

---

---

OFFICE OF  
CAMPAIGN  
and  
POLITICAL  
FINANCE

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Commonwealth  
of Massachusetts

---

---

---

---

**Campaign Finance Activity**  
**by**  
**Candidates for the**  
**Massachusetts General Court**

**2006**

---

---

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 2006. The Office of Campaign and Political Finance has issued a report of this type after every state election since 1990.

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 most 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 most candidates and committees are available on the office's web site at [www.mass.gov/ocpf](http://www.mass.gov/ocpf). In the case of candidates and committees that file paper reports, those documents are available for public inspection at OCPF's office at the John W. McCormack Building, One Ashburton Place, Boston.

The information contained in this legislative spending study is based on data for 2006 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 2006, a total of 339 candidates sought legislative office and filed disclosure reports with OCPF: 70 running for the Senate and 269 seeking a House seat. The total number of candidates is a decrease of 51 from the last legislative election in 2004. The highest number of candidates in an OCPF study was the 507 recorded in 1990.

Legislative candidates and their committees are required to file three campaign finance reports disclosing election year financial activity. 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 of the year immediately following. Reports were due from the candidates in this study on Sept. 11 and Oct. 25, 2006, and Jan. 22, 2007 (the statutory deadline fell on a weekend). Only one report is due for a year in which there is no state election, such as 2007.

Starting in 2002, legislative candidates were also required to file their campaign finance reports in electronic form to an OCPF server, which immediately posts the information on the office web site. Electronic filing was required for candidates whose aggregate receipts or expenditures exceeded \$5,000 in a two-year election cycle. All but a handful of legislative candidates exceeded this threshold and were therefore required to e-file their reports.

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 2006 (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 spring of 2007. 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. Those seeking further information on the study or any other facet of the Massachusetts campaign finance law may contact the Office of Campaign and Political Finance, John W. 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](http://www.mass.gov/ocpf).

May 2007

## OVERVIEW

Two years after record-setting fundraising and spending by legislative candidates, the 2006 election saw a drop in relative campaign finance activity, with fewer contested races and a drop in the number of candidates.

Total fundraising by the 339 legislative candidates in 2006 reached almost \$12.4 million, about \$5 million less than the 2004 figure and more comparable with those from 2002 and 2000. Spending followed a similar pattern, as the 2006 mark of almost \$11.9 million was almost \$5.8 million less than 2004 but similar to the previous two years.

### AGGREGATE FUNDRAISING AND SPENDING BY LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATES 2000 – 2006

	<b>2000</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Number of candidates</b>	330	372	390	339
<b>Receipts</b>	\$12,223,071	\$11,561,938	\$17,275,537	\$12,398,381
<b>Expenditures</b>	\$11,013,392	\$11,968,889	\$17,640,644	\$11,877,068

Of the 339 legislative candidates in 2006, 70 were seeking one of the 40 Senate seats and 269 were running for the 160-seat House. The number of candidates in 2006 represented a decrease of 51 from the last election in 2004: 11 fewer in the Senate and 40 fewer in the House. (The highest number of legislative candidates recorded in an OCPF study was 507 in 1990.)

Of the 160 legislative races, 75, or 37.5 percent, were contested by more than one candidate. That is a decrease of 55 races, or 28 percentage points, from 2004.

The 339 legislative candidates were comprised of 184 incumbents, or 54 percent of the total number of contenders. Of those incumbents, all but two, or 99 percent, were re-elected, 124 after running unopposed. Eighteen new legislators were elected: two in the Senate and 16 in the House.

The finding for each of the two chambers of the Legislature are broken down in each of the two sections that follow this introduction.

## Campaign Finance Activity by Legislative Candidates 1990-2006

<b><i>SENATE</i></b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Candidates</b>	106	111	85	63	71	65	61	81	70
<b>Total raised</b>	\$4,530,863	\$5,674,643	\$4,829,019	\$3,510,827	\$3,809,576	\$5,504,933	\$3,819,774	\$7,562,984	\$4,612,580
<b>Average raised</b>	\$42,744	\$51,123	\$56,812	\$55,727	\$53,656	\$84,691	\$62,619	\$93,370	\$65,894
<b>Total spent</b>	\$5,060,968	\$6,086,061	\$5,044,959	\$3,211,808	\$3,806,032	\$4,369,766	\$4,177,425	\$7,620,649	\$4,596,300
<b>Average spent</b>	\$47,745	\$54,829	\$59,352	\$50,981	\$53,606	\$67,227	\$68,482	\$94,082	\$65,661

<b><i>HOUSE</i></b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Candidates</b>	401	361	323	280	296	265	311	309	269
<b>Total raised</b>	\$6,787,691	\$6,342,000	\$5,662,804	\$5,165,929	\$6,765,000	\$6,718,138	\$7,746,418	\$9,712,553	\$7,785,801
<b>Average raised</b>	\$16,927	\$17,568	\$17,532	\$18,450	\$22,855	\$25,351	\$24,908	\$31,432	\$28,943
<b>Total spent</b>	\$7,129,457	\$6,250,385	\$5,488,771	\$5,065,065	\$6,875,821	\$6,643,626	\$7,799,288	\$10,019,995	\$7,280,768
<b>Average spent</b>	\$17,779	\$17,314	\$16,993	\$18,090	\$23,229	\$25,070	\$25,078	\$32,247	\$27,066

## SECTION I: THE SENATE

Fundraising and spending by candidates for the state Senate in 2006 dropped from record highs in 2004, due mainly to two factors: a decrease in candidates and the lack of the several Senate challengers who injected substantial amounts of their own money into their races, as was the case in 2004. It should be noted, however, that it is difficult to compare election years because each year presents a different roster of candidates and a variety of types of races.

A total of 70 candidates ran for the Senate in 2006, a decrease of 14 percent from the 81 candidates in 2004.

Of the 40 races, 25 featured unopposed incumbents, an increase of 14 over 2004. The 25 unopposed candidates is the highest number ever recorded in an OCPF study, matching the figure reached in 1996. The remaining 15 races in 2006 featured 45 candidates, 13 of whom were incumbents seeking re-election. All 38 incumbents on the ballot were returned to office. The two new senators were both elected to fill open seats; one of the newcomers had been a state representative. The Senate that was seated in January 2007 was made up of 35 Democrats and five Republicans, a gain of one seat for the Democrats from the start of the previous term two years before.

### OVERVIEW OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY FOR SENATE CANDIDATES

	<b>2002</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b><i>Number of candidates</i></b>	61	81	70
<b><i>Total on hand at start</i></b>	\$3,261,677	\$3,593,595	\$4,847,382
<b><i>Total receipts</i></b>	\$3,819,774	\$7,562,984	\$4,612,580
<b><i>Average receipts per candidate</i></b>	\$62,619	\$93,370	\$65,894
<b><i>Total expenditures</i></b>	\$4,177,425	\$7,620,649	\$4,596,300
<b><i>Average expenditures per candidate</i></b>	\$68,482	\$94,082	\$65,661
<b><i>Total on hand at end</i></b>	\$2,919,457	\$3,501,943	\$4,843,370

Expenditures do not include debts incurred that had not been paid at the end of 2006. Also, total receipts do not include in-kind contributions, which are things of value other than money. Senate candidates reported receiving \$115,958 in in-kind contributions in 2006, a substantial decrease from the \$1,244,740 recorded in 2004 but more than the \$44,893 reported in 2002.

Ending cash on hand does not correspond exactly with the aggregate starting balance, total receipts and total expenditures due to inconsistencies or errors in candidates' reports that are addressed during the OCPF audit process.

The 2006 fundraising total of \$4.6 million represents a drop of 39 percent from the 2004 figure. The spending figure of just under \$4.6 million is 40 percent less than its

counterpart from two years before. The record figures recorded in 2004 were \$7.56 million in receipts and \$7.62 million in spending.

Average fundraising and spending totals also showed a substantial drop from the record highs of 2004. The 2006 average fundraising figure of \$65,859 represented a decrease of 29 percent from 2004, while the 2006 spending average of \$65,428 was a drop of 30 percent.

The findings in greater detail:

## **I. Success of Campaigns**

Once again, the winning candidates outspent their opponents in the 2006 Senate campaigns, with both total and average fundraising and spending outpacing those who lost by a margin of three to one. That edge is an increase from the two-to-one advantage posted in 2004 and comparable to the ratio in 2002. As noted above, a reason for the narrower disparity in 2004 was the presence of several well-funded, yet ultimately unsuccessful, challengers for Senate seats that year.

The candidates spending the most money in 2006 won in all but one of the 15 contested Senate races, or 93 percent of the time; the comparable ratio in 2004 was 25 of 29 races, or 86 percent. The sole candidate who won his race despite being outspent was Benjamin Downing, D-Pittsfield, who won election to an open seat. The race for that Berkshire, Hampden and Franklin District seat featured the highest spending of any contested election for a Senate seat in 2006.

The average amounts raised and spent by both winners and losers in 2006 dropped substantially from two years before, especially among the unsuccessful candidates. The average amount raised by a winning candidate dropped 28 percent while the average expenditures went down 29 percent. For losing candidates, average receipts were down 48 percent and expenditures dipped 49 percent.

### **SENATE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY SUCCESS OF CAMPAIGNS 2006**

	<b><i>Successful (40)</i></b>	<b><i>Unsuccessful (30)</i></b>
<b><i>Total Receipts</i></b>	\$3,698,166	\$914,414
<b><i>Average Receipts</i></b>	\$92,454	\$30,480
<b><i>Total Expenditures</i></b>	\$3,680,191	\$916,108
<b><i>Average Expenditures</i></b>	\$92,005	\$30,537

## **II. Incumbency**

Senators seeking to return to office once again accounted for the majority of the fundraising and spending, though their figures were down from 2004.<sup>1</sup>

The 38 senators on the ballot, both opposed and unopposed, represented an increase of two from two years before. While accounting for 54 percent of all candidates, incumbents were responsible for about 75 percent of fundraising and spending, up fifteen percentage points from 2004. Incumbents therefore outspent non-incumbents three to one in 2006. As noted earlier, all of the 13 opposed incumbents were re-elected.

Incumbents as a group, both opposed and unopposed, still outspent non-incumbents, but the margin slipped below the two-to-one advantage posted in 2002.

### **SENATE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY INCUMBENCY 2006**

	<b><i>Incumbents (38)</i></b>	<b><i>Non-Incumbents (32)</i></b>
<b><i>Total Receipts</i></b>	\$3,443,409	\$1,169,170
<b><i>Average Receipts</i></b>	\$90,616	\$36,537
<b><i>Total Expenditures</i></b>	\$3,413,629	\$1,182,670
<b><i>Average Expenditures</i></b>	\$89,832	\$36,958

Fundraising and spending averages were down from 2004 for both types of candidates. The average raised by an incumbent dropped 28 percent, while expenditures decreased 30 percent. Non-incumbents saw their fundraising average drop 46 percent and their spending go down 45 percent. Nevertheless, incumbents once again posted higher averages in both categories.

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.

---

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this study, incumbents are defined as those individuals holding the office of senator at the time of the 2006 election and seeking re-election. A member of the House running for a Senate seat is not considered an incumbent in this analysis. One state representative, Gale Candaras, sought a Senate seat in 2006.

### **III. Party Affiliation**

Accounting for the majority of Senate candidates once again, Democrats also dominated election fundraising and spending in 2006.

The 48 candidates from the party in 2006 (an increase of 4 from 2004) accounted for 83 percent of funds raised and 74 percent of spending, or margins of four to one and three to one over other candidates. Two years before, the party's share was 68 percent of receipts and 66 percent of spending.

The 20 Republicans on the ballot, a decrease of 11 over 2004, made up 29 percent of all candidates (down 9 points). The GOP's share of fundraising and spending was 17 and 16 percent, respectively -- a drop from their 31 and 33 percent shares in 2004 but more in line with 2002.

Two Senate candidates were not Democrats or Republicans and therefore did not have a primary election. Those two candidates accounted for well under 1 percent of total receipts and expenditures.

#### **SENATE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY PARTY AFFILIATION 2006**

	<b><i>Democrats (48)</i></b>	<b><i>Republicans (20)</i></b>	<b><i>Unenrolled (2)</i></b>
<b><i>Total receipts</i></b>	\$3,829,957	\$774,386	\$8,237
<b><i>Average receipts</i></b>	\$79,791	\$38,719	\$4,119
<b><i>Total expenditures</i></b>	\$3,853,578	\$731,411	\$11,310
<b><i>Average expenditures</i></b>	\$80,283	\$36,571	\$5,655

There were substantial declines in the average amount raised and spent by both Democrats and Republicans, most notably in the latter party. The average Democrat raised 32 percent less and spent 30 percent less than in 2004, while the average Republican raised 48 percent less and spent 54 percent less. (In 2004, the Republican averages were both increases over 2002 of more than 90 percent.)

### **IV. Contested and Uncontested Races**

In 2004, candidates in contested races reported higher spending than those who were unopposed for re-election, both overall and on average. In 2006, however, the findings were mixed. Opposed candidates reported higher total receipts and

expenditures, but the averages for those figures were lower than those of unopposed candidates.<sup>2</sup>

Candidates in contested races accounted for 53 percent of the total receipts and 50 percent of total expenditures; the corresponding figures in 2004 were 87 and 89 percent.

The average amount raised by an opposed candidate in 2006 was 43 percent lower than in 2004, while the expenditure average was down 47 percent. Averages for unopposed candidates were mixed, reflecting a drop of 2 percent in average receipts and a rise of 31 percent in average expenditures.

**RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY SENATE CANDIDATES  
OPPOSED AND UNOPPOSED  
2006**

	<i><b>Opposed (45)</b></i>	<i><b>Unopposed (25)</b></i>
<i><b>Total Receipts</b></i>	\$2,425,138	\$2,187,442
<i><b>Average receipts</b></i>	\$53,892	\$87,498
<i><b>Total Expenditures</b></i>	\$2,316,213	\$2,280,087
<i><b>Average Expenditures</b></i>	\$51,471	\$91,203

**CONTESTED SEATS**

Fifteen of the 40 seats for the Senate in 2006 were contested, with races featuring more than one candidate. Of those 15 races, two were for seats being vacated by outgoing senators: Brian Lees, R-East Longmeadow, and Andrea Nuciforo, D-Pittsfield.

The two races for open seats saw a slightly higher spending average than the other contested elections. The 13 candidates for those seats raised a total of \$688,404, or \$52,954 each, and spent a total of \$715,435, or \$55,033 each. As noted below, these two races were the most expensive contested elections for Senate seats in 2006.

The remaining 13 contested races featured incumbents seeking re-election. The 32 candidates in those races raised a total of \$1,734,259, or an average of \$54,196, and spent a total of \$1,584,409, or \$49,513.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 activity.

## **V. Starting Balances**

Candidates for the Senate reported having a total of \$4,847,382 on hand at the start of 2006. That figure is about \$1.25 million more than the starting balance in 2004 and the largest amount ever recorded in an OCPF study.

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 99.3 percent of the total available at the start of the election year, all but \$35,483. The comparable percentage for the incumbents' share in 2004 was 94 percent. The average amount on hand in an incumbent's account at the start of the year was \$126,629, while the average held by a non-incumbent was \$1,109. The comparable amount held by an incumbent in 2004 was \$95,401.

The starting balance figures have traditionally favored incumbents, because many challengers are first-time candidates who begin their campaign with zero balances and start their campaigns later in the election year. A total of 25 candidates reported having no campaign funds on hand at the start of the year; the comparable figure in 2004 was 29. Only one of the 25 non-incumbents who started with no money was elected: Benjamin Downing, D-Pittsfield, who won Nuciforo's open Berkshire, Hampden and Franklin seat.

The Senate candidate with the highest starting balance was once again Sen. Mark Montigny, D-New Bedford, who reported a total of \$1,016,113. Montigny was also first in cash on hand in 2004, with a total of \$933,366. This is only the second time a Senate candidate has reported an election-year starting balance of more than \$1 million (Senate President Thomas Birmingham started 2000 with \$1.1 million.) Montigny has had the highest starting balance of any Senate candidate in four of the last five election years, finishing second only to Birmingham in 2000.

Thirteen of the 70 Senate candidates reported starting balances of more than \$100,000, six more than in 2004.

All of the candidates with the 10 largest starting balances in 2006 shared at least three characteristics: each was a Democrat, each was an incumbent and each was re-elected. Only one, Montigny, was opposed.

**SENATE CANDIDATES WITH  
THE HIGHEST STARTING BALANCES  
2006**

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Balance</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1.	Mark Montigny (D)(I)	2nd Bristol & Plymouth	\$1,016,113	Yes	Yes
2.	Jarrett Barrios (D)(I)	Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex	\$712,135	No	Yes
3.	Robert Travaglini (D)(I)	1st Suffolk & Middlesex	\$419,001	No	Yes
4.	Michael Morrissey (D)(I)	Norfolk & Plymouth	\$270,722	No	Yes
5.	Steven Baddour (D)(I)	1st Essex	\$226,894	No	Yes
6.	Marc Pacheco (D)(I)	1st Plymouth & Bristol	\$218,879	No	Yes
7.	Joan Menard (D)(I)	1st Bristol & Plymouth	\$203,344	No	Yes
8.	Stephen Brewer (D)(I)	Worcester, Hampden, Hampshire & Franklin	\$196,779	No	Yes
9.	Frederick Berry (D)(I)	2nd Essex	\$164,048	No	Yes
10.	Therese Murray (D)(I)	Plymouth & Barnstable	\$118,169	No	Yes

D=Democrat I = Incumbent

**VI. Most Active Candidates and Races**

Of the fifteen contested races for Senate seats, eight featured total spending of more than \$100,000. Of the 10 most expensive of these races, eight were won by incumbents. The exceptions were the top two races, which were for open seats and were therefore won by non-incumbents.

The race that featured the highest total spending in 2006 was in the Berkshire, Hampshire and Franklin district, where seven candidates spent \$413,630 to succeed outgoing Sen. Andrea Nuciforo. The winner, Benjamin Downing, prevailed despite not being the top spender in the race. The highest amount ever spent for a Senate race was the \$809,637 spent by three candidates for an open seat in the Middlesex, Suffolk and Essex District in 2002. (The winner of that contest was Jarrett Barrios, D-Cambridge.)

The ten races below accounted for \$1.9 million, or 43 percent of the total spending by Senate candidates in 2006. The comparable percentage in 2004 was 58 percent.

## SENATE RACES WITH THE HIGHEST SPENDING 2006

	<i>District</i>	<i>Total spent</i>	<i>Number of candidates</i>	<i>Winner</i>
1.	Berkshire, Hampshire & Franklin (O)	\$413,630	7	Benjamin Downing (D)
2.	1st Hampden & Hampshire (O)	\$301,804	6	Gale Candaras (D)
3.	2nd Suffolk	\$263,854	4	Dianne Wilkerson (D)(I)
4.	Suffolk & Norfolk	\$242,735	2	Marian Walsh (D)(I)
5.	Norfolk, Bristol & Plymouth	\$159,261	2	Brian Joyce (D)(I)
6.	4th Middlesex	\$144,188	2	Robert Havern (D)(I)
7.	Bristol & Norfolk	\$126,151	2	James Timilty (D)(I)
8.	Cape & Islands	\$102,336	3	Robert O'Leary (D)(I)
9.	2nd Worcester	\$97,256	3	Edward Augustus (D)(I)
10.	3rd Middlesex	\$96,263	2	Susan Fargo (D)(I)

\*O=Open seat. I = Incumbent. D= Democrat

The least expensive contested Senate election was in the 1<sup>st</sup> Middlesex District, where two candidates – incumbent Steven Panagiotakos, D-Lowell, and challenger Brooks Lyman, R-Groton -- spent a total of \$51,416. Panagiotakos accounted for 94 percent of the spending.

\* \* \* \* \*

### TOP FUNDRAISERS

The list of the 10 Senate candidates who raised the most money in 2006 is made up of nine incumbents and one representative who was seeking to move to an open Senate seat. All were Democrats and were successful in their campaigns. (This list included four Republicans in 2004.)

The top three fundraisers in 2006 were incumbents who were unopposed for re-election. Topping the list was Senate President Robert Travaglini, D-Boston, with receipts of \$337,658. The top fundraiser opposed for election was Sen. Marian Walsh, D-Boston, who raised \$154,423 and placed fourth overall. The highest amount ever raised by any Senate candidate was \$1.358 million by Thomas Birmingham in 2000; Birmingham was unopposed for re-election and subsequently used his funds for an unsuccessful run for governor in 2002. The highest amount ever raised by an opposed Senate candidate was the \$364,973 reported by Sen. Therese Murray, D-Plymouth, in her successful campaign in 2004. Murray placed second in fundraising in 2006, when she was unopposed.

## SENATE CANDIDATES RAISING THE MOST MONEY IN 2006

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Receipts</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Winner</b>
1.	Robert Travaglini (D)(I)	1st Suffolk & Middlesex	\$337,658	No	Yes
2.	Therese Murray (D)(I)	Plymouth & Barnstable	\$232,593	No	Yes
3.	John Hart Jr. (D)(I)	1st Suffolk	\$161,675	No	Yes
4.	Marian Walsh (D)(I)	Suffolk & Norfolk	\$154,423	Yes	Yes
5.	Joan Menard (D)(I)	1st Bristol & Plymouth	\$152,417	No	Yes
6.	Brian Joyce (D)(I)	Norfolk, Bristol & Plymouth	\$149,772	Yes	Yes
7.	Gale Candaras (D)	1st Hampden & Hampshire (O)	\$146,163	Yes	Yes
8.	Mark Montigny (D)(I)	2nd Bristol & Plymouth	\$145,904	Yes	Yes
9.	Dianne Wilkerson (D)(I)	2nd Suffolk	\$138,591	Yes	Yes
10.	Steven Baddour (D)(I)	1st Essex	\$125,778	No	Yes

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

All but one of the 70 Senate candidates reported raising funds in 2006. The winning candidate who raised the least was Patricia Jehlen, D-Somerville, who was unopposed and whose receipts totaled \$24,735. The winning candidate who was opposed and raised the least was Sen. Susan Fargo, D-Lincoln, who had receipts of \$51,341.

\* \* \* \* \*

### TOP SPENDERS

Sen. Travaglini also topped the spending list in 2006, with \$459,871 in disbursements. He was unopposed, as were the senators in the next three positions in the list. Placing fifth in spending, and one of the two opposed candidates on the list, was Sen. Marian Walsh, who spent \$181,219.

All of the candidates on the top ten list were elected. Unlike the fundraising list, which was populated exclusively by Democrats, the spending list below includes one Republican, Sen. Richard Tisei. He was on the list in 2004 along with three other Republicans, all unsuccessful challengers.

**SENATE CANDIDATES SPENDING  
THE MOST MONEY IN 2006**

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1.	Robert Travaglini (D)(I)	1st Suffolk & Middlesex	\$459,871	No	Yes
2.	Therese Murray (D)(I)	Plymouth & Barnstable	\$223,928	No	Yes
3.	Jarrett Barrios (D)(I)	Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex	\$203,390	No	Yes
4.	John Hart Jr. (D)(I)	1st Suffolk	\$187,917	No	Yes
5.	Marian Walsh (D)(I)	Suffolk & Norfolk	\$181,219	Yes	Yes
6.	Gale Candaras (D)	1st Hampden & Hampshire (O)	\$175,787	Yes	Yes
7.	Brian Joyce (D)(I)	Norfolk, Bristol & Plymouth	\$148,922	Yes	Yes
8.	Dianne Wilkerson (D)(I)	2nd Suffolk	\$148,601	Yes	Yes
9.	Richard Tisei (R)(I)	Middlesex & Essex	\$148,319	No	Yes
10.	Frederick Berry (D)(I)	2nd Essex	\$112,260	No	Yes

I = Incumbent. D= Democrat. R=Republican

Travaglini’s spending is short of the record amount of \$474,095, posted by Sen. Murray in a contested race in 2004. As noted earlier, spending in 2004 was significantly higher than other years; in contrast, Murray’s 2006 spending figure of \$223,928 would have only been good for 10th place in 2004, when nine candidates spent more than \$200,000.

Expenditures were reported by all but one of the Senate candidates (Paul Nordborg, R-Holden, who was also the only candidate who reported no receipts). The winning opposed candidate who spent the least was Sen. Robert Hedlund, R-Weymouth, who reported an outlay of \$39,488. His two opponents spent a total of \$18,543. Sen. Jehlen, the candidate who raised the least of any successful candidate, also spent the least at \$17,406, but she was unopposed for re-election. (Jehlen was elected to her seat in special election in late 2005, in which she spent \$194,744.)

**VII. Ending Balances**

Candidates for the Senate reported ending 2006 with a total of \$4,843,370, which was only about \$4,000 less than their total at the start of the year. The total ending balance is about \$1.3 million more than the ending balance from 2004, but slightly less than the record high of \$4.896 million posted in 2000.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> This ending balance may not correspond exactly with the aggregate starting balance, total receipts and total expenditures due to inconsistencies or errors in candidates’ reports that are addressed during the OCPF audit process.

Once again, the candidate with the greatest amount of money on hand was Sen. Mark Montigny, with a total of more than \$1 million. That amount is second only to the record \$2.2 million held by Senate President Thomas Birmingham in 2000, but as noted above, Birmingham was raising money in anticipation of a run for governor in 2002. Montigny also had the most in hand at the end of 2004, with more than \$944,000, and also topped the list in 2002.

As was the case in every election year since 1998, all of the candidates with the ten highest ending balances in 2006 were incumbents and all had been re-elected. Only two had been opposed. Nine were Democrats; for the first time in eight years, a Republican, incumbent Robert Hedlund, cracked the list.

### SENATE CANDIDATES WITH THE HIGHEST ENDING BALANCES 2006

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Balance</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Winner</b>
1.	Mark Montigny (D)(I)	2nd Bristol & Plymouth	\$1,078,047	Yes	Yes
2.	Jarrett Barrios (D)(I)	Middlesex, Suffolk & Essex	\$552,976	No	Yes
3.	Robert Travaglini (D)(I)	1st Suffolk & Middlesex	\$296,788	No	Yes
4.	Michael Morrissey (D)(I)	Norfolk & Plymouth	\$291,830	No	Yes
5.	Steven Baddour (D)(I)	1st Essex	\$281,894	No	Yes
6.	Joan Menard (D)(I)	1st Bristol & Plymouth	\$271,200	No	Yes
7.	Marc Pacheco (D)(I)	1st Plymouth & Bristol	\$224,034	No	Yes
8.	Stephen Brewer (D)(I)	Worcester, Hampden, Hampshire & Franklin	\$189,791	No	Yes
9.	Robert Hedlund (R)(I)	Plymouth & Norfolk	\$144,369	Yes	Yes
10	Frederick Berry (D)(I)	2nd Essex	\$127,905	No	Yes

I = Incumbent. D= Democrat. R=Republican

Nine Senate candidates reported having no money (or negative balances) at the end of the election year, down three from 2004. All of the candidate who were left with no money were non-incumbents; one, Rep. Gale Candaras, had been successful in her campaign for an open seat. (In fact, incumbents accounted for a total of 99.75 percent of all funds on hand at the end of the year, all but \$11,627.) Aside from Candaras, the winning candidate who finished with the next smallest amount was Sen. Brian Joyce, D-Milton, who was opposed and showed an ending balance of \$997.

*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 2006

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>	
<b>Berkshire, Hampshire &amp; Franklin</b>										
	Benjamin Downing	Pittsfield	D		W	\$0.00	\$108,593.00	\$90,774.82	\$6,477.58	
	Christopher Hodgkins	Lee	D		L	\$0.00	\$63,830.00	\$82,683.90	(\$18,853.90)	
	Matthew Kinnaman	Lee	R		L	\$0.00	\$82,022.00	\$79,297.50	\$2,719.50	
	Dion Robbins-Zust	Richmond	U		L	\$0.00	\$662.26	\$662.26	\$0.00	
	Helen Sharron	Worthington	D		L	\$0.00	\$105,751.00	\$105,831.51	(\$80.51)	
	Margaret Johnson Ware	Pittsfield	D		L	\$0.00	\$54,307.54	\$54,180.17	\$127.37	
	John Zelazo	Adams	D		L	\$0.00	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$0.00	
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 7</i>						\$0.00	\$415,365.80	\$413,630.16	(\$9,609.96)
<b>Bristol &amp; Norfolk</b>										
	Michael Atwill	Mansfield	R		L	\$0.00	\$55,967.00	\$59,393.61	(\$3,426.61)	
	James Timilty	Walpole	D	I	W	\$11,511.60	\$84,744.00	\$66,757.14	\$29,498.46	
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 2</i>						\$11,511.60	\$140,711.00	\$126,150.75	\$26,071.85
<b>1st Bristol &amp; Plymouth</b>										
	Joan Menard	Fall River	D	I	W	\$203,344.45	\$152,417.04	\$84,091.92	\$271,199.60	
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 1</i>						\$203,344.45	\$152,417.04	\$84,091.92	\$271,199.60

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>2nd Bristol &amp; Plymouth</b>									
	Raimundo Delgado	New Bedford	U		L	\$0.00	\$7,575.00	\$10,648.00	\$1,902.00
	Mark Montigny	New Bedford	D	I	W	\$1,016,113.08	\$145,904.19	\$83,970.29	\$1,078,046.98
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 2</i>					<u>\$1,016,113.08</u>	<u>\$153,479.19</u>	<u>\$94,618.29</u>	<u>\$1,079,948.98</u>
<b>Cape &amp; Islands</b>									
	Ricardo Barros	Centerville	R		L	\$0.00	\$46,211.00	\$44,956.09	\$737.91
	Doug Bennett	Nantucket	R		L	\$4,390.20	\$6,330.00	\$9,552.96	\$1,167.24
	Robert O'Leary	Cummaquid	D	I	W	\$25,215.47	\$56,698.00	\$47,826.89	\$34,086.58
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 3</i>					<u>\$29,605.67</u>	<u>\$109,239.00</u>	<u>\$102,335.94</u>	<u>\$35,991.73</u>
<b>1st Essex</b>									
	Steven Baddour	Methuen	D	I	W	\$226,894.45	\$125,777.75	\$70,777.93	\$281,894.27
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 1</i>					<u>\$226,894.45</u>	<u>\$125,777.75</u>	<u>\$70,777.93</u>	<u>\$281,894.27</u>
<b>2nd Essex</b>									
	Frederick Berry	Peabody	D	I	W	\$164,047.79	\$76,117.63	\$112,260.31	\$127,905.11
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 1</i>					<u>\$164,047.79</u>	<u>\$76,117.63</u>	<u>\$112,260.31</u>	<u>\$127,905.11</u>
<b>1st Essex &amp; Middlesex</b>									
	Bruce Tarr	Gloucester	R	I	W	\$26,452.56	\$44,875.00	\$19,251.07	\$52,076.49
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 1</i>					<u>\$26,452.56</u>	<u>\$44,875.00</u>	<u>\$19,251.07</u>	<u>\$52,076.49</u>

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>2nd Essex &amp; Middlesex</b>									
	Susan Tucker	Andover	D	I	W	\$112,997.64	\$37,086.79	\$32,394.18	\$117,690.25
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$112,997.64	\$37,086.79	\$32,394.18	\$117,690.25
<b>3rd Essex &amp; Middlesex</b>									
	Thomas McGee	Lynn	D	I	W	\$48,367.17	\$49,350.00	\$39,834.43	\$57,882.74
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$48,367.17	\$49,350.00	\$39,834.43	\$57,882.74
<b>Hampden</b>									
	Stephen Buoniconti	W. Springfield	D	I	W	\$56,321.30	\$71,631.07	\$32,516.85	\$94,985.42
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$56,321.30	\$71,631.07	\$32,516.85	\$94,985.42
<b>1st Hampden &amp; Hampshire</b>									
	Brian Ashe	Longmeadow	D		L	\$0.00	\$23,942.67	\$23,586.26	\$356.38
	Gale Candaras	Wilbraham	D		W	\$29,152.35	\$146,163.32	\$175,787.20	(\$471.53)
	Kevin Corridan	Springfield	R		L	\$0.00	\$30,575.00	\$29,076.41	\$511.75
	Ronald Cutler	East Longmeadow	R		L	\$225.00	\$4,285.00	\$4,510.00	\$0.00
	Rosemarie Mazza-Moriarty	Springfield	D		L	\$1,032.36	\$6,550.00	\$7,492.53	\$89.83
	Enrico Villamaino III	E. Longmeadow	R		L	\$0.00	\$61,521.99	\$61,351.99	\$170.00
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		6			\$30,409.71	\$273,037.98	\$301,804.39	\$656.43
<b>2nd Hampden &amp; Hampshire</b>									
	Michael Knapik	Westfield	R	I	W	\$5,701.45	\$64,403.00	\$50,698.19	\$19,406.26
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$5,701.45	\$64,403.00	\$50,698.19	\$19,406.26

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>Hampshire &amp; Franklin</b>									
	Michaela LeBlanc	Northampton	R		L	\$550.00	\$3,625.00	\$4,009.99	\$165.01
	Stanley Rosenberg	Amherst	D	I	W	\$52,963.72	\$58,774.44	\$69,816.81	\$41,921.35
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		2			\$53,513.72	\$62,399.44	\$73,826.80	\$42,086.36
<b>1st Middlesex</b>									
	Brooks Lyman	Groton	R		L	\$14.16	\$4,022.68	\$3,300.68	\$736.16
	Steven Panagiotakos	Lowell	D	I	W	\$52,255.61	\$74,876.26	\$48,115.28	\$79,016.59
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		2			\$52,269.77	\$78,898.94	\$51,415.96	\$79,752.75
<b>2nd Middlesex</b>									
	Patricia Jehlen	Somerville	D	I	W	\$2,287.72	\$24,735.41	\$17,406.14	\$9,616.99
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$2,287.72	\$24,735.41	\$17,406.14	\$9,616.99
<b>3rd Middlesex</b>									
	Susan Fargo	Lincoln	D	I	W	\$33,864.48	\$51,341.00	\$50,912.69	\$34,292.79
	Sandra Martinez	Chelmsford	R		L	\$0.00	\$47,653.75	\$45,350.66	\$2,403.09
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		2			\$33,864.48	\$98,994.75	\$96,263.35	\$36,695.88
<b>4th Middlesex</b>									
	Joanna Gonsalves	Woburn	D		L	\$0.00	\$66,975.55	\$66,901.00	\$74.55
	Robert Havern III	Arlington	D	I	W	\$115,684.77	\$65,739.00	\$77,287.00	\$104,011.72
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		2			\$115,684.77	\$132,714.55	\$144,188.00	\$104,086.27

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>Middlesex &amp; Essex</b>									
	Richard Tisei	Wakefield	R	I	W	\$79,941.73	\$104,613.74	\$148,319.04	\$36,236.43
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$79,941.73	\$104,613.74	\$148,319.04	\$36,236.43
<b>1st Middlesex &amp; Norfolk</b>									
	Cynthia Creem	Newton	D	I	W	\$91,531.75	\$35,824.00	\$18,257.49	\$109,098.26
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$91,531.75	\$35,824.00	\$18,257.49	\$109,098.26
<b>2nd Middlesex &amp; Norfolk</b>									
	Karen Spilka	Ashland	D	I	W	\$31,886.86	\$33,869.89	\$43,799.54	\$21,957.21
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$31,886.86	\$33,869.89	\$43,799.54	\$21,957.21
<b>Middlesex, Suffolk &amp; Essex</b>									
	Jarrett Barrios	Cambridge	D	I	W	\$712,134.63	\$44,280.03	\$203,390.11	\$552,975.68
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$712,134.63	\$44,280.03	\$203,390.11	\$552,975.68
<b>Middlesex &amp; Worcester</b>									
	Pamela Resor	Acton	D	I	W	\$22,803.25	\$38,718.00	\$42,585.52	\$18,935.73
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$22,803.25	\$38,718.00	\$42,585.52	\$18,935.73
<b>Norfolk, Bristol &amp; Middlesex</b>									
	Scott Brown	Wrentham	R	I	W	\$42,581.55	\$40,339.00	\$40,073.43	\$42,847.12
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$42,581.55	\$40,339.00	\$40,073.43	\$42,847.12

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>Norfolk, Bristol &amp; Plymouth</b>									
	James Aldred	Randolph	R		L	\$0.00	\$13,430.00	\$10,339.44	\$3,090.56
	Brian Joyce	Milton	D	I	W	\$147.26	\$149,771.98	\$148,921.77	\$997.47
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		2			\$147.26	\$163,201.98	\$159,261.21	\$4,088.03
<b>Norfolk &amp; Plymouth</b>									
	Michael Morrissey	Quincy	D	I	W	\$270,721.99	\$122,870.29	\$101,762.24	\$291,830.04
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$270,721.99	\$122,870.29	\$101,762.24	\$291,830.04
<b>Plymouth &amp; Barnstable</b>									
	Therese Murray	Plymouth	D	I	W	\$118,169.39	\$232,593.00	\$223,928.08	\$126,834.31
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$118,169.39	\$232,593.00	\$223,928.08	\$126,834.31
<b>1st Plymouth &amp; Bristol</b>									
	Marc Pacheco	Taunton	D	I	W	\$218,879.03	\$88,730.00	\$83,575.01	\$224,034.02
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$218,879.03	\$88,730.00	\$83,575.01	\$224,034.02
<b>2nd Plymouth &amp; Bristol</b>									
	Robert Creedon Jr.	Brockton	D	I	W	\$33,886.92	\$39,974.00	\$34,492.59	\$39,368.33
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$33,886.92	\$39,974.00	\$34,492.59	\$39,368.33

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>Plymouth &amp; Norfolk</b>									
	Robert Hedlund	E. Weymouth	R	I	W	\$108,300.48	\$75,556.15	\$39,487.90	\$144,368.73
	Stephen Lynch	Brant Rock	D		L	\$119.37	\$4,825.00	\$3,987.18	\$950.51
	Matthias Mulvey	Weymouth	D		L	\$0.00	\$17,463.00	\$14,555.40	\$2,907.60
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 3</i>					\$108,419.85	\$97,844.15	\$58,030.48	\$148,226.84
<b>1st Suffolk</b>									
	John Hart Jr.	South Boston	D	I	W	\$31,573.84	\$161,675.45	\$187,916.95	\$5,332.34
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 1</i>					\$31,573.84	\$161,675.45	\$187,916.95	\$5,332.34
<b>2nd Suffolk</b>									
	Sonia Chang-Diaz	Jamaica Plain	D		L	\$0.00	\$73,605.00	\$70,187.77	\$3,417.23
	Samiyah Diaz	Boston	R		L	\$0.00	\$24,115.39	\$17,479.46	\$3,774.61
	John Kelleher	Jamaica Plain	D		L	\$0.00	\$30,100.00	\$27,585.25	\$2,514.00
	Dianne Wilkerson	Boston	D	I	W	\$35,740.22	\$138,591.00	\$148,601.38	\$25,729.84
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 4</i>					\$35,740.22	\$266,411.39	\$263,853.86	\$35,435.68
<b>1st Suffolk &amp; Middlesex</b>									
	Robert Travaglini	East Boston	D	I	W	\$419,001.43	\$337,657.71	\$459,870.70	\$296,788.44
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 1</i>					\$419,001.43	\$337,657.71	\$459,870.70	\$296,788.44
<b>2nd Suffolk &amp; Middlesex</b>									
	Steven Tolman	Brighton	D	I	W	\$79,656.32	\$69,405.00	\$53,178.14	\$95,883.18
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 1</i>					\$79,656.32	\$69,405.00	\$53,178.14	\$95,883.18

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>Suffolk &amp; Norfolk</b>									
	Douglas Obey	Westwood	R		L	\$0.00	\$61,315.33	\$61,515.23	\$87.16
	Marian Walsh	W. Roxbury	D	I	W	\$39,086.70	\$154,423.17	\$181,219.31	\$12,290.56
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 2</i>					\$39,086.70	\$215,738.50	\$242,734.54	\$12,377.72
<b>1st Worcester</b>									
	Harriette Chandler	Worcester	D	I	W	\$93,523.75	\$87,521.54	\$77,705.48	\$102,564.89
	Deidre Healy	Worcester	D		L	\$0.00	\$13,137.86	\$13,137.86	\$0.00
	Paul Nordborg	Holden	R		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 3</i>					\$93,523.75	\$100,659.40	\$90,843.34	\$102,564.89
<b>2nd Worcester</b>									
	Edward Augustus	Worcester	D	I	W	\$9,881.66	\$112,026.68	\$92,920.78	\$28,987.56
	John Lazzaro	Millbury	D		L	\$0.00	\$890.00	\$887.77	\$2.23
	Richard Peters	Worcester	R		L	\$0.00	\$3,525.00	\$3,447.42	\$77.58
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 3</i>					\$9,881.66	\$116,441.68	\$97,255.97	\$29,067.37
<b>Worcester, Hampden, Hampshire &amp; Franklin</b>									
	Stephen Brewer	Barre	D	I	W	\$196,778.94	\$44,476.08	\$51,464.39	\$189,790.66
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 1</i>					\$196,778.94	\$44,476.08	\$51,464.39	\$189,790.66
<b>Worcester &amp; Middlesex</b>									
	Robert Antonioni	Leominster	D	I	W	\$10,953.82	\$59,519.00	\$41,704.80	\$28,768.02
	<i>Total candidates for seat: 1</i>					\$10,953.82	\$59,519.00	\$41,704.80	\$28,768.02

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>Worcester &amp; Norfolk</b>									
	Richard Moore	Uxbridge	D	I	W	\$10,693.54	\$86,503.17	\$86,537.52	\$2,591.86
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i> 1					<u>\$10,693.54</u>	<u>\$86,503.17</u>	<u>\$86,537.52</u>	<u>\$2,591.86</u>
	<b>Total candidates: 70</b>					<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
	<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>					<b><u>\$4,847,381.76</u></b>	<b><u>\$4,612,579.80</u></b>	<b><u>\$4,596,299.61</u></b>	<b><u>\$4,843,369.58</u></b>

## SECTION II: THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Like the races for Senate, the contests for seats in the House of Representatives in the 2006 state election featured a reversal from the record fundraising and spending posted two years before. The aggregate figures for both receipts and expenditures dropped to levels comparable to those recorded in 2002. Average figures in both categories were lower than their 2004 levels, but were still the second highest ever recorded for House candidates.

A total of 269 candidates sought election to the House in 2006, a decrease of 40 from 2004 and 42 from 2002.<sup>1</sup> The largest number of House candidates recorded in an OCPF study was the 401 contenders in 1990.

Of the 160 House seats, 60 were contested, or sought by more than one candidate. A total of 169 candidates sought those 60 seats. The amount of opposition is a decrease from 2004, when there were 101 contested races, with a total of 250 candidates vying for them. The remaining 100 seats were held by incumbents running for re-election unopposed. That's a significant jump from 2004, when 59 representatives ran unopposed.

Of the 169 candidates in contested races, 46 were incumbents, of whom all but two were elected, for a success rate of 96 percent. That rate is comparable to the incumbent success rate of two years before.

Fourteen seats were considered open, including 12 in which the incumbents chose not to run for re-election. In the thirteenth contest, incumbent Thomas O'Brien, D-Kingston, withdrew after winning the primary after he was appointed Plymouth County treasurer. In the final race, incumbent Deborah Blumer, D-Framingham, died suddenly in October after winning the primary. The Democratic caucus's choice for O'Brien's seat, Thomas Calter, won the election. The winner among the write-in candidates for Blumer's seat was Democrat Pamela Richardson of Framingham.

The new House that took office in January 2007 was composed of 144 returning members and 16 new representatives. A total of 141 were Democrats and 19 were Republicans. That is an increase of three Democrats and a decrease of two Republicans from the start of the 2005-06 session. The other "new" Democrat was a member who was originally elected as an independent, but later joined the majority party.

---

<sup>1</sup> This study does not include campaign finance activity in special elections for three vacated house seats in 2006: the 1<sup>st</sup> Bristol (won by Virginia Coppola), 27<sup>th</sup> Middlesex (Denise Provost) and 2<sup>nd</sup> Worcester (Robert Rice). Rather than covering the entire year, figures in this study for Provost start on Feb. 28 and those for Rice start on March 8. While both Provost and Rice faced opposition in their special elections, neither was opposed for re-election later in the year, and their spending was significantly less than in their earlier campaigns. Coppola, who won the seat of her late husband, chose not to seek re-election in November. Figures for the special election are available from OCPF.

## OVERVIEW OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY FOR HOUSE CANDIDATES

	<b>2002</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Number of candidates</b>	311	309	269
<b>Total cash on hand at start</b>	\$3,872,269	\$5,191,305	\$5,514,689
<b>Total receipts</b>	\$7,746,418	\$9,712,553	\$7,785,801
<b>Average receipts per candidate</b>	\$24,908	\$31,432	\$28,943
<b>Total expenditures</b>	\$7,799,288	\$10,019,995	\$7,280,768
<b>Average expenditures per candidate</b>	\$25,078	\$32,247	\$27,066
<b>Total on hand at end</b>	\$3,853,255	\$4,912,736	\$6,036,061

Expenditures do not include debts incurred that had not been paid at the end of 2006. Also, total receipts do not include in-kind contributions, which are things of value other than money. House candidates reported a total of \$289,467 in in-kind receipts in 2006, a substantial drop from the \$1.5 million reported in 2004 and more in line with the \$187,724 recorded in 2002.

Total fundraising and spending reflected decreases from the record amount recorded in both categories in 2004. The House fundraising total was a decrease of 20 percent from 2004. Total spending in 2006 reflected a drop of 27 percent.

Likewise, the average fundraising and spending totals represented drops from the record highs of 2004. The decreases in average receipts and expenditures for 2006 were 7 and 16 percent, respectively.

The findings in greater detail:

### **I. Winners vs. Losers**

Once again, the winning candidates accounted for the majority of financial activity in 2006, outspending their opponents in the aggregate more than three to one. Winners accounted for 60 percent of the candidates, but 77 percent of the spending.

Average receipts and expenditures in 2006 represented a decrease in the figures from 2004, most dramatically on the spending side. The average spent by a winning candidate dropped 22 percent, while the average for a losing candidates went down 18 percent. The declines in average receipts were 13 percent for a winning candidate and 15 percent for a candidate who lost.

**HOUSE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES  
BY SUCCESS OF CAMPAIGNS  
2006**

	<b>Successful (160)</b>	<b>Unsuccessful (109)</b>
<b>Total Receipts</b>	\$6,130,191	\$1,655,610
<b>Average Receipts</b>	\$38,314	\$15,189
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	\$5,606,080	\$1,674,688
<b>Average Expenditures</b>	\$35,038	\$15,364

In the 60 contested races for a House seat, the candidate who spent the most money won 53 times, for a success rate of 88 percent. The comparable rate in 2004 was 92 of 101 races, for 91 percent. The seven winning candidates who were outspent but still won their races in 2006 were incumbents Cleon Turner, D-East Dennis (1<sup>st</sup> Barnstable); Demetrius Atsalis, D-Barnstable (2<sup>nd</sup> Barnstable); David Linsky, D-Natick (5<sup>th</sup> Middlesex); (4<sup>th</sup> Norfolk) and Ann Gobi, D-Spencer (5<sup>th</sup> Worcester) and three candidates who won open seats: Pamela Richardson, D-Framingham (6<sup>th</sup> Middlesex); Thomas Calter, D-Kingston (12<sup>th</sup> Plymouth); Stephen DiNatale, D-Fitchburg (3<sup>rd</sup> Worcester).

At first glance, a winner also seemed to have been outspent in an additional race: the 4<sup>th</sup> Norfolk District, where successful incumbent James Murphy, D-Weymouth, reported lower expenditures than challenger Robert Thomas, R-Weymouth. Of Thomas' total expenditures of \$60,250, however, \$59,000 was a reimbursement of a \$60,000 personal loan he had made to his campaign account a few weeks before. While the reimbursement technically qualifies as a disclosed expenditure, this study does not consider Thomas to have "outspent" Murphy, and he is therefore not included in the seven races noted in the preceding paragraph.

## **II. Incumbents vs. Challengers**

House incumbents once again accounted for most of the total fundraising and spending in 2006. The 146 representatives seeking re-election made up 69 percent of receipts and 67 percent of expenditures. The comparable figures in 2004 were 56 and 55 percent.<sup>2</sup>

On average, both fundraising and spending were down for incumbents from 2004. Receipts for the average incumbent declined 14 percent over 2004's figure and expenditures were down 25 percent. For non-incumbents, average receipts dipped 5 percent and expenditures declined 6 percent.

<sup>2</sup> For purposes of this study, incumbents are defined as those individuals holding the office of representative at the time of the 2006 election and seeking re-election. A House candidate who also held local office such as city councilor or selectman is not considered an incumbent in this analysis.

**HOUSE CANDIDATES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES  
BY INCUMBENCY  
2006**

	<i>Incumbents (146)</i>	<i>Non-Incumbents (123)</i>
<b>Total Receipts</b>	\$5,408,071	\$2,377,731
<b>Average Receipts</b>	\$37,042	\$19,331
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	\$4,887,404	\$2,393,364
<b>Average Expenditures</b>	\$33,475	\$19,458

The 2006 election saw two incumbents representatives lose their bids for re-election: Susan Pope, R-Wayland (13<sup>th</sup> Middlesex District), and Marie Parente, D-Milford (10<sup>th</sup> Worcester). Both were outspent by their successful challengers: Pope by about \$1,600 and Parente by about \$47,000. (In 2004, two of the three defeated incumbents were outspent in their races.)

Historically, much of the expenditures by incumbents, both unopposed and opposed, are not necessarily related directly to their campaigns (such as bumper 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 travel 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**

As in past years, Democrats were the dominant party in terms of fundraising and spending in 2006.

The 189 Democrats represented 70 percent of all those running for House seats, but accounted for 80 percent of the total spending in 2006. By contrast, the party made up 61 percent of candidates and 75 percent of spending in 2004. The 63 Republicans running in 2006 (37 less than in 2004) made up 23 percent of the candidate roster, but only 19 percent of total spending.

While Democrats continued to post the highest fundraising and spending averages, those figures were down from 2004 for both parties as well as the candidates who did not run under either banner. Averages receipts for Democrats dropped 13 percent, while expenditures were 23 percent lower than 2004. The average Republican's drop was lower, with receipts 1 percent lower than two years before and expenditures

down 5 percent. The decline in the averages of unenrolled candidates was more pronounced, with both fundraising and spending by the average candidate down about 55 percent. A relatively low number of candidates in this category means greater fluctuations in campaign finance averages each election year.

**RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES  
BY PARTY AFFILIATION  
2006**

	<i><b>Democrats (189)</b></i>	<i><b>Republicans ( 63)</b></i>	<i><b>Unenrolled (17)</b></i>
<i><b>Total Receipts</b></i>	\$6,309,415	\$1,385,829	\$90,557
<i><b>Average Receipts</b></i>	\$33,383	\$21,997	\$5,327
<i><b>Total Expenditures</b></i>	\$5,806,320	\$1,384,505	\$89,943
<i><b>Average Expenditures</b></i>	\$30,721	\$21,976	\$5,291

**IV. Contested and Uncontested Races**

One hundred of the races for House seats in 2006 featured a single unopposed candidate, each of whom was an incumbent. That is 41 more than the number of unopposed candidates in 2004 and the highest amount ever recorded in an OCPF study. (The previous high was 90 recorded in 2000.) The remaining 60 races were contested, featuring two or more candidates.<sup>3</sup>

Opposed candidates in 2006 once again outspent unopposed candidates as a whole, which is not surprising given the greater numbers of those who were in contested races. The gap in activity between the two types narrowed, however: in 2004 opposed candidates as a whole outspent unopposed contenders almost four to one, while in 2006, the margin was reduced to slightly under two to one.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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 activity. In addition, one contested race featured an incumbent opposed by a single candidate who reported no campaign finance activity, neither receipts nor expenditures. The winning candidate is still considered opposed in this study.

**RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY HOUSE CANDIDATES  
OPPOSED AND UNOPPOSED  
2006**

	<b><i>Opposed (169)</i></b>	<b><i>Unopposed (100)</i></b>
<b><i>Total Receipts</i></b>	\$4,701,303	\$3,084,498
<b><i>Average receipts</i></b>	\$27,818	\$30,845
<b><i>Total Expenditures</i></b>	\$4,823,473	\$2,457,295
<b><i>Average Expenditures</i></b>	\$28,541	\$24,573

***CONTESTED SEATS***

The 60 contested races in 2006 consist of two categories: contests for open seats and those featuring incumbents seeking re-election. The latter type of race once again featured higher totals and averages for both fundraising and spending.

Fourteen House seats were open in the 2006 election, an increase of four from 2004:

<b><i>District</i></b>	<b><i>Previous incumbent</i></b>	<b><i>Winner</i></b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Barnstable	Shirley Gomes (R)	Sarah Peake (D)
1 <sup>st</sup> Bristol	Virginia Coppola (R)	Fred Barrows ((R)
4 <sup>th</sup> Bristol	Philip Travis (D)	Steven D'Amico (D)
15 <sup>th</sup> Essex	Arthur Broadhurst (D)	Linda Dean Campbell (D)
3 <sup>rd</sup> Hampden	Daniel Keenan (D)*	Rosemary Sandlin (D)
12 <sup>th</sup> Hampden	Gale Candaras (D) **	Angelo Puppolo (D)
6 <sup>th</sup> Middlesex	Deborah Blumer (D) ***	Pamela Richardson (D)
24 <sup>th</sup> Middlesex	Anne Paulsen (D)	William Brownsberger (D)
28 <sup>th</sup> Middlesex	Edward Connolly (D) ***	Stephen Smith (D)
7 <sup>th</sup> Plymouth	Kathleen Teahan (D)	Allen McCarthy (D)
12 <sup>th</sup> Plymouth	Thomas O'Brien (D)	Thomas Calter (D)
6 <sup>th</sup> Suffolk	Shirley Owens-Hicks (D)	Willie Mae Allen (D)
3 <sup>rd</sup> Worcester	Emile Goguen (D)	Stephen DiNatale (D)
6 <sup>th</sup> Worcester	Mark Carron (D)	Geraldo Alicea (D)

\* Resigned from the House in 2006. seat was left vacant for the rest of the term.

\*\* Elected to the state Senate in November 2006.

\*\*\* Died in office; seat was left vacant for the rest of the term.

The 61 candidates for these 14 seats reported raising a total of \$1,414,277, or an average of \$23,185, and spending a total of \$1,435,032, or an average of \$23,525. The top spender won in 11 of the 14 races, or 79 percent of the time. Winners who were outspent in their races were Richardson, Calter and DiNatale.

The most expensive race for an open seat was in the 6<sup>th</sup> Worcester District, where seven candidates raised a total of \$179,093, or an average of \$25,585, and spending a total of \$178,521, or an average of \$25,503. The winner, Geraldo Alicea, was also the top spender in that race, with a total outlay of \$36,167.

\* \* \* \* \*

In 2006, 46 contested races featured an incumbent, which was a decrease of 45 from two years before. The incumbent won all but two of these races, or 96 percent of the time. In these 46 contested races, the 106 candidates raised a total of \$3,226,000, with an average of \$30,434, and spent \$3,319,000, averaging \$31,311.

The top spender won in 42 of the 46 races involving an incumbent. The most expensive of these races may be found in Section VI., below.

## **V. Starting Balances**

Candidates for the House had a total of \$5,514,689 on hand at the start of the 2006 election. That total is about \$323,000 more than the starting balance in 2004 and surpasses that year's figure as the largest ever recorded in an OCPF study.

As a rule, incumbents and well-established or returning challengers usually have money on hand at the start of an election year. 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, 97 percent was held by eventual winners. The 38 incumbents seeking re-election also held 96 percent of the cash on hand, or an average of \$36,257 each. That average is about \$3,000 more than the amount held by the average incumbent at the start of 2004 and about \$10,000 more than the figure in 2002.

A total of 83 candidates, or almost a third of the total number running, started their 2006 campaigns with no funds on hand and/or no organized committee. Nine of those candidates, all non-incumbents, were ultimately elected.

The list of the candidates with the 10 highest starting balances consists entirely of incumbents, all of whom subsequently won re-election in 2006. Six were unopposed. All but one were Democrats.

**HOUSE CANDIDATES WITH  
HIGHEST STARTING BALANCES  
2006**

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Balance</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1.	Salvatore DiMasi (D)(I)	3rd Suffolk	\$318,171	Yes	Yes
2.	Peter Koutoujian (D)(I)	10th Middlesex	\$315,536	Yes	Yes
3.	John Binienda, Sr. (D)(I)	17th Worcester	\$281,258	No	Yes
4.	Thomas Petrolati (D)(I)	7th Hampden	\$236,671	No	Yes
5.	Ronald Mariano (D)(I)	3rd Norfolk	\$209,888	No	Yes
6.	John Quinn (D)(I)	9th Bristol	\$174,432	No	Yes
7.	Antonio Cabral (D)(I)	13th Bristol	\$164,261	Yes	Yes
8.	Robert DeLeo (D)(I)	19th Suffolk	\$132,044	No	Yes
9.	Rachel Kaprielian (D)(I)	29th Middlesex	\$130,846	Yes	Yes
10.	Karyn Polito (R)(I)	11th Worcester	\$122,688	No	Yes

D=Democrat R=Republican I=Incumbent

The largest starting balance in 2004 belonged to House Speaker Thomas Finneran, who reported having \$477,388. Finneran resigned from the House in early 2004.

**VI. Most Active Candidates and Races**

While 60 of the 160 seats in the House were contested in the 2006 election, each election varied in factors such as level of competition and campaign finance activity. Thirteen races featured total spending that exceeded \$100,000.

Half of the ten most active races were for open House seats. Another featured a three-way race in which an incumbent was defeated. The other four races featured incumbents who were re-elected.

The most expensive House race was in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Suffolk District, where Speaker Salvatore DiMasi, D-Boston, and Republican challenger Kenneth Procaccianti spent a total of \$355,113. DiMasi, who was re-elected, accounted for 98 percent of the total spending in the race. The spending total in this race is a new record, surpassing the \$347,148 in the 11<sup>th</sup> Norfolk District in 2002. That race, however, included four candidates, including winner Robert Coughlin, D-Dedham, who defeated an incumbent.

A total of \$1.7 million was spent in the ten races listed below, good for 24 percent of the overall total for House candidates in 2006.

## HOUSE RACES WITH THE HIGHEST SPENDING 2006

	District	Total spent	Number of candidates	Winner
1.	3rd Suffolk	\$355,113	2	Salvatore DiMasi (D)(I)
2.	12th Norfolk	\$229,648	2	John Rogers (D)(I)
3.	6th Worcester (O)	\$178,521	7	Geraldo Alicea (D)
4.	4th Barnstable (O)	\$164,119	6	Sarah Peake (D)
5.	15th Essex (O)	\$161,275	6	Linda Dean Campbell (D)
6.	1st Bristol (O)	\$157,159	4	Fred Barrows (R)
7.	10th Worcester	\$144,506	3	John Fernandes (D)
8.	6th Plymouth	\$120,660	2	Daniel Webster (R) (I)
9.	5th Suffolk	\$118,701	4	Marie St. Fleur (D)(I)
10.	24th Middlesex (O)	\$116,315	2	William Brownsberger (D)

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

The least expensive contested election was in the 6<sup>th</sup> Essex District, a race with two candidates and total spending of \$12,633. All of that spending, however, was done by incumbent Mary Grant, D-Beverly; her opponent, independent Donato Paglia, reported no expenditures in his unsuccessful challenge.

### TOP FUNDRAISERS AND SPENDERS

The list of top House fundraisers in 2006 was made up of nine incumbents, all of whom were Democrats. The other candidate was a Democrat who defeated an incumbent in the primary. Five were opposed for election; all won their races.

## HOUSE CANDIDATES RAISING THE MOST MONEY IN 2006

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1.	Salvatore DiMasi (D)(I)	3rd Suffolk	\$353,202	Yes	Yes
2.	John Rogers (D)(I)	12th Norfolk	\$179,895	Yes	Yes
3.	Robert DeLeo (D)(I)	19th Suffolk	\$159,146	No	Yes
4.	Peter Koutoujian (D)(I)	10th Middlesex	\$132,320	Yes	Yes
5.	Robert Spellane (D)(I)	13th Worcester	\$115,380	No	Yes
6.	Thomas Petrolati (D)(I)	7th Hampden	\$114,814	No	Yes
7.	Michael Rodrigues (D)(I)	8th Bristol	\$108,766	No	Yes
8.	Ronald Mariano (D)(I)	3rd Norfolk	\$101,877	No	Yes
9.	John Fernandes (D)	10th Worcester	\$92,369	Yes	Yes
10.	Marie St. Fleur (D)(I)	5th Suffolk	\$87,679	Yes	Yes

I = Incumbent. D=Democrat. R=Republican

DiMasi's predecessor at the top of the fundraising list was the man he succeeded as speaker, Democrat Thomas Finneran. Finneran, who resigned his seat after winning re-election in 2004, had been number one for four straight election years. His highest recorded receipts total, and the highest ever recorded by a House candidate in an OCPF study, was \$370,641 in 2002.

Eight House candidate reported no receipts (including two who failed to file all required reports). All were unsuccessful non-incumbents but one: Rep. Robert Rice, D-Gardner, who was re-elected to his 2<sup>nd</sup> Worcester District with no opposition. As noted earlier, however, Rice reported significant activity at the beginning of the year, when he beat four candidates to win the open seat in a special election. Rice reported raising \$36,425 in that election. The winning opposed candidate who reported raising the least amount of money and winning in 2006 was Rep. Colleen Garry, D-Dracut, who raised \$275 in her successful defense of her 36<sup>th</sup> Middlesex seat.

\* \* \* \* \*

The top ten list of candidates in terms of spending is made up of seven re-elected incumbents, two candidates who won open seats and one candidate who defeated an incumbent. Nine were Democrats; all but one were opposed.

Speaker DiMasi also succeeded Finneran atop the list of top spenders among House candidates. His total of \$347,060, however, trails the record high of \$407,232 set by Finneran in 2002.

## HOUSE CANDIDATES SPENDING THE MOST MONEY IN 2006

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1.	Salvatore DiMasi (D)(I)	3rd Suffolk	\$347,060	Yes	Yes
2.	John Rogers (D)(I)	12th Norfolk	\$174,295	Yes	Yes
3.	Robert DeLeo (D)(I)	19th Suffolk	\$126,515	No	Yes
4.	Marie St. Fleur (D)(I)	5th Suffolk	\$106,682	Yes	Yes
5.	William Brownsberger (D)	24th Middlesex (O)	\$90,528	Yes	Yes
6.	John Fernandes (D)	10th Worcester	\$90,260	Yes	Yes
7.	Peter Koutoujian (D)(I)	10th Middlesex	\$87,274	Yes	Yes
8.	Antonio Cabral (D)(I)	13th Bristol	\$82,107	Yes	Yes
9.	Robert Correia (D)(I)	7th Bristol	\$77,409	Yes	Yes
10.	Fred Barrows (R)	1st Bristol (O)	\$76,781	Yes	Yes

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

Nine candidates reported no expenditures in 2006, including seven who also reported no receipts. Six were non-incumbents who lost in contested races. One candidate reported no expenditures but was elected: incumbent Frank Hynes, D-Marshfield, who was unopposed in his bid for his 4<sup>th</sup> Plymouth District seat. (Hynes reported receipts of \$305 and finished the year with \$50,735.)

The winning candidate who was opposed and spent the least after Hynes was incumbent Denis Guyer, D-Dalton, who spent \$11,035 to retain his 2<sup>nd</sup> Berkshire District seat. Guyer accounted for 62 percent of the total spending; his opponent, independent Stefan Racz of Shelburne Falls, spent \$6,694.

### **VII. Ending Balances**

Candidates for the House in 2006 reported a total balance of \$6,036,061 on hand at the end of the year. That's about a half-million dollars more than they held at the start of the year. The ending balance is also \$1.1 million more than the corresponding figure from 2004 and is the largest such total recorded in an OCPF study.<sup>4</sup>

All of the candidates with the ten highest ending balances were incumbents who has been re-elected. All but one were Democrats.

---

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

**HOUSE CANDIDATES WITH  
THE HIGHEST ENDING BALANCES  
2006**

	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Balance</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1.	Peter Koutoujian (D)(I)	10th Middlesex	\$360,582	Yes	Yes
2.	Salvatore DiMasi (D)(I)	3rd Suffolk	\$324,314	Yes	Yes
3.	Thomas Petrolati (D)(I)	7th Hampden	\$311,006	No	Yes
4.	John Binienda, Sr. (D)(I)	17th Worcester	\$308,129	No	Yes
5.	Ronald Mariano (D)(I)	3rd Norfolk	\$267,947	No	Yes
6.	John Quinn (D)(I)	9th Bristol	\$188,201	No	Yes
7.	Robert DeLeo (D)(I)	19th Suffolk	\$164,675	No	Yes
8.	Karyn Polito (R)(I)	11th Worcester	\$127,251	No	Yes
9.	Antonio Cabral (D)(I)	13th Bristol	\$124,366	Yes	Yes
10.	Michael Rodrigues (D)(I)	8th Bristol	\$114,819	No	Yes

D = Democrat. R = Republican. I = Incumbent

The highest ending balances in 2000, 2002 and 2004 had been posted by then-Speaker Finneran, whose highest figure was \$472,331 in 2002.

A total of 35 candidates reported having no money on hand (or negative account balances) at the end of 2006. All were non-incumbents who had lost their elections. The winning candidate who finished with the least amount of money was Rep. William Lantigua, D-Lawrence, who reported a balance of \$67. Lantigua had been unopposed for election to his 16<sup>th</sup> Essex District seat.

*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 2006

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>1st Barnstable</b>									
	Richard Neitz	South Yarmouth	R		L	\$20,402.58	\$43,210.38	\$62,391.94	\$1,221.02
	Cleon Turner	E. Dennis	D	I	W	\$13,745.22	\$46,725.00	\$53,358.22	\$7,112.00
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$34,147.80	\$89,935.38	\$115,750.16	\$8,333.02
<b>2nd Barnstable</b>									
	Demetrius Atsalis	Barnstable	D	I	W	\$20,288.57	\$37,534.00	\$45,092.76	\$11,879.81
	William Crocker, Jr.	Centerville	R		L	\$0.00	\$53,019.12	\$52,888.16	\$130.96
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$20,288.57	\$90,553.12	\$97,980.92	\$12,010.77
<b>3rd Barnstable</b>									
	Matthew Patrick	Waquoit	D	I	W	\$4,445.65	\$16,742.00	\$12,471.30	\$8,716.35
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$4,445.65	\$16,742.00	\$12,471.30	\$8,716.35

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>4th Barnstable</b>									
	Ronald Bergstrom	Chatham	D		L	\$0.00	\$8,245.00	\$7,967.07	\$277.93
	Andrew. Buckley	Chatham	R		L	\$0.00	\$9,590.00	\$9,575.76	\$14.24
	Raymond Gottwald	Harwich	D		L	\$12,240.00	\$12,607.17	\$21,319.97	\$3,527.20
	Donald Howell	Harwich	R		L	\$4,618.00	\$15,905.52	\$20,132.02	\$391.50
	Aaron Maloy	Orleans	R		L	\$0.00	\$30,461.38	\$30,461.38	\$0.00
	Sarah Peake	Provincetown	D		W	\$19,850.45	\$61,798.00	\$74,662.70	\$6,985.75
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	6				\$36,708.45	\$138,607.07	\$164,118.90	\$11,196.62
<b>5th Barnstable</b>									
	Jeffrey Perry	E. Sandwich	R	I	W	\$17,195.96	\$47,637.42	\$45,261.14	\$19,572.24
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$17,195.96	\$47,637.42	\$45,261.14	\$19,572.24
<b>Barnstable, Dukes &amp; Nantucket</b>									
	James Powell	West Tisbury	R		L	\$181.77	\$9,856.00	\$9,912.53	\$125.24
	Eric Turkington	Woods Hole	D	I	W	\$40,600.00	\$36,019.36	\$15,019.22	\$61,600.14
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$40,781.77	\$45,875.36	\$24,931.75	\$61,725.38
<b>1st Berkshire</b>									
	Daniel Bosley	North Adams	D	I	W	\$1,022.41	\$53,636.00	\$41,652.31	\$13,006.10
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$1,022.41	\$53,636.00	\$41,652.31	\$13,006.10

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>2nd Berkshire</b>									
	Denis Guyer	Dalton	D	I	W	\$6,364.91	\$13,138.17	\$11,035.32	\$8,467.76
	Stefan Racz	Shelburne Falls	U		L	\$0.00	\$7,139.49	\$6,693.85	\$445.64
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$6,364.91	\$20,277.66	\$17,729.17	\$8,913.40
<b>3rd Berkshire</b>									
	Christopher Speranzo	Pittsfield	D	I	W	\$6,710.82	\$5,700.00	\$10,108.75	\$2,302.07
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$6,710.82	\$5,700.00	\$10,108.75	\$2,302.07
<b>4th Berkshire</b>									
	Patrick Long	Great Barrington	D		L	\$0.00	\$10,958.40	\$10,927.97	\$0.00
	William Pignatelli	Lenox	D	I	W	\$15,647.76	\$31,705.00	\$19,110.57	\$28,242.19
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$15,647.76	\$42,663.40	\$30,038.54	\$28,242.19
<b>1st Bristol</b>									
	Fred Barrows	Mansfield	R		W	\$0.00	\$77,220.00	\$76,780.67	\$439.33
	Matthew Donovan	Foxborough	D		L	\$0.00	\$580.00	\$480.00	\$100.00
	Paul Feeney	Foxborough	D		L	\$0.00	\$18,796.28	\$18,391.26	\$405.02
	Claire Naughton	Foxboro	D		L	\$954.71	\$60,675.56	\$61,507.41	\$122.86
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	4				\$954.71	\$157,271.84	\$157,159.34	\$1,067.21

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>2nd Bristol</b>									
	Kate Jackson	Attleboro	D		L	\$0.00	\$12,012.22	\$7,414.49	\$4,597.73
	John Lepper	Attleboro	R	I	W	\$12,176.13	\$46,113.00	\$51,131.69	\$7,157.44
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$12,176.13	\$58,125.22	\$58,546.18	\$11,755.17
<b>3rd Bristol</b>									
	James Fagan	Taunton	D	I	W	\$28,725.43	\$38,738.76	\$24,417.07	\$43,047.12
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$28,725.43	\$38,738.76	\$24,417.07	\$43,047.12
<b>4th Bristol</b>									
	Nicholas Bernier	Swansea	D		L	\$0.00	\$17,327.00	\$14,889.84	\$2,437.16
	Steven D'Amico	Seekonk	D		W	\$0.00	\$45,200.40	\$40,620.56	\$4,579.84
	Steven Howitt	Seekonk	R		L	\$15,516.47	\$26,643.00	\$27,656.76	\$14,502.71
	Brian Langevin	Seekonk	R		L	\$0.00	\$200.00	\$0.00	\$200.00
	Robert Marquis	Swansea	D		L	\$0.00	\$9,617.80	\$9,617.80	\$0.00
	John Whelan	Seekonk	D		L	\$0.00	\$14,369.00	\$14,321.26	\$47.74
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	6				\$15,516.47	\$113,357.20	\$107,106.22	\$21,767.45
<b>5th Bristol</b>									
	Patricia Haddad	Somerset	D	I	W	\$50,148.57	\$19,545.49	\$3,376.63	\$66,317.43
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$50,148.57	\$19,545.49	\$3,376.63	\$66,317.43

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>6th Bristol</b>									
	David Sullivan	Fall River	D	I	W	\$11,549.78	\$29,985.00	\$30,341.63	\$12,118.15
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>					<u>\$11,549.78</u>	<u>\$29,985.00</u>	<u>\$30,341.63</u>	<u>\$12,118.15</u>
<b>7th Bristol</b>									
	Kevin Aguiar	Fall River	D		L	\$344.41	\$8,220.00	\$7,372.86	\$1,191.55
	Robert Correia	Fall River	D	I	W	\$6,200.63	\$83,772.18	\$77,408.84	\$12,563.97
	Raymond Leary, Jr.	Fall River	U		L	\$1,344.69	\$4,645.00	\$4,976.96	\$1,012.73
	John Rodrigues	Fall River	D		L	\$0.00	\$7,206.96	\$7,206.96	\$0.00
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>					<u>\$7,889.73</u>	<u>\$103,844.14</u>	<u>\$96,965.62</u>	<u>\$14,768.25</u>
<b>8th Bristol</b>									
	Michael Rodrigues	Westport	D	I	W	\$81,364.90	\$108,766.07	\$75,312.29	\$114,818.68
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>					<u>\$81,364.90</u>	<u>\$108,766.07</u>	<u>\$75,312.29</u>	<u>\$114,818.68</u>
<b>9th Bristol</b>									
	John Quinn	Dartmouth	D	I	W	\$174,432.37	\$50,286.86	\$36,517.76	\$188,201.47
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>					<u>\$174,432.37</u>	<u>\$50,286.86</u>	<u>\$36,517.76</u>	<u>\$188,201.47</u>

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>10th Bristol</b>									
	William Straus	Mattapoisett	D	I	W	\$17,084.47	\$29,341.44	\$22,637.48	\$23,788.43
	Peter Winters	Marion	R		L	\$1,900.00	\$8,769.50	\$9,339.60	\$1,329.90
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$18,984.47	\$38,110.94	\$31,977.08	\$25,118.33
<b>11th Bristol</b>									
	Dennis Dallaire, Jr.	New Bedford	U		L	\$132.87	\$12,370.00	\$12,124.85	\$378.02
	Robert Koczera	New Bedford	D	I	W	\$54,275.46	\$24,712.78	\$53,248.38	\$25,739.86
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$54,408.33	\$37,082.78	\$65,373.23	\$26,117.88
<b>12th Bristol</b>									
	Stephen Canessa	New Bedford	D	I	W	\$38,499.63	\$47,421.00	\$61,775.68	\$24,144.95
	Mark Howland	E. Freetown	D		L	\$22.07	\$16,922.07	\$16,902.40	\$41.74
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$38,521.70	\$64,343.07	\$78,678.08	\$24,186.69
<b>13th Bristol</b>									
	Antonio Cabral	New Bedford	D	I	W	\$164,261.25	\$42,211.52	\$82,106.54	\$124,366.23
	Carlos Felix	New Bedford	U		L	\$0.00	\$350.00	\$350.00	\$0.00
	Robert Gardner	New Bedford	U		L	\$0.00	\$12,420.11	\$12,813.52	(\$274.64)
	Brian Gomes	New Bedford	D		L	\$0.00	\$1,063.91	\$1,063.91	\$0.00
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	4				\$164,261.25	\$56,045.54	\$96,333.97	\$124,091.59

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>14th Bristol</b>									
	Elizabeth Poirier	N. Attleboro	R	I	W	\$1,786.02	\$17,499.77	\$14,808.86	\$4,476.93
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$1,786.02	\$17,499.77	\$14,808.86	\$4,476.93
<b>1st Essex</b>									
	Michael Costello	Newburyport	D	I	W	\$22,039.11	\$38,750.00	\$35,652.57	\$25,136.54
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$22,039.11	\$38,750.00	\$35,652.57	\$25,136.54
<b>2nd Essex</b>									
	Evan O'Reilly	Georgetown	R		L	\$0.00	\$13,403.00	\$15,045.98	(\$1,642.98)
	Harriett Stanley	W. Newbury	D	I	W	\$56,597.17	\$22,570.00	\$19,916.37	\$59,250.80
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		2			\$56,597.17	\$35,973.00	\$34,962.35	\$57,607.82
<b>3rd Essex</b>									
	Brian Dempsey	Haverhill	D	I	W	\$52,051.93	\$57,222.03	\$38,402.06	\$70,871.90
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$52,051.93	\$57,222.03	\$38,402.06	\$70,871.90
<b>4th Essex</b>									
	Bradford Hill	Ipswich	R	I	W	\$437.98	\$17,655.00	\$10,721.87	\$7,743.18
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$437.98	\$17,655.00	\$10,721.87	\$7,743.18

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>5th Essex</b>									
	Anthony Verga	Gloucester	D	I	W	\$18,977.93	\$15,420.50	\$32,513.24	\$8,581.84
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$18,977.93	\$15,420.50	\$32,513.24	\$8,581.84
<b>6th Essex</b>									
	Mary Grant	Beverly	D	I	W	\$11,814.14	\$16,821.00	\$12,633.23	\$16,001.91
	Donato Paglia	Beverly	U		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$11,814.14	\$16,821.00	\$12,633.23	\$16,001.91
<b>7th Essex</b>									
	John Keenan Jr.	Salem	D	I	W	\$22,144.21	\$44,324.00	\$31,488.39	\$34,979.82
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$22,144.21	\$44,324.00	\$31,488.39	\$34,979.82
<b>8th Essex</b>									
	Douglas Petersen	Marblehead	D	I	W	\$9,225.97	\$5,912.69	\$1,362.14	\$13,776.52
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$9,225.97	\$5,912.69	\$1,362.14	\$13,776.52
<b>9th Essex</b>									
	Mark Falzone	Saugus	D	I	W	\$48,010.39	\$54,335.29	\$56,129.76	\$46,215.92
	Sean Grant	Saugus	D		L	\$0.00	\$22,229.25	\$21,911.99	\$317.26
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$48,010.39	\$76,564.54	\$78,041.75	\$46,533.18

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>10th Essex</b>									
	Robert Fennell	Lynn	D	I	W	\$76,865.44	\$12,625.00	\$13,682.83	\$75,807.61
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$76,865.44	\$12,625.00	\$13,682.83	\$75,807.61
<b>11th Essex</b>									
	Steven Walsh	Lynn	D	I	W	\$21,081.65	\$27,035.00	\$20,922.94	\$27,193.71
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$21,081.65	\$27,035.00	\$20,922.94	\$27,193.71
<b>12th Essex</b>									
	Sean Robert Fitzgerald	Peabody	D		L	\$0.00	\$17,886.74	\$17,794.51	\$92.23
	Jason Harding	Peabody	R		L	\$0.00	\$6,580.00	\$6,785.98	\$6.02
	Joyce Spiliotis	Peabody	D	I	W	\$10,973.01	\$26,319.00	\$26,658.55	\$10,633.46
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	3				\$10,973.01	\$50,785.74	\$51,239.04	\$10,731.71
<b>13th Essex</b>									
	Theodore Speliotis	Danvers	D	I	W	\$943.82	\$7,738.00	\$6,080.18	\$2,601.64
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$943.82	\$7,738.00	\$6,080.18	\$2,601.64
<b>14th Essex</b>									
	David Torrasi	N. Andover	D	I	W	\$50,597.32	\$25,428.07	\$21,158.00	\$54,867.39
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$50,597.32	\$25,428.07	\$21,158.00	\$54,867.39

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>15th Essex</b>									
	Robert Andrew	Methuen	R		L	\$0.00	\$5,840.00	\$1,767.00	\$4,073.00
	Linda Dean Campbell	Methuen	D		W	\$14,509.02	\$40,820.00	\$54,301.14	\$1,027.88
	Edward Curran	Methuen	D		L	\$328.60	\$38,395.00	\$38,723.60	\$0.00
	Christopher DiBella	Methuen	D		L	\$104.44	\$34,859.63	\$34,803.61	\$160.46
	Michael Hennessy	Methuen	D		L	\$2,961.26	\$24,389.46	\$27,350.72	\$0.00
	Kenneth Henrick	Methuen	U		L	\$103.67	\$3,974.00	\$4,329.03	(\$251.36)
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	6				\$18,006.99	\$148,278.09	\$161,275.10	\$5,009.98
<b>16th Essex</b>									
	William Lantigua	Lawrence	D	I	W	\$249.03	\$43,745.00	\$44,652.16	\$66.87
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$249.03	\$43,745.00	\$44,652.16	\$66.87
<b>17th Essex</b>									
	Barry Finegold	Andover	D	I	W	\$34,326.66	\$51,460.00	\$41,451.25	\$40,608.39
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$34,326.66	\$51,460.00	\$41,451.25	\$40,608.39
<b>18th Essex</b>									
	Lawrence Brennan	Georgetown	R		L	\$59.25	\$24,314.93	\$23,805.39	\$568.79
	Barbara L'Italien	Andover	D	I	W	\$19,888.37	\$46,243.00	\$40,825.84	\$25,305.53
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$19,947.62	\$70,557.93	\$64,631.23	\$25,874.32

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>1st Franklin</b>									
	Stephen Kulik	Worthington	D	I	W	\$22,111.83	\$13,459.81	\$9,101.51	\$26,470.13
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$22,111.83	\$13,459.81	\$9,101.51	\$26,470.13
<b>2nd Franklin</b>									
	Christopher Donelan	Orange	D	I	W	\$2,182.42	\$14,450.00	\$13,847.41	\$2,785.01
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$2,182.42	\$14,450.00	\$13,847.41	\$2,785.01
<b>1st Hampden</b>									
	Todd Smola	Three Rivers	R	I	W	\$5,894.58	\$33,592.00	\$24,908.98	\$14,577.60
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$5,894.58	\$33,592.00	\$24,908.98	\$14,577.60
<b>2nd Hampden</b>									
	Mary Rogeness	Longmeadow	R	I	W	\$53,287.45	\$2,738.33	\$9,048.77	\$46,977.01
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$53,287.45	\$2,738.33	\$9,048.77	\$46,977.01

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>3rd Hampden</b>									
	Owen Broadhurst	Agawam	U		L	\$69.02	\$980.00	\$1,034.97	\$14.05
	John Cesan	Feeding Hills	R		L	\$0.00	\$779.10	\$779.10	\$0.00
	Carley Johnson, Jr.	Agawam	U		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Robert Magovern	Agawam	R		L	\$1,171.81	\$17,776.00	\$15,127.97	\$3,819.84
	Joseph Mineo	Agawam	D		L	\$0.00	\$13,172.50	\$13,155.67	\$16.83
	Rosemary Sandlin	Agawam	D		W	\$0.00	\$51,126.97	\$47,974.54	\$3,552.43
	Joseph Schebel	Feeding Hills	U		L	\$0.00	\$830.32	\$834.57	(\$4.75)
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	7				\$1,240.83	\$84,664.89	\$78,906.82	\$7,398.40
<b>4th Hampden</b>									
	Donald Humason Jr.	Westfield	R	I	W	\$10,429.16	\$22,567.69	\$19,253.56	\$13,743.29
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$10,429.16	\$22,567.69	\$19,253.56	\$13,743.29
<b>5th Hampden</b>									
	Michael Kane	Holyoke	D	I	W	\$7,949.57	\$37,910.90	\$27,846.51	\$18,013.96
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$7,949.57	\$37,910.90	\$27,846.51	\$18,013.96
<b>6th Hampden</b>									
	James Welch	W. Springfield	D	I	W	\$19,976.29	\$24,179.02	\$19,596.93	\$24,558.38
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$19,976.29	\$24,179.02	\$19,596.93	\$24,558.38

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>7th Hampden</b>									
	Thomas Petrolati	Ludlow	D	I	W	\$236,671.28	\$114,814.11	\$40,479.21	\$311,006.18
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$236,671.28	\$114,814.11	\$40,479.21	\$311,006.18
<b>8th Hampden</b>									
	Ronald Sliski	Chicopee	U		L	\$0.00	\$3,743.01	\$3,743.01	\$0.00
	Joseph Wagner	Chicopee	D	I	W	\$33,483.54	\$38,361.38	\$52,866.96	\$18,977.96
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		2			\$33,483.54	\$42,104.39	\$56,609.97	\$18,977.96
<b>9th Hampden</b>									
	Megan Anzalotti	Springfield	U		L	\$0.00	\$20,433.28	\$16,661.18	\$1,886.05
	Sean Curran	Springfield	D	I	W	\$13,216.16	\$16,635.00	\$28,167.11	\$1,684.05
	Robert Underwood	Springfield	D		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		3			\$13,216.16	\$37,068.28	\$44,828.29	\$3,570.10
<b>10th Hampden</b>									
	Kyle Burns	Chicopee	U		L	\$0.00	\$560.90	\$490.39	\$39.61
	Cheryl Rivera	Springfield	D	I	W	\$2,019.60	\$16,606.00	\$14,781.32	\$3,844.28
	George Vazquez	Springfield	R		L	\$263.65	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$263.65
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		3			\$2,283.25	\$17,166.90	\$15,271.71	\$4,147.54

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>11th Hampden</b>									
	Larry Lawson	Springfield	D		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Norman Oliver	Springfield	D		L	(\$113.84)	\$4,202.59	\$3,957.87	\$130.88
	Benjamin Swan	Springfield	D	I	W	\$9,199.48	\$11,339.00	\$17,676.03	\$2,862.35
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	3				\$9,085.64	\$15,541.59	\$21,633.90	\$2,993.23
<b>12th Hampden</b>									
	Bob Collamore	Springfield	R		L	\$0.00	\$1,250.00	\$5,054.00	(\$3,804.00)
	James Driscoll	East Longmeadow	D		L	\$0.00	\$6,517.57	\$6,517.57	\$0.00
	Christopher Leisey	Wilbraham	R		L	\$0.00	\$16,194.91	\$15,917.01	\$0.00
	Angelo Puppolo Jr.	Springfield	D		W	\$88,243.68	\$54,327.60	\$63,784.84	\$78,786.44
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	4				\$88,243.68	\$78,290.08	\$91,273.42	\$74,982.44
<b>1st Hampshire</b>									
	John Andrulis	Leeds	U		L	\$427.74	\$4,627.00	\$4,557.13	\$497.61
	Peter Kocot	Northampton	D	I	W	\$521.05	\$27,653.00	\$25,269.52	\$2,904.53
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$948.79	\$32,280.00	\$29,826.65	\$3,402.14
<b>2nd Hampshire</b>									
	John Scibak	S. Hadley	D	I	W	\$26,558.10	\$13,972.00	\$11,882.23	\$28,647.87
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$26,558.10	\$13,972.00	\$11,882.23	\$28,647.87

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>3rd Hampshire</b>									
	Ellen Story	Amherst	D	I	W	\$21,594.41	\$7,767.76	\$8,830.89	\$20,531.28
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$21,594.41	\$7,767.76	\$8,830.89	\$20,531.28
<b>1st Middlesex</b>									
	Carol Bousquet	Ayer	D		L	\$0.00	\$29,294.01	\$28,905.82	\$388.19
	Robert Hargraves	Groton	R	I	W	\$51,838.92	\$27,152.86	\$36,344.35	\$42,647.43
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$51,838.92	\$56,446.87	\$65,250.17	\$43,035.62
<b>2nd Middlesex</b>									
	Geoffrey Hall	Westford	D	I	W	\$12,495.42	\$6,475.00	\$4,825.63	\$14,144.79
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$12,495.42	\$6,475.00	\$4,825.63	\$14,144.79
<b>3rd Middlesex</b>									
	Patricia Walrath	Stow	D	I	W	\$37,003.20	\$13,784.85	\$3,702.19	\$47,085.86
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$37,003.20	\$13,784.85	\$3,702.19	\$47,085.86
<b>4th Middlesex</b>									
	Stephen LeDuc	Marlborough	D	I	W	\$3,280.10	\$34,193.74	\$32,511.80	\$4,962.04
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$3,280.10	\$34,193.74	\$32,511.80	\$4,962.04

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>5th Middlesex</b>									
	David Linsky	Natick	D	I	W	\$7,621.95	\$35,969.51	\$37,211.89	\$6,379.57
	William Whittlesey	Sherborn	R		L	\$0.00	\$40,118.85	\$39,548.96	\$569.89
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$7,621.95	\$76,088.36	\$76,760.85	\$6,949.46
<b>6th Middlesex</b>									
	Dawn Harkness	Framingham	U		L	\$0.00	\$5,274.14	\$5,190.20	\$83.94
	Pam Richardson	Framingham	D		W	\$0.00	\$22,541.35	\$19,067.61	\$3,473.74
	Wes Ritchie	Framingham	D		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	James Rizoli	Framingham	R		L	\$0.00	\$3,169.00	\$3,112.31	\$66.69
	Nicolas Sanchez	Framingham	R		L	\$0.00	\$19,660.00	\$19,187.29	\$472.71
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	5				\$0.00	\$50,644.49	\$46,557.41	\$4,097.08
<b>7th Middlesex</b>									
	Kevin Looby	Framingham	R		L	\$0.00	\$2,600.00	\$647.18	\$1,952.82
	Tom Sannicandro	Ashland	D	I	W	\$11,708.08	\$11,440.00	\$7,618.80	\$15,529.28
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$11,708.08	\$14,040.00	\$8,265.98	\$17,482.10
<b>8th Middlesex</b>									
	Paul Loscocco	Holliston	R	I	W	\$30,331.18	\$8,714.00	\$1,080.44	\$43,692.55
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$30,331.18	\$8,714.00	\$1,080.44	\$43,692.55

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>9th Middlesex</b>									
	Thomas Stanley	Waltham	D	I	W	\$13,731.36	\$29,607.00	\$36,334.65	\$7,003.71
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$13,731.36	\$29,607.00	\$36,334.65	\$7,003.71
<b>10th Middlesex</b>									
	Peter Koutoujian	Waltham	D	I	W	\$315,535.90	\$132,320.49	\$87,274.15	\$360,582.24
	Dara Pourghasemi	Waltham	R		L	\$0.00	\$450.00	\$152.90	\$297.10
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$315,535.90	\$132,770.49	\$87,427.05	\$360,879.34
<b>11th Middlesex</b>									
	Kay Khan	Newton	D	I	W	\$36,542.53	\$14,195.00	\$13,320.90	\$37,416.63
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$36,542.53	\$14,195.00	\$13,320.90	\$37,416.63
<b>12th Middlesex</b>									
	Ruth Balsler	Chestnut Hill	D	I	W	\$34,338.06	\$26,678.00	\$15,988.40	\$45,027.66
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$34,338.06	\$26,678.00	\$15,988.40	\$45,027.66
<b>13th Middlesex</b>									
	Thomas Conroy	Wayland	D		W	\$100.00	\$44,189.62	\$43,466.52	\$823.10
	Susan Pope	Wayland	R	I	L	\$62,595.64	\$24,815.82	\$41,864.62	\$45,546.84
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$62,695.64	\$69,005.44	\$85,331.14	\$46,369.94

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>14th Middlesex</b>									
	Cory Atkins	Concord	D	I	W	\$15,533.02	\$20,445.78	\$31,518.93	\$4,459.87
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$15,533.02	\$20,445.78	\$31,518.93	\$4,459.87
<b>15th Middlesex</b>									
	Jay Kaufman	Lexington	D	I	W	\$9,994.63	\$1,637.57	\$8,803.60	\$2,828.60
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$9,994.63	\$1,637.57	\$8,803.60	\$2,828.60
<b>16th Middlesex</b>									
	Thomas Golden Jr.	Lowell	D	I	W	\$28,418.89	\$54,427.18	\$41,721.56	\$41,124.51
	Matthew Prah	Lowell	R		L	\$0.00	\$11,521.78	\$9,326.77	\$2,195.01
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$28,418.89	\$65,948.96	\$51,048.33	\$43,319.52
<b>17th Middlesex</b>									
	David Nangle	Lowell	D	I	W	\$21,346.19	\$31,044.00	\$30,604.87	\$17,927.11
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$21,346.19	\$31,044.00	\$30,604.87	\$17,927.11
<b>18th Middlesex</b>									
	Kevin Murphy	Lowell	D	I	W	\$30,897.94	\$29,620.00	\$11,225.47	\$49,292.47
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$30,897.94	\$29,620.00	\$11,225.47	\$49,292.47

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>19th Middlesex</b>									
	James Miceli	Wilmington	D	I	W	\$29,689.03	\$7,040.47	\$32,490.37	\$3,879.26
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$29,689.03	\$7,040.47	\$32,490.37	\$3,879.26
<b>20th Middlesex</b>									
	Bradley Jones Jr.	North Reading	R	I	W	\$64,116.28	\$72,827.76	\$55,806.23	\$81,137.81
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$64,116.28	\$72,827.76	\$55,806.23	\$81,137.81
<b>21st Middlesex</b>									
	Charles Murphy	Burlington	D	I	W	\$18,380.98	\$36,405.00	\$16,065.00	\$38,720.98
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$18,380.98	\$36,405.00	\$16,065.00	\$38,720.98
<b>22nd Middlesex</b>									
	William Greene, Jr.	Billerica	D	I	W	\$377.48	\$1,550.00	\$788.00	\$1,139.48
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$377.48	\$1,550.00	\$788.00	\$1,139.48
<b>23rd Middlesex</b>									
	James Marzilli	Arlington	D	I	W	\$20,021.68	\$500.00	\$5,909.07	\$14,112.61
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$20,021.68	\$500.00	\$5,909.07	\$14,112.61

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>24th Middlesex</b>									
	William Brownsberger	Belmont	D		W	\$14,988.28	\$80,890.00	\$90,528.26	\$5,350.02
	M. Elizabeth Firenze	Belmont	R		L	\$0.00	\$29,017.00	\$25,786.54	\$3,230.46
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$14,988.28	\$109,907.00	\$116,314.80	\$8,580.48
<b>25th Middlesex</b>									
	Henry Irving	Cambridge	R		L	\$0.00	\$4,019.89	\$3,095.29	\$924.60
	Alice Wolf	Cambridge	D	I	W	\$86,209.54	\$22,695.08	\$30,626.60	\$78,278.02
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$86,209.54	\$26,714.97	\$33,721.89	\$79,202.62
<b>26th Middlesex</b>									
	Timothy Toomey Jr.	Cambridge	D	I	W	\$12,346.55	\$31,467.20	\$23,624.09	\$20,189.66
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$12,346.55	\$31,467.20	\$23,624.09	\$20,189.66
<b>27th Middlesex</b>									
	Denise Provost	Somerville	D	I	W	\$10,619.94	\$5,084.71	\$4,092.78	\$11,611.87
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$10,619.94	\$5,084.71	\$4,092.78	\$11,611.87

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>28th Middlesex</b>									
	Joseph Hickey	Everett	U		L	\$0.00	\$11,684.00	\$14,617.56	(\$2,933.56)
	Rosemary Miller	Everett	D		L	\$0.00	\$6,100.00	\$5,523.40	\$576.60
	Frank Nuzzo, Jr.	Everett	D		L	\$0.00	\$19,330.15	\$17,965.15	\$1,365.00
	Stephen Smith	Everett	D		W	\$865.40	\$32,035.00	\$29,472.31	\$3,428.09
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	4				\$865.40	\$69,149.15	\$67,578.42	\$2,436.13
<b>29th Middlesex</b>									
	Thomas Geary, Jr.	Watertown	U		L	\$0.00	\$1,526.21	\$1,526.21	\$0.00
	Rachel Kaprielian	Watertown	D	I	W	\$130,846.39	\$45,340.00	\$73,191.08	\$102,995.31
	Keith Mercurio	Watertown	R		L	\$0.00	\$10,955.00	\$1,136.02	\$9,818.98
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	3				\$130,846.39	\$57,821.21	\$75,853.31	\$112,814.29
<b>30th Middlesex</b>									
	Patrick Natale	Woburn	D	I	W	\$5,528.12	\$15,632.00	\$5,204.56	\$15,955.56
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$5,528.12	\$15,632.00	\$5,204.56	\$15,955.56
<b>31st Middlesex</b>									
	Paul Casey	Winchester	D	I	W	\$3,398.04	\$19,555.00	\$17,895.28	\$5,057.76
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$3,398.04	\$19,555.00	\$17,895.28	\$5,057.76

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>32nd Middlesex</b>									
	Michael Festa	Melrose	D	I	W	\$79,068.81	\$19,504.28	\$41,329.91	\$57,243.18
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				<u>\$79,068.81</u>	<u>\$19,504.28</u>	<u>\$41,329.91</u>	<u>\$57,243.18</u>
<b>33rd Middlesex</b>									
	Christopher Fallon	Malden	D	I	W	\$3,644.47	\$61,960.00	\$51,568.58	\$14,035.89
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				<u>\$3,644.47</u>	<u>\$61,960.00</u>	<u>\$51,568.58</u>	<u>\$14,035.89</u>
<b>34th Middlesex</b>									
	Carl Sciortino, Jr.	Medford	D	I	W	\$8,815.26	\$5,875.00	\$12,116.35	\$2,573.91
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				<u>\$8,815.26</u>	<u>\$5,875.00</u>	<u>\$12,116.35</u>	<u>\$2,573.91</u>
<b>35th Middlesex</b>									
	Paul Donato	Medford	D	I	W	\$32,327.24	\$77,202.79	\$54,713.15	\$54,816.88
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				<u>\$32,327.24</u>	<u>\$77,202.79</u>	<u>\$54,713.15</u>	<u>\$54,816.88</u>
<b>36th Middlesex</b>									
	Colleen Garry	Dracut	D	I	W	\$10,998.18	\$275.00	\$4,639.95	\$6,633.23
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				<u>\$10,998.18</u>	<u>\$275.00</u>	<u>\$4,639.95</u>	<u>\$6,633.23</u>

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>37th Middlesex</b>									
	James Eldridge	Acton	D	I	W	\$16,247.13	\$69,799.00	\$61,488.70	\$24,557.43
	Kevin. Hayes, Sr.	Shirley	R		L	\$0.00	\$28,192.06	\$27,087.37	\$1,104.69
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$16,247.13	\$97,991.06	\$88,576.07	\$25,662.12
<b>1st Norfolk</b>									
	Bruce Ayers	N. Quincy	D	I	W	\$51,556.84	\$19,590.79	\$20,171.64	\$50,983.32
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$51,556.84	\$19,590.79	\$20,171.64	\$50,983.32
<b>2nd Norfolk</b>									
	Arthur Stephen Tobin	Quincy	D	I	W	\$75,902.08	\$22,664.85	\$27,745.90	\$70,821.03
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$75,902.08	\$22,664.85	\$27,745.90	\$70,821.03
<b>3rd Norfolk</b>									
	Ronald Mariano	Quincy	D	I	W	\$209,888.33	\$101,876.86	\$43,818.06	\$267,947.13
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$209,888.33	\$101,876.86	\$43,818.06	\$267,947.13
<b>4th Norfolk</b>									
	Brad Bennion	Weymouth	R		L	\$1,350.00	\$0.00	\$703.60	\$646.40
	James Murphy	Weymouth	D	I	W	\$14,868.90	\$57,555.48	\$45,959.80	\$26,464.58
	Robert Thomas	Weymouth	R		L	\$0.00	\$66,599.44	\$60,249.95	\$6,349.49
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	3				\$16,218.90	\$124,154.92	\$106,913.35	\$33,460.47

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>5th Norfolk</b>									
	Joseph Driscoll	Braintree	D	I	W	\$22,608.96	\$27,239.00	\$17,017.39	\$32,830.57
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$22,608.96	\$27,239.00	\$17,017.39	\$32,830.57
<b>6th Norfolk</b>									
	William Galvin	Canton	D	I	W	\$13,802.83	\$15,540.00	\$5,631.08	\$23,711.75
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$13,802.83	\$15,540.00	\$5,631.08	\$23,711.75
<b>7th Norfolk</b>									
	Walter Timilty	Milton	D	I	W	\$8,677.43	\$32,695.00	\$24,672.32	\$16,537.09
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$8,677.43	\$32,695.00	\$24,672.32	\$16,537.09
<b>8th Norfolk</b>									
	Louis Kafka	Sharon	D	I	W	\$7,935.61	\$23,734.47	\$27,468.69	\$4,201.39
	Lydia Wiener	Sharon	R		L	\$0.00	\$4,915.00	\$3,550.70	(\$69.00)
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$7,935.61	\$28,649.47	\$31,019.39	\$4,132.39
<b>9th Norfolk</b>									
	Richard Ross	Wrentham	R	I	W	\$22,689.93	\$8,170.00	\$7,791.50	\$23,068.43
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$22,689.93	\$8,170.00	\$7,791.50	\$23,068.43

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>10th Norfolk</b>									
	James Vallee	Franklin	D	I	W	\$65,196.89	\$39,465.00	\$37,545.09	\$67,248.80
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$65,196.89	\$39,465.00	\$37,545.09	\$67,248.80
<b>11th Norfolk</b>									
	Robert Coughlin	Dedham	D	I	W	\$2,446.28	\$65,526.50	\$52,327.96	\$15,619.82
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$2,446.28	\$65,526.50	\$52,327.96	\$15,619.82
<b>12th Norfolk</b>									
	Leah O'Leary	Norwood	D		L	\$0.00	\$55,352.90	\$55,352.90	\$0.00
	John Rogers	Norwood	D	I	W	\$33,538.96	\$179,895.07	\$174,294.85	\$39,139.18
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$33,538.96	\$235,247.97	\$229,647.75	\$39,139.18
<b>13th Norfolk</b>									
	Lida Harkins	Needham	D	I	W	\$26,266.51	\$25,876.76	\$38,062.45	\$14,080.82
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$26,266.51	\$25,876.76	\$38,062.45	\$14,080.82
<b>14th Norfolk</b>									
	Alice Hanlon Peisch	Wellesley	D	I	W	\$16,701.32	\$5,116.00	\$7,490.88	\$14,326.44
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$16,701.32	\$5,116.00	\$7,490.88	\$14,326.44

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>15th Norfolk</b>									
	Frank Smizik	Brookline	D	I	W	\$8,788.48	\$17,300.00	\$25,085.33	\$1,003.15
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$8,788.48	\$17,300.00	\$25,085.33	\$1,003.15
<b>1st Plymouth</b>									
	Vinny deMacedo	Plymouth	R	I	W	\$16,402.83	\$13,999.00	\$19,182.40	\$11,219.43
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$16,402.83	\$13,999.00	\$19,182.40	\$11,219.43
<b>2nd Plymouth</b>									
	Susan Williams Gifford	Wareham	R	I	W	\$32,248.40	\$43,691.47	\$48,519.93	\$27,519.94
	Margaret Ishihara	Wareham	D		L	\$0.00	\$15,220.80	\$12,619.23	\$2,601.57
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$32,248.40	\$58,912.27	\$61,139.16	\$30,121.51
<b>3rd Plymouth</b>									
	Garrett Bradley	Hingham	D	I	W	\$84,934.71	\$58,920.00	\$67,611.33	\$76,243.38
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$84,934.71	\$58,920.00	\$67,611.33	\$76,243.38
<b>4th Plymouth</b>									
	Frank Hynes	Marshfield	D	I	W	\$50,430.46	\$305.00	\$0.00	\$50,735.46
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$50,430.46	\$305.00	\$0.00	\$50,735.46

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>5th Plymouth</b>									
	Timothy Gillespie, Jr.	Hanover	R		L	\$6,190.24	\$8,985.00	\$14,913.57	\$261.67
	Robert Nyman	Hanover	D	I	W	\$1,992.07	\$32,334.00	\$30,120.90	\$4,205.17
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$8,182.31	\$41,319.00	\$45,034.47	\$4,466.84
<b>6th Plymouth</b>									
	Gregory Hanley	Pembroke	D		L	\$0.00	\$58,851.76	\$57,425.13	\$1,426.63
	Daniel Webster	Hanson	R	I	W	\$20,926.80	\$47,551.04	\$63,235.36	\$294.84
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$20,926.80	\$106,402.80	\$120,660.49	\$1,721.47
<b>7th Plymouth</b>									
	R. Andrew Burbine	Abington	R		L	\$0.00	\$40,117.20	\$39,186.27	\$930.93
	Allen McCarthy	East Bridgewater	D		W	\$0.00	\$61,822.38	\$59,711.38	\$2,111.00
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$0.00	\$101,939.58	\$98,897.65	\$3,041.93
<b>8th Plymouth</b>									
	David Flynn	Bridgewater	D	I	W	\$10,729.51	\$17,100.00	\$19,777.67	\$8,051.84
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$10,729.51	\$17,100.00	\$19,777.67	\$8,051.84
<b>9th Plymouth</b>									
	Thomas Kennedy	Brockton	D	I	W	\$104,933.05	\$11,839.20	\$13,199.06	\$103,573.19
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$104,933.05	\$11,839.20	\$13,199.06	\$103,573.19

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>10th Plymouth</b>									
	Christine Canavan	Brockton	D	I	W	\$13,580.42	\$9,400.00	\$10,568.24	\$12,412.18
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$13,580.42	\$9,400.00	\$10,568.24	\$12,412.18
<b>11th Plymouth</b>									
	Geraldine Creedon	Brockton	D	I	W	\$5,107.46	\$16,900.00	\$14,894.68	\$7,112.78
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$5,107.46	\$16,900.00	\$14,894.68	\$7,112.78
<b>12th Plymouth</b>									
	Thomas Calter	Kingston	D		W	\$0.00	\$42,416.57	\$33,872.67	\$8,543.90
	Paul Timmins Curtis	Plymouth	R		L	\$623.91	\$7,588.00	\$6,475.33	\$1,736.58
	Oly deMacedo	Kingston	R		L	\$190.55	\$39,843.00	\$39,994.59	\$38.96
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	3				\$814.46	\$89,847.57	\$80,342.59	\$10,319.44
<b>1st Suffolk</b>									
	Anthony Petruccelli	East Boston	D	I	W	\$11,395.04	\$62,845.00	\$40,142.45	\$34,097.59
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$11,395.04	\$62,845.00	\$40,142.45	\$34,097.59
<b>2nd Suffolk</b>									
	Eugene O'Flaherty	Chelsea	D	I	W	\$48,905.90	\$42,134.00	\$42,682.31	\$48,357.59
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$48,905.90	\$42,134.00	\$42,682.31	\$48,357.59

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>3rd Suffolk</b>									
	Salvatore DiMasi	Boston	D	I	W	\$318,171.19	\$353,202.05	\$347,059.68	\$324,313.56
	Kenneth Procaccianti	Boston	R		L	\$0.00	\$8,173.99	\$8,053.19	(\$449.20)
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				<u>\$318,171.19</u>	<u>\$361,376.04</u>	<u>\$355,112.87</u>	<u>\$323,864.36</u>
<b>4th Suffolk</b>									
	Brian Wallace	South Boston	D	I	W	\$1,214.48	\$17,650.00	\$17,757.28	\$1,107.20
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				<u>\$1,214.48</u>	<u>\$17,650.00</u>	<u>\$17,757.28</u>	<u>\$1,107.20</u>
<b>5th Suffolk</b>									
	Severiano Cruz	Boston	D		L	\$0.00	\$1,877.57	\$1,877.57	\$0.00
	Althea Garrison	Roxbury	D		L	\$0.00	\$10,140.94	\$10,140.94	\$0.00
	Roy Owens	Roxbury	D		L	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Marie St. Fleur	Dorchester	D	I	W	\$19,965.71	\$87,679.00	\$106,682.43	\$962.28
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	4				<u>\$19,965.71</u>	<u>\$99,697.51</u>	<u>\$118,700.94</u>	<u>\$962.28</u>
<b>6th Suffolk</b>									
	Willie Mae Allen	Mattapan	D		W	\$0.00	\$24,835.00	\$24,699.08	\$135.92
	William Celester, Sr.	Dorchester	D		L	\$0.00	\$15,334.00	\$17,405.21	(\$2,071.21)
	Wayne Wilson, Jr.	Roslindale	D		L	\$0.00	\$300.00	\$256.41	\$43.59
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	3				<u>\$0.00</u>	<u>\$40,469.00</u>	<u>\$42,360.70</u>	<u>(\$1,891.70)</u>

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>7th Suffolk</b>									
	Gloria Fox	Roxbury	D	I	W	\$1,741.27	\$4,250.00	\$3,156.59	\$2,834.68
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				<u>\$1,741.27</u>	<u>\$4,250.00</u>	<u>\$3,156.59</u>	<u>\$2,834.68</u>
<b>8th Suffolk</b>									
	Marty Walz	Boston	D	I	W	\$12,951.20	\$38,370.00	\$12,756.36	\$38,564.84
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				<u>\$12,951.20</u>	<u>\$38,370.00</u>	<u>\$12,756.36</u>	<u>\$38,564.84</u>
<b>9th Suffolk</b>									
	Byron Rushing	Boston	D	I	W	\$17,707.96	\$1,300.00	\$1,214.10	\$17,793.86
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				<u>\$17,707.96</u>	<u>\$1,300.00</u>	<u>\$1,214.10</u>	<u>\$17,793.86</u>
<b>10th Suffolk</b>									
	Michael Rush	West Roxbury	D	I	W	\$9,678.01	\$25,845.00	\$26,568.16	\$8,954.85
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				<u>\$9,678.01</u>	<u>\$25,845.00</u>	<u>\$26,568.16</u>	<u>\$8,954.85</u>
<b>11th Suffolk</b>									
	Elizabeth Malia	Jamaica Plain	D	I	W	\$4,513.55	\$7,670.60	\$8,608.97	\$4,175.93
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				<u>\$4,513.55</u>	<u>\$7,670.60</u>	<u>\$8,608.97</u>	<u>\$4,175.93</u>

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>12th Suffolk</b>									
	Linda Dorcena Forry	Dorchester	D	I	W	\$8,819.49	\$45,855.00	\$30,267.08	\$24,407.41
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$8,819.49	\$45,855.00	\$30,267.08	\$24,407.41
<b>13th Suffolk</b>									
	Martin Walsh	Dorchester	D	I	W	\$74,149.99	\$79,710.00	\$48,082.88	\$105,777.11
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$74,149.99	\$79,710.00	\$48,082.88	\$105,777.11
<b>14th Suffolk</b>									
	Angelo Scaccia	Readville	D	I	W	\$56,409.47	\$42,813.32	\$35,287.71	\$63,935.08
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$56,409.47	\$42,813.32	\$35,287.71	\$63,935.08
<b>15th Suffolk</b>									
	Jeffrey Sanchez	Jamaica Plain	D	I	W	\$875.43	\$33,835.82	\$23,017.37	\$11,693.88
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$875.43	\$33,835.82	\$23,017.37	\$11,693.88
<b>16th Suffolk</b>									
	Kathi-Anne Reinstein	Revere	D	I	W	\$16,152.41	\$36,609.24	\$45,363.95	\$7,397.70
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$16,152.41	\$36,609.24	\$45,363.95	\$7,397.70

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>17th Suffolk</b>									
	Kevin Honan	Brighton	D	I	W	\$53,229.14	\$38,635.00	\$32,399.41	\$59,464.73
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$53,229.14	\$38,635.00	\$32,399.41	\$59,464.73
<b>18th Suffolk</b>									
	Russell Evans	Brookline	R		L	\$0.00	\$10,559.50	\$8,450.79	\$2,108.71
	Michael Moran	Brighton	D	I	W	\$5,454.73	\$37,071.75	\$22,861.38	\$19,565.10
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$5,454.73	\$47,631.25	\$31,312.17	\$21,673.81
<b>19th Suffolk</b>									
	Robert DeLeo	Winthrop	D	I	W	\$132,044.14	\$159,146.16	\$126,515.35	\$164,674.95
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$132,044.14	\$159,146.16	\$126,515.35	\$164,674.95
<b>1st Worcester</b>									
	Lewis Evangelidis	Holden	R	I	W	\$27,176.59	\$57,016.00	\$49,065.92	\$35,126.67
	Nate Kaplan	Shrewsbury	D		L	\$2,521.98	\$18,518.46	\$19,746.18	\$1,294.26
	Emery Markles	Hubbardston	D		L	\$0.00	\$2,106.00	\$1,829.49	\$276.51
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	3				\$29,698.57	\$77,640.46	\$70,641.59	\$36,697.44
<b>2nd Worcester</b>									
	Robert Rice, Jr.	Gardner	D	I	W	\$7,181.50	\$0.00	\$2,819.71	\$4,361.79
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$7,181.50	\$0.00	\$2,819.71	\$4,361.79

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>3rd Worcester</b>									
	Stephen DiNatale	Fitchburg	D		W	\$1,489.30	\$23,536.70	\$18,340.97	\$6,685.03
	David LeBlanc	Fitchburg	D		L	\$0.00	\$2,585.60	\$2,585.60	\$0.00
	Edward Niemczura	Fitchburg	R		L	\$0.00	\$23,924.87	\$23,914.87	\$10.00
	Mary Whitney	Fitchburg	D		L	\$0.00	\$14,395.43	\$14,395.43	\$0.00
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	4				\$1,489.30	\$64,442.60	\$59,236.87	\$6,695.03
<b>4th Worcester</b>									
	Jennifer Flanagan	Leominster	D	I	W	\$11,155.29	\$27,634.00	\$38,570.62	\$218.67
	Claire Freda	Leominster	D		L	\$3,121.68	\$28,340.00	\$30,479.86	\$981.82
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$14,276.97	\$55,974.00	\$69,050.48	\$1,200.49
<b>5th Worcester</b>									
	Stephen Comtois II	Brookfield	R		L	\$535.00	\$24,276.25	\$24,152.28	\$658.97
	Anne Gobi	Spencer	D	I	W	\$8,071.40	\$14,305.00	\$18,268.65	\$10,879.13
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$8,606.40	\$38,581.25	\$42,420.93	\$11,538.10

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>6th Worcester</b>									
	Geraldo Alicea	Charlton	D		W	\$0.00	\$38,206.20	\$36,166.99	\$2,039.21
	Ronald Chernisky	Southbridge	R		L	\$0.00	\$20,862.94	\$20,788.92	\$74.02
	Patrick Driscoll	Spencer	D		L	\$0.00	\$32,646.10	\$32,646.10	\$0.00
	Scott Lazo	Southbridge	D		L	\$53.54	\$23,259.00	\$23,290.26	\$22.28
	Joanne Powell	Charlton	D		L	\$0.00	\$27,275.00	\$26,737.93	\$537.07
	David Singer	Charlton	R		L	\$2,497.50	\$21,070.00	\$23,124.97	\$442.53
	Karen Spiewak	Charlton	D		L	\$0.00	\$15,773.50	\$15,766.18	\$7.32
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	7				\$2,551.04	\$179,092.74	\$178,521.35	\$3,122.43
<b>7th Worcester</b>									
	Paul Frost	Auburn	R	I	W	\$7,783.87	\$11,483.16	\$14,822.71	\$4,444.32
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$7,783.87	\$11,483.16	\$14,822.71	\$4,444.32
<b>8th Worcester</b>									
	Mark Dowgiewicz	Webster	D		L	\$24.92	\$2,850.00	\$5,474.92	\$0.00
	Paul Kujawski	Webster	D	I	W	\$1,755.32	\$45,034.00	\$37,663.36	\$9,125.96
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$1,780.24	\$47,884.00	\$43,138.28	\$9,125.96
<b>9th Worcester</b>									
	George Peterson Jr.	Grafton	R	I	W	\$10,029.63	\$28,580.00	\$25,582.10	\$13,027.53
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$10,029.63	\$28,580.00	\$25,582.10	\$13,027.53

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>10th Worcester</b>									
	Robert Burns	Hopedale	R		L	\$0.00	\$12,871.34	\$11,075.06	\$1,796.28
	John Fernandes	Milford	D		W	\$0.00	\$92,369.00	\$90,260.45	\$2,108.55
	Marie Parente	Milford	D	I	L	\$52.94	\$46,398.50	\$43,170.54	\$3,280.90
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	3				\$52.94	\$151,638.84	\$144,506.05	\$7,185.73
<b>11th Worcester</b>									
	Karyn Polito	Shrewsbury	R	I	W	\$122,688.43	\$48,451.29	\$43,888.49	\$127,251.23
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$122,688.43	\$48,451.29	\$43,888.49	\$127,251.23
<b>12th Worcester</b>									
	Harold Naughton Jr.	Clinton	D	I	W	\$34,678.25	\$26,055.00	\$27,045.86	\$36,369.39
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$34,678.25	\$26,055.00	\$27,045.86	\$36,369.39
<b>13th Worcester</b>									
	Robert Spellane	Worcester	D	I	W	\$1,689.80	\$115,380.00	\$69,049.63	\$48,020.17
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	1				\$1,689.80	\$115,380.00	\$69,049.63	\$48,020.17
<b>14th Worcester</b>									
	James Leary	Worcester	D	I	W	\$16,287.37	\$30,439.58	\$36,048.76	\$10,678.19
	Joseph Rice	Worcester	R		L	\$0.00	\$5,070.00	\$5,049.91	\$20.09
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>	2				\$16,287.37	\$35,509.58	\$41,098.67	\$10,698.28

<i>District</i>	<i>Candidate</i>	<i>City/Town</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Incumbent</i>	<i>Won/Lost</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>End</i>
<b>15th Worcester</b>									
	Vincent Pedone	Worcester	D	I	W	\$16,913.00	\$84,869.00	\$45,188.99	\$56,593.01
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$16,913.00	\$84,869.00	\$45,188.99	\$56,593.01
<b>16th Worcester</b>									
	John Fresolo	Worcester	D	I	W	\$59,625.27	\$41,575.43	\$69,316.06	\$31,884.64
	Melissa Murgo	Worcester	D		L	\$963.56	\$25,680.00	\$30,281.79	\$1,494.17
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		2			\$60,588.83	\$67,255.43	\$99,597.85	\$33,378.81
<b>17th Worcester</b>									
	John Binienda, Sr.	Worcester	D	I	W	\$281,258.15	\$55,105.00	\$28,234.04	\$308,129.11
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$281,258.15	\$55,105.00	\$28,234.04	\$308,129.11
<b>18th Worcester</b>									
	Jennifer Callahan	Sutton	D	I	W	\$27,962.28	\$34,723.00	\$28,550.35	\$34,134.93
	<i>Total candidates for seat:</i>		1			\$27,962.28	\$34,723.00	\$28,550.35	\$34,134.93
	<b>Total candidates: 269</b>								
	<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>					<b>\$5,514,688.56</b>	<b>\$7,785,801.41</b>	<b>\$7,280,768.04</b>	<b>\$6,034,175.15</b>