 268,010.79 | \$ 13,282.99 |
| Suffolk, 1st | | Bulger, William M. (D) | Y | \$ 450,125.06 | \$ 144,096.89 | \$ 264,330.10 | \$ 0.00 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | \$ 144,096.89 | \$ 264,330.10 | \$ 264,330.10 | \$ 0.00 |
| Suffolk, 2nd | | Wilkerson, Dianne (D) | Y | \$ 1,314.33 | \$ 73,482.34 | \$ 69,067.43 | \$ 755.34 |
| | | Williams, Arthur (D) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 24,000.00 | \$ 24,000.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | \$ 97,482.34 | \$ 93,067.43 | \$ 93,067.43 | \$ 755.34 |
| Suffolk & Middlesex | | Travaglini, Robert E. (D) | Y | \$ 2,731.27 | \$ 84,372.00 | \$ 84,841.27 | \$ 1,057.50 |
| | | Lopez, Ralph (D) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 1,769.81 | \$ 1,769.81 | \$ 0.00 |
| | | Salemi, Denise (D) | N | \$ 100.80 | \$ 15,131.81 | \$ 15,050.80 | \$ 467.44 |
| | | Pini, Anthony (R) | N | \$ 1,940.67 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 300.00 | \$ 1,600.00 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | \$ 101,273.62 | \$ 101,961.88 | \$ 101,961.88 | \$ 3,124.94 |
| Suffolk & Norfolk | | White, W. Paul (D) | Y | \$ 64,854.90 | \$ 163,509.26 | \$ 166,805.96 | \$ 1,166.12 |
| | | Flood, John H. (D) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 22,233.00 | \$ 21,273.89 | \$ 1,598.25 |
| | | Preble, Ronald O. (R) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 4,196.17 | \$ 3,929.57 | \$ 0.00 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | \$ 189,938.43 | \$ 192,009.42 | \$ 192,009.42 | \$ 2,764.37 |

| DISTRICT NAME | E | CANDIDATE NAME | INCUMBENT YES/NO | BEGINNING BALANCE | TOTAL RECEIPTS | TOTAL EXPENDITURES | IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS |
|---|---|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Worcester, 1st | * | Bernstein, Robert A. (D) | N | \$ 361.56 | \$ 77,920.00 | \$ 78,107.17 | \$ 1,646.11 |
| | | Gibbs, Jerry (R) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 9,267.76 | \$ 9,267.76 | \$ 0.00 |
| | | Lionett, David J. (R) | N | \$ 38,687.78 | \$ 124,026.26 | \$ 159,691.14 | \$ 742.71 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 211,214.02 | \$ 247,066.07 | \$ 2,388.82 | |
| Worcester, 2nd | * | Amorello, Matthew John (R) | Y | \$ 22,208.30 | \$ 31,451.00 | \$ 38,571.85 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 31,451.00 | \$ 38,571.85 | \$ 0.00 | |
| Worcester & Middlesex | * | Antonioni, Robert A. (D) | Y | \$ 28,965.43 | \$ 31,349.75 | \$ 34,461.08 | \$ 1,888.75 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 31,349.75 | \$ 34,461.08 | \$ 1,888.75 | |
| Worcester, Hampden, Hampshire & Franklin | * | Wetmore, Robert D. (D) | Y | \$ 27,207.85 | \$ 36,252.47 | \$ 38,294.14 | \$ 2,091.52 |
| | | Latino, Patricia Q. (R) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 9,351.65 | \$ 9,358.75 | \$ 22.43 |
| | | Bowe, Kevin (I) | N | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 45,614.12 | \$ 47,652.89 | \$ 2,113.95 | |
| Worcester & Norfolk | * | Bertonazzi, Louis P. (D) | Y | \$ 136,012.29 | \$ 61,581.89 | \$ 33,365.09 | \$ 600.00 |
| Total: | | | | \$ 61,581.89 | \$ 33,365.09 | \$ 600.00 | |

DISCLAIMER: The figures contained in this report are based on campaign finance reports filed with the Office of Campaign and Political Finance. This report does not take into account corrections, additions or deletions which may occur based on reviews conducted by this office or amendments filed by candidates or political committees.