

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

STATE ELECTION

Massachusetts

William Francis Galvin
 SECRETARY OF THE
 COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

OFFICIAL ABSENTEE BALLOT

Tuesday, November 3, 1998

FALL RIVER
 WD. 1, Pct. B, C, D
 WD. 2, Pcts. A, B, C
 WD. 3, Pcts. A, B, C
 WD. 4, Pct. B
 211 / 211

To vote for a candidate, join the arrow to the right of the candidate's name. To vote for a person not on the ballot, write that person's name and residence in the blank space provided and join the arrow.

GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR
 Vote for ONE

CELLUCCI AND SWIFT Republican

HARSHBARGER AND TOLMAN Democratic

COOK AND ISRAEL Libertarian

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
 USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

ATTORNEY GENERAL
 Vote for ONE

BRAD BAILEY Republican

THOMAS F. REILLY Democratic

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
 USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

SECRETARY OF STATE
 Vote for ONE

WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN Democratic

DALE C. JENKINS, JR. Republican

DAVID L. ATKINSON Libertarian

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
 USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

TREASURER
 Vote for ONE

BOB MAGINN Republican

SHANNON P. O'BRIEN Democratic

MERTON B. BAKER Libertarian

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
 USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

AUDITOR
 Vote for ONE

A. JOSEPH DeNUCCI Democratic

MICHAEL T. DUFFY Republican

CARLA A. HOWELL Libertarian

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
 USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
 THIRD DISTRICT
 Vote for ONE

JAMES P. MCGOVERN Democratic

MATTHEW J. AMORELLO Republican

GEORGE PHILLIES Libertarian

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
 USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

COUNCILLOR
 FIRST DISTRICT
 Vote for ONE

DAVID F. CONSTANTINE Democratic

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
 USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT
 FIRST BRISTOL DISTRICT
 Vote for ONE

THOMAS C. NORTON Democratic

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
 USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT
 SEVENTH BRISTOL DISTRICT
 Vote for ONE

ROBERT CORREIA Democratic

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
 USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
 BRISTOL DISTRICT
 Vote for ONE

PAUL F. WALSH, JR. Democratic

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
 USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

SHERIFF
 BRISTOL COUNTY
 Vote for ONE

THOMAS M. HODGSON Republican

JOSEPH McINTYRE Democratic

WAYNE G. REGO Unenrolled

EDWARD J. WILEY Unenrolled

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
 USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

COUNTY COMMISSIONER
 BRISTOL COUNTY
 Vote for ONE

MARIA F. LOPES Democratic

PATRICK H. HARRINGTON Independent

JOAN E. HARWOOD Independent

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
 USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

QUESTION 1
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Do you approve of the adoption of an amendment to the constitution summarized below, which was approved by the General Court in joint sessions of the two houses on July 29, 1996 (yeas 127 - nays 65); and again on June 9, 1998 (yeas 149 - nays 41)?

SUMMARY

This proposed constitutional amendment would prohibit the state Legislature from changing the base compensation received by members of the Legislature as of January 1, 1996. As of the first Wednesday in January of 2001, and every second year thereafter, the base compensation would be increased or decreased at the same rate as increases or decreases in the median household income for the Commonwealth for the preceding two-year period, as ascertained by the Governor.

A YES VOTE would prohibit state legislators from changing their base pay and instead would adjust that pay according to changes in median household income.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the method for setting legislators' base pay.

YES

NO

QUESTION 2
LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives before May 6, 1998?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would create a new voluntary system allowing candidates for state office who agree to campaign spending limits and \$100 contribution limits to receive a set amount of public funds for their campaigns, starting with the 2002 election. The proposed law would also limit transfers of money from national political parties to state political parties for administrative, overhead, or party-building activities. It would also require candidates for state office who had raised or spent at least a set minimum amount in an election cycle to file their required campaign finance reports with the state electronically, and the public would have prompt electronic access to such reports.

The new funding system would replace the existing system of limited public financing of campaigns for statewide office. To participate in the new system, a candidate would have to raise a minimum number of contributions from registered voters in the relevant district, as follows: Governor, 6000; Lt. Governor, Attorney General, or Treasurer, 3000; Secretary of State or Auditor, 2000; Executive Councillor, 400; State Senator, 450; State Representative, 200. Such contributions would have to be between \$5 and \$100 and be collected during a limited period: for statewide candidates beginning on August 1 of the year before the election, for other candidates beginning on January 1 of the election year, and for all candidates ending on the last day to file nomination papers with the Secretary of State.

For any election, a participating candidate could not accept contributions of more than \$100 from any person or political committee and could not raise or spend any money other than these contributions and public funds.

Candidates meeting all of these requirements would, subject to appropriation by the Legislature, receive public funding in the primary and general elections. This would come from a new state Clean Elections Fund, consisting of amounts voluntarily contributed through the checkoff on the state income tax return, any amounts appropriated by the Legislature, and any money in the existing state election campaign fund.

**TURN BALLOT OVER
 TO CONTINUE VOTING**

QUESTION 2 (cont.)

The chart below shows the amounts of public funds a candidate could receive in the primary and general elections. A candidate could raise and spend private contributions in order to bring his or her spending up to the spending limit shown below.

Office	Primary Election: Public Funds	Primary Election: Spending Limit	General Election: Public Funds	General Election: Spending Limit
Governor	\$1,500,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,200,000
Lt. Governor	\$383,000	\$450,000	\$255,000	\$300,000
Attorney General or Treasurer	\$360,000	\$450,000	\$240,000	\$300,000
Secretary of State or Auditor	\$120,000	\$150,000	\$80,000	\$100,000
Councillor	\$19,000	\$24,000	\$13,000	\$16,000
Senator	\$43,000	\$54,000	\$29,000	\$36,000
Representative	\$15,000	\$18,000	\$9,000	\$12,000

A participating candidate running unopposed would receive only half the listed amount of public funds and could spend correspondingly less than a candidate with an opponent. All funds could be spent only for campaign purposes. Any unspent public funds from a primary or general election would have to be returned after that election. A participating candidate who violated the contribution or spending limits would have to return all public funds, become ineligible for further funds, and in some cases pay fines.

Candidates who do not accept public funds would have to report any spending in excess of the limit shown above and could be fined for failing to do so. If such a non-participating candidate spent more than the limit, participating candidates in that race would immediately receive, and could spend, public "matching funds" equal to the amount of the excess spending. The total amount of public funding (including matching funds) a candidate could receive would be limited to twice the spending limit for that race. During the general election campaign, running mates for Governor and Lt. Governor would be treated as teams in order to determine the distribution of any matching funds.

An individual or political committee's total in-kind contributions (such as goods and some services) to a participating candidate would be limited to \$500 per election. Higher limits would govern political parties' in-kind contributions. Participating candidates could not accept more than a set amount in such contributions, ranging from \$3,000 per election for Representative up to \$35,000 for Governor.

The expenditure, contribution, and public funding limits would be adjusted every two years for inflation. A special commission (including elected officials and private citizens) would be set up to meet every two years to review the system and recommend any needed changes. The state Director of Campaign Finance could issue regulations to interpret and enforce the proposed law.

The proposed law states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the rest of the law would stay in effect.

A YES VOTE would change the laws governing public financing of campaigns.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the laws governing public financing of campaigns.

YES ←
NO ←

QUESTION 3

LAW PROPOSED BY AN INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives before May 6, 1998?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would change the state income tax rate on interest and dividend income, which was 12% as of September 1997, to whatever rate applies to Part B taxable income (such as wages and salaries), which was 5.95% as of September 1997. The change would take effect starting in tax year 2000.

A YES VOTE would reduce the state tax rate for interest and dividend income.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the current state tax rate for interest and dividend income.

YES ←
NO ←

QUESTION 4

REFERENDUM ON AN EXISTING LAW

Do you approve of a law summarized below, which was approved by the House of Representatives on November 19, 1997 by a vote of 124 to 30, approved by the Senate on November 19, 1997 by a vote of 32 to 6?

SUMMARY

The law changes the state's electric utility industry. Starting in March 1998, instead of buying power from the utility that owns the power lines, customers may choose to buy power from separate generating companies competing with each other to sell power to be delivered by the existing utility. Customers not choosing a new competing generating company will be provided power by their existing utility under a transition rate for 7 years, starting from a rate 10% less than 1997 rates. By September 1999, rates for such customers must be further reduced from 1997 rates (adjusted for inflation) by 5%. Subject to restrictions in the law, rates paid by such customers may be adjusted up or down if approved by the new state Department of Telecommunications and Energy (DTE).

The law lets a utility recover, from customers, previously incurred costs related to generating plants and contracts that have become uneconomical under competition. Utilities must first reduce such "transition costs" in all reasonable ways, which may include selling non-nuclear generating plants. DTE must approve such sales and the utility's way of financing transition costs, and DTE may limit which costs may be charged to customers. Public agencies may arrange the sale of special bonds to help a utility finance transition costs to provide savings to customers.

Utilities claiming they cannot offer the required rate reductions must work with DTE to find all possible ways to do so. State tax revenues related to sales of power plants may be used, if found necessary by DTE and subject to legislative appropriation, to ensure that utilities provide the 15% rate reduction. Utilities must maintain discounts for low-income customers.

DTE must issue consumer protection and related regulations related to energy sales, and the law lets the state Attorney General enforce consumer protection laws and regulations against energy companies. To maintain reliability, DTE must set performance-based rates and service quality standards for electric and gas utilities. Utilities failing to meet the standards may be fined up to 2% of their annual revenues.

Such utilities will not be allowed to cut staff levels unless either the relevant unions agree or DTE finds that the cuts will not lead to sub-standard service. Utility employees who are laid off due to the law will, if eligible for unemployment benefits, also be eligible for reemployment assistance benefits.

If a generating plant loses value due to the law, the responsible company must pay the affected city or town until 2009 to offset lost property tax revenue. Cities and towns may set up power purchasing cooperatives for local customers. Businesses and other organizations may also set up cooperatives. A municipal lighting plant that chooses to sell power outside its own service area must compete with other generating companies within its service area.

The law requires electric utilities to continue energy efficiency and demand management programs until 2003 and directs DTE to ensure that such programs are cost effective. The law imposes a charge on electricity consumers to promote renewable energy projects and to help cities and towns pay to add pollution control equipment to existing trash-to-energy plants. By 2003, power suppliers must provide an annually increasing percentage of power from new renewable sources, and fossil-fuel power plants must start to meet efficiency standards limiting pollution. The law ends the requirement that the state find a need for a proposed power plant but preserves environmental reviews.

The law changes the State Department of Public Utilities to the new DTE, controlled by a 5-member commission with expertise on specified issues. The law gives the state Division of Energy Resources new duties related to energy restructuring, such as educating consumers and helping cities and towns.

A YES VOTE would continue the new law changing the electric utility industry.

A NO VOTE would undo these changes in the electric utility industry.

YES ←
NO ←