

**OFFICE OF  
CAMPAIGN  
and  
POLITICAL  
FINANCE**

**Commonwealth  
of Massachusetts**

**REPORT OF  
CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY  
BY CANDIDATES FOR THE  
MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE OF  
REPRESENTATIVES  
IN 1994**

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Scope .....	1
Findings .....	2
Overview of Campaign Finance Activity For State House of Representatives.....	3
Candidates Raising and Spending Greatest Amounts in 1994.....	4
Analysis of Receipts and Expenditures By Party Affiliation.....	5
Analysis of Receipts and Expenditures By Incumbency.....	6
Analysis of Receipts and Expenditures For Successful and Unsuccessful Candidates.....	6
Analysis of Receipts and Expenditures For Unopposed Candidates and Candidates in Contested Races.....	7
Most Expensive House Races by District.....	7
Analysis of Election Year Beginning Balances For Incumbents and Non-Incumbents.....	8

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

- (1) political committees organized on behalf of an individual candidate for public office in Massachusetts;
- (2) political committees promoting or opposing ballot questions;
- (3) political committees registered on behalf of political parties at the ward, town, city or state level;
- (4) and political action committees (PACs) and people's committees.

## SCOPE

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

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

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

## FINDINGS

- The cost of seeking a House seat decreased in 1994 as compared to 1992. Both the total monies raised and the average receipts were down from the 1992 levels. Likewise, the total amount of expenditures and the average expenditure decreased from 1992. Overall, the total monies raised by all candidates decreased by \$679,196 from 1992, partly due to the fact that 38 fewer candidates ran for the House in 1994. But the average receipts per candidate also fell slightly from 1992, by \$36. Similarly, the total expenditures in 1994 were \$761,614 less than what was spent overall in 1992, but the average expenditures also decreased by \$ 323 from the 1992 elections. The decrease in average spending continued a trend seen in the 1992 House elections, when the average expenditures also fell, by \$465, from 1990. (See Page 3)
- For the most part, House elections continue to be won by the candidates who spend the most money. Of the 85 contested House seats, the candidate who spent the most money won in 74 of the races, or 87 percent of the time. That percentage was consistent with 1992, when the candidates who spent the most money won 81 percent of the contested seats. As a group, successful candidates raised an average of \$24,090, compared to an average of \$11,095 raised by unsuccessful candidates. Similarly, successful candidates spent an average of \$22,923, more than doubling the average expenditures of the unsuccessful candidates, who spent \$11,172. (Candidates were able to spend more than they raised due to existing balances with which they began the year.) (See Page 5)
- The most expensive contested House race was in the 8th Suffolk district, where five candidates spent a total of \$ 291,406 to contest an open seat in 1994. The least expensive contested race was in the 1st Essex & Middlesex district, where two candidates spent a total of \$39,908.
- Incumbent candidates continued to hold a decided edge in terms of the amounts of money they begin their campaigns with. The 136 incumbent House candidates began 1994 with nearly 30 times the amount of cash on hand as the 187 non-incumbent candidates. (See Page 8)
- While incumbents continue to hold an advantage in terms of cash on hand, the average receipts and expenditures for incumbent candidates was down from 1992 levels, while the average receipts and expenditures for non-incumbent candidates increased from 1992. The 135 incumbent candidates raised an average of \$21,627 in 1994, compared to \$24,995 raised in 1992. Likewise, average expenditures in 1994 were \$20,658, down by over \$4,500 from the \$25,188 spent in 1992. Non-incumbent candidates, on the other hand, raised and spent more money on average than they did in 1992. The 187 non-incumbent challengers raised an average of \$14,554 in 1994, up from \$13,131 in 1992. And non-incumbent candidates spent more on average in 1994 than in 1992, \$14,327 as compared to \$12,611. (See Page 6)
- Democrats continue to outraise and outspend Republicans in House races, but their averages decreased in 1994, while average receipts and expenditures by candidates from the Republican party and other political designations increased. The average receipts (\$19,369) and expenditures (\$18,658) for Democrats were down from 1992 (\$20,645 and \$20,028, respectively), while average receipts (\$14,627) and expenditures (\$14,452) for Republicans were up from 1992 (\$12,765 and \$13,253, respectively). Candidates with other affiliations more than doubled their 1992 averages in both receipts and expenditures. (See Page 5).

## OVERVIEW OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY FOR HOUSE CANDIDATES IN 1994

	323	Total Candidates	
\$	1,751,296	Cash balances available at beginning of 1994	
\$	5,662,804	Total receipts for all candidates	
\$	7,414,100	Total monies available to candidates in 1994	
\$	5,488,771	Total expenditures for all candidates	
\$	17,532	Average receipts per candidate	
\$	16,993	Average expenditures per candidate	

## COMPARISON TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACTIVITY FOR HOUSE CANDIDATES IN 1992

	361	Total Candidates	
\$	1,816,471	Cash balances available at beginning of 1992	
\$	6,342,000	Total receipts for all candidates	
\$	8,158,471	Total monies available to candidates in 1992	
\$	6,250,385	Total expenditures for all candidates	
\$	17,568	Average receipts per candidate	
\$	17,314	Average expenditures per candidate	

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

RECEIPTS

<u>No.</u>	<u>Elected</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Incumbent</u>	<u>Total Receipts</u>
1.	Y	Flaherty, Charles (D)	Y	\$ 134,269
2.	Y	Demakis, Paul (D)	N	\$ 111,828
3.	Y	Finneran, Thomas (D)	Y	\$ 108,855
4.	Y	Serra, Emanuel (D)	Y	\$ 75,775
5.	Y	Menard, Joan (D)	Y	\$ 67,960
6.	N	Collier, Charles (D)	N	\$ 63,610
7.	N	Gannon, Paul (D)	Y	\$ 62,055
8.	Y	Teague, Edward (R)	Y	\$ 61,999
9.	N	Cataldo, Joseph (D)	N	\$ 60,163
10.	N	Levine, Julius (I)	N	\$ 59,298

EXPENDITURES

<u>No.</u>	<u>Elected</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Incumbent</u>	<u>Total Expenditures</u>
1.	Y	Flaherty, Charles (D)	Y	\$ 161,813
2.	Y	Demakis, Paul (D)	N	\$ 111,660
3.	N	Collier, Charles (D)	N	\$ 86,760
4.	Y	Serra, Emanuel (D)	Y	\$ 81,522
5.	Y	Caron, Paul (D)	Y	\$ 72,655
6.	Y	Teague, Edward (R)	Y	\$ 71,572
7.	Y	Finneran, Thomas (D)	Y	\$ 66,472
8.	Y	Menard, Joan (D)	Y	\$ 64,724
9.	N	Gannon, Paul (D)	Y	\$ 62,582
10.	N	Cataldo, Joseph (D)	N	\$ 62,580

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

**ANALYSIS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR  
HOUSE CANDIDATES WHO WERE UNOPPOSED IN 1994**

Number	75
Total Receipts	\$ 1,364,766
Average Receipts	\$ 18,197
Total Expenditures	\$ 1,181,479
Average Expenditures	\$ 15,753

**ANALYSIS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR  
HOUSE CANDIDATES IN CONTESTED RACES IN 1994**

Number	248
Total Receipts	\$ 4,298,038
Average Receipts	\$ 17,331
Total Expenditures	\$ 4,307,292
Average Expenditures	\$ 17,368

**MOST EXPENSIVE HOUSE RACES BY DISTRICT IN 1994**

<u>Number</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>No. of candidates</u>	<u>Winner</u>
1.	8th Suffolk	\$ 291,406	5	Demakis
2.	27th Middlesex	\$ 166,772	2	Flaherty
3.	13th Worcester	\$ 131,995	3	Chandler
4.	10th Norfolk	\$ 121,121	2	Vallee
5.	18th Suffolk	\$ 115,551	9	Tolman
6.	4th Suffolk	\$ 112,746	3	Lynch
7.	1st Barnstable	\$ 89,101	2	Teague
8.	11th Essex	\$ 88,174	4	McGee
9.	13th Norfolk	\$ 85,647	3	Harkins
10.	1st Suffolk	\$ 85,248	2	Serra

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

	<u>INCUMBENTS</u>	<u>NON-INCUMBENTS</u>
Number	136	187
Total Beginning Balances	\$ 1,693,287	\$ 58,009
Average Beginning Balance	\$ 12,451	\$ 310

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

<u>Number</u>	<u>Elected</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Beginning Balance</u>
1.	Y	Voke, Richard (D)	\$ 355,241
2.	Y	Finneran, Thomas (D)	\$ 163,151
3.	Y	Flaherty, Charles (D)	\$ 108,194
4.	Y	DiMasi, Salvatore (D)	\$ 83,949
5.	Y	Caron, Paul (D)	\$ 76,885
6.	Y	Petrolati, Thomas (D)	\$ 36,272
7.	Y	Mara, Francis (D)	\$ 31,050
8.	Y	Fitzgerald, Kevin (D)	\$ 27,758
9.	Y	Buell, Carmen (D)	\$ 27,078
10.	Y	Kennedy, Thomas (D)	\$ 26,942

Note: Generally, non-incumbent candidates do not organize their campaigns until the year in which the election is held, accounting for significantly lower beginning balances among non-incumbents.

---

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

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