



Special Report May 2008

The Role of Money in the Campaign to Expand Legalized Gambling in Massachusetts

By Karla J. de Steuben, Esq.

Acknowledgments

The Role of Money in the Campaign to Expand Legalized Gambling in Massachusetts was researched and written by Karla J. de Steuben, Esq., with editing assistance provided by Common Cause Massachusetts Executive Director Pamela Wilmot and technical assistance provided by Marc Warner. Assistance with obtaining Massachusetts campaign finance data was graciously provided by the Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance. State Lobbyist data was provided by the Lobbyist Section of the Massachusetts Secretary of State's office.

Introduction

After he and his staff met with opponents and supporters of legalized casino gambling in the spring and summer of 2007, Massachusetts Governor Deval Patrick announced, on September 17, 2007, that he supported the establishment of casino gaming in Massachusetts.¹ He subsequently submitted legislation on October 11, 2007, that would establish a new regulatory authority and allow up to three licensed casinos in Massachusetts.² The stated goals of the legislation were to “spur economic development and job growth” and to generate “millions of dollars of additional revenue” for property tax relief and infrastructure repairs.³ Although lobbyists already had been hard at work throughout 2007, groups on both sides of the casino question organized in anticipation of the coming legislative battle.⁴

The battle over Governor Patrick’s bill, however, did not last long. On March 20, 2008, the Joint Committee on Economic Development, chaired by Representative Daniel Bosley, a long-time opponent of allowing casinos in the state, voted 10 to 8 to send the bill to the full House, with a recommendation that it be defeated.⁵ The following day, under the leadership of House Speaker Salvatore F. DiMasi, the House voted 108 to 46 to defeat Governor Patrick’s bill.⁶

The most recent skirmish over whether to allow casinos into Massachusetts was a small part of the war over whether to expand legalized gambling in the state; a war that has been waged for at least the past twenty-five years. Although Governor Patrick’s bill was defeated in the House, efforts to expand legalized gambling in Massachusetts are likely to continue. There is simply too much money at

¹ Michael Levinson and Christine Wallgren, “Tribe Thrown Curve With Plan To License Gaming Resorts,” The Boston Globe, Sept. 18, 2007, at A13.

² Andrea Estes, “In Bill, Patrick Controls Panel,” The Boston Globe, Oct. 11, 2007, at A1.

³ Letter from Governor Deval Patrick to the Massachusetts Senate and House of Representatives (October 11, 2007) accompanying An Act Establishing and Regulating Resort Casinos in the Commonwealth, House Bill No. 4307, <http://www.mass.gov/legis/bills/house/185/ht04pdf/ht04307.pdf>.

⁴ Casino Free Mass (www.casinofreemass.com), whose membership included church groups, local political groups, and the League of Women Voters, formed in opposition to Governor Patrick’s bill. The Massachusetts Coalition for Jobs and Growth (www.masscoalitionforjobsandgrowth.com), whose membership included the Massachusetts AFL-CIO and other unions, a number of city mayors, and Suffolk Downs, formed in support of Governor Patrick’s bill.

⁵ Casey Ross, “Narrow Defeat For Casino Bill,” The Boston Herald, March 20, 2008, <http://www.bostonherald.com/news/regional/politics/view.bg?articleid=1081578>.

⁶ Matt Viser, “House Rejects Casino Bill; Backers Vow to Roll Again,” The Boston Globe, March 21, 2008, at A1.

stake.⁷ Other gambling initiatives are still pending in the Massachusetts legislature, including a renewed proposal to allow slot machines at the state's four racetracks and a proposal for a statewide casino referendum.⁸

The goal of this report is to examine how much money has been spent in campaign contributions and lobbying fees and expenses by key opponents and proponents to this latest effort to extend legalized gambling in Massachusetts. It also will examine expenditures in the recent past, before Governor Patrick's plan was proposed, by parties interested in expanding legalized gambling in Massachusetts. The report then will discuss what effect money appears to have had on the political process and try to predict, to the extent possible, what the public can expect in the future.

A LITTLE HISTORY

At least since the lottery was first approved by the legislature in 1971 and created in 1972,⁹ there have been repeated attempts to expand legalized gambling beyond what is currently allowed in Massachusetts. Currently, the only legalized gambling allowed are the state-run lottery, betting at the four tracks, and charitable bingo games, raffles and "Las Vegas nights."¹⁰ A complete legislative history of all the attempts to expand legalized gambling in Massachusetts since the lottery was approved is beyond the scope of this report, but it is worth repeating a few of the highlights of the recent past, before Governor Patrick's casino bill was proposed.

⁷ The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce recent report on Governor Patrick's casino proposal estimated that the gross gaming revenue (amount wagered at the casino, less total winnings paid out) would be between \$2 billion to \$2.3 billion a year, and could be as high as \$ 2.7 billion in 2012. UHY Advisors FLVS, Inc, Casino Gaming In Massachusetts: An Economic, Fiscal & Social Analysis, Commissioned by the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce,

http://www.bostonchamber.com/policy/Casino%20Gaming%20Report/Chamber_Casino_Gaming_Report.pdf But see Phil Primack, Playing the Numbers," *CommonWealth Magazine*, Winter 2008 at 51 (some commentators have questioned whether similar figures from the Patrick Administration are too high), http://www.massinc.org/fileadmin/CommonWealth/Winter_2008/numbers.pdf.

⁸ Matt Viser, "House Rejects Casino Bill; Backers Vow to Roll Again," *The Boston Globe*, March 21, 2008, at A1. Governor Patrick told the Brookline Chamber of Commerce on May 7, 2008, that legislation to legalize casino gambling may be revived, particularly in light of the need for property tax relief, the possibility of slot machines at the racetracks, and the continuing efforts by the Wampanoag Indians to build their own casino. Glen Johnson, "Patrick: Casinos Plan Could Still Fly," *The Boston Globe*, May 8, 2008, at B2. In addition, on May 21, 2008, House Speaker Salvatore F. DiMasi announced that he would back a ballot question asking voters whether they support casinos in Massachusetts because he was worried about the budget process being bogged down by casino amendments. Matt Viser, "DiMasi Poses Referendum On Casinos," *The Boston Globe*, May 22, 2008, at A1.

⁹ The legislation creating the lottery actually was vetoed by then Governor Francis Sergeant. The legislature overrode the veto in 1971. Renee Loth, "A Deficit-cutting Plan? You Bet Your Life Weld Team Is Big On Lottery, Gambling Games," *The Boston Globe*, March 17, 1991, at A22.

¹⁰ Phineas B. Axandall and Bruce Sacerdote, *The Casino Gamble in Massachusetts*, Rappaport Institute for Greater Boston, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, January 13, 2005, <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/rappaport/downloads/gambling/casino.pdf> (hereinafter "Rappaport Institute Report").

In 1992, Massachusetts race tracks were allowed to simulcast races taking place at other tracks in the country and collect bets for those races.¹¹ In addition, legislation was introduced to legalize video poker machines, essentially computerized slot machines, and to allow their placement in restaurants, bars, race tracks and social clubs.¹² This legislation did not pass.

In July 1993, legislation was passed authorizing the lottery to hold Keno drawings, which began on September 30, 1993.¹³ Also in July 1993, Governor William Weld introduced legislation to authorize up to twelve casino boats around the state to fund a Boston convention center-stadium proposal.¹⁴ This legislation also did not pass.

There have been a number of proposals concerning the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head ("Aquinnah Wampanoags"). For example, in 1995, Governor Weld and the Aquinnah Wampanoags entered into a compact that gave the tribe exclusive casino rights for six years in eastern Massachusetts in exchange for giving the state \$90 million a year, with twelve percent going to the cities and towns of Bristol County.¹⁵ According to published reports, the Aquinnah Wampanoags gave up on the plan when it appeared that they could not obtain the necessary two-thirds vote in the legislature required in order for the Tribe to purchase city owned land on which to build the casino.¹⁶ Around March 1997, Governor Weld submitted a proposal that would permit an Aquinnah Wampanoag casino in Bristol County, a commercial casino in western Massachusetts, and 700 slot machines at each of the state's four race tracks.¹⁷ This proposal failed to pass in the legislature in May 1997.¹⁸ The

¹¹ "After spending a combined \$367,000 in lobbying fees in 1991, Suffolk Downs and Foxboro Park won legislative approval for expanded racing dates, the right to broadcast and collect bets for race tracks in other areas of the country, and the right to combine betting pools to boost jackpots for higher rollers." Doug Bailey, "Track Owners See Video Poker As Threat or Salvation," The Boston Globe, Jan. 5, 1993, at Metro section, 1.

¹² See Doug Bailey, "State Race to Grab Gaming Dollars Massachusetts Officials Eager to Expand Betting," The Boston Globe, Jan. 3, 1993, at Metro section, 1; Doug Bailey, "Video Poker Has Lawmakers Pondering A Difficult Hand," The Boston Globe, Jan. 4, 1993, at Metro section, 1.

¹³ Massachusetts Lottery Commission Information Packet, 1971-2008, <http://www.masslottery.com/pdfs/infopack.pdf>.

¹⁴ Richard Kindelberger, "Weld Files Proposal For \$700 Million Megaplex Gambling Boats Would be Major Fund Source," The Boston Globe, July 30, 1993, at Metro section, 1.

¹⁵ Michael Zuckoff, "Weld, Wampanoags Sign Casino Compact Agreement A Big Step Towards Establishing New Bedford Casino," The Boston Globe, Sept. 30, 1995, at 61.

¹⁶ Kimberly Blanton, "Wampanoag Move Revives Casino Siting Differences Pitches Aired For New Bedford, Western Mass., Fall River," The Boston Globe, Jan. 24, 1997, at F2.

¹⁷ Brian C. Mooney, "For Lobbyists, A Sure Bet," The Boston Globe, March 22, 1997, at B6.

¹⁸ Martin Finucane, Associated Press, "House Votes Down Casino Gambling; Some Lawmakers Protest," The Boston Globe, May 6, 1997, at C3.

Aquinnah Wampanoags then pursued building a bingo hall in Fall River.¹⁹ The bingo hall proposal reportedly failed when it lost the support of the Fall River City council in May 1998.²⁰

In 2003, Senate Minority Leader Brian Lees (R-Springfield), Senator Richard Tisei (R-Wakefield), and Senator Joan Menard (D-Somerset), proposed legislation to allow two casinos, one in Bristol County that the Aquinnah Wampanoags would be able to bid on first, and one in either Worcester or Hampden counties.²¹ The proposal failed to gain enough votes to pass in the Senate.²² Also in 2003, the House rejected two separate bills for slot machines at the race tracks.²³

In October 2005, the state Senate approved legislation with a 26 to 9 vote to establish slot machines at the tracks, the first time either legislative branch had approved such legislation.²⁴ The measure failed, however, to pass in the House in April 2006.²⁵ In any event, Governor Mitt Romney had threatened to veto the plan if it had passed.²⁶

Governor Patrick's casino proposal was only the latest in a long line of proposals to expand legalized gambling in Massachusetts, although it was described by one former Governor, Michael Dukakis, as "creative and thought out a plan as I have seen."²⁷ After much attention and lobbying, within only five months of it being proposed, it was voted down by the legislature. Based on past history, however, its demise will not be the end to efforts to expand legalized gambling in Massachusetts, particularly since the Mashpee Wampanoags are continuing to pursue a plan to build a casino on land in Middleborough, Massachusetts, under federal law concerning Indian casinos.

CASINO AND GAMING INTERESTS

¹⁹ Meg Vaillancourt, "Lower Stakes, High Hopes With Casino Plans Thwarted, Wampanoags Try New Game," The Boston Globe, May 13, 1997, at C1.

²⁰ Tina Cassidy, "Bingo Hall Plan Dealt Fatal Blow Fall River Mayor Drops Support For Project," The Boston Globe, May 29, 1998, at D4.

²¹ Rappaport Institute Report, at 23.

²² Raphael Lewis, "Senate Gambling Plan Withdrawn," The Boston Globe, Nov. 7, 2003, at B1.

²³ Rappaport Institute Report, at 23.

²⁴ Raphael Lewis, "Mass. Senate OK's Track Slot Machines," The Boston Globe, Oct. 7, 2005, at A1.

²⁵ Associated Press, "Slots Turn Up Lemons In House Vote," The Boston Globe, April 6, 2006, New England In Brief section, at B2.

²⁶ Raphael Lewis, "Mass. Senate OK's Track Slot Machines," The Boston Globe, Oct. 7, 2005, at A1.

There are a number of Massachusetts casino and gaming related entities, and parties with ties to these entities, who have been key players in recent and past debates over expanding legalized gambling in Massachusetts. These entities include the four race tracks in Massachusetts: Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, which owns Suffolk Downs (horses); Westwood Group, Inc, which owns Wonderland Greyhound Park; Ourway Realty, which owns Plainridge Racecourse (harness racing); and the Massasoit Greyhound Association, Inc., which owns Raynham Park. It also includes the two federally recognized tribes in Massachusetts: the Aquinnah Wampanoags²⁸ and the Mashpee Wampanoags,²⁹ and a number of casino and gaming interests headquartered outside Massachusetts that have contributed to campaigns in the state and have hired lobbyists to lobby the state government. These entities include GTECH, Scientific Games, Harrah's, and Delaware North.³⁰

In addition, according to newspaper reports, soon after Governor Patrick presented his casino bill, Leon Dragone and Peter Picknelly, an owner of the Peter Pan Bus Company, joined with the Mohegan Indian Tribe to bid on a license to build a casino in Palmer, Massachusetts, if Governor Patrick's bill was enacted.³¹ Both the Picknelly family and Leon Dragone had pursued opening casinos in the past.³² This report refers to this group as the "Palmer group."

Casino and gaming related interests do not always agree on whether a particular legislative proposal expanding legalized gambling should pass. The primary determining factor for whether a casino and gaming interest will support or oppose a particular gambling-related legislation is economic self-interest. Because casino and gaming interests compete with one another over gambling dollars, their interests may be at odds over a particular piece of legislation, even though it will result in expanding legalized gambling. In fact, according to newspaper reports, some casino and gaming interests were opposed to Governor Patrick's casino bill. Governor Patrick's bill allowed for the

²⁷ Andrea Estes and Frank Phillips, "Liberal Gaming Critics Fell Betrayed by Patrick Plan," *The Boston Globe*, Sept. 19, 2007, at A9.

²⁸ The Aquinnah Wampanoags entered into a partnership with the Seneca Nation of New York in 2007 to build a casino under Governor Patrick's casino bill. Sean Murphy, "Tribes Pursue Casino License Together," *The Boston Globe*, October 25, 2007, at B3. The Seneca Nation has developed and operates casinos in New York. *Id.*

²⁹ Reportedly, the Mashpee Wampanoags have partnered with Sol Kerzner and Len Wolman, who were developers of Mohegan Sun and are investors in the Twin Rivers racino in Rhode Island, to develop a resort casino in Middleborough, Massachusetts. *Id.*

³⁰ In addition to the entities that have a direct financial self-interest in expansion of legalized gambling in the state, there were a number of other groups that supported Governor Patrick's bill, including the AFL-CIO. In addition, two groups formed in response to bill: the Massachusetts Coalition for Jobs and Growth, which supported it, and Casino Free Mass, which opposed it.

³¹ Lori Stabile, "Picknelly Boosts Palmer Casino," *The Republican Newsroom*, Jan. 9, 2008, at http://blog.masslive.com/breakingnews/2008/01/picknelly_boosts_palmer_casino.html (last visited May 5, 2008).

³² Meg Vaillancourt, "Bid for Springfield Casino Renewed, Picknelly, Bally's Seen in \$200M Deal," *The Boston Globe*, June 8, 1995, at 55; Meg Vaillancourt, "Minn. Firm Betting on Gaming OK," *The Boston Globe*, March 15, 1994, at 37 (reporting that the Dragone family business, Massachusetts Leisure Corp. hired by Casino Magic Corp. to assist it in establishing casinos in Massachusetts and other New England states).

licensing of three casinos, but it did not allow slot machines at the race tracks. Reportedly, the owner of at least one racetrack was opposed to Governor Patrick's bill for this reason.³³

In this report, all the casino and gaming interests are grouped together, even though they may have been on opposite sides of a particular legislative proposal. All casino and gaming interests are interested in expanding legalized gambling, even if they may disagree over the form of the expansion.

MONEY'S INFLUENCE – WHAT THE DATA SHOWS

Special interests, including casino and gaming interests, try to influence policy making through campaign contributions to candidates who support their interests and through payments to lobbyists who have access to elected officials. Campaign contributions help get candidates elected so they can promote certain policies and lobbyists present specific policies to elected officials on behalf of their clients. Both provide access to elected officials that the ordinary citizen does not have.

Campaign Contributions By Casino And Gaming Interests

“Another tie between state legislators and the gambling industry will perhaps further strengthen the forces that maintain legalized gambling in the states. The gambling industry- particularly casinos- has begun attempting to influence election outcomes in gubernatorial and state legislative races.”

Patrick A. Pierce & Donald E. Miller, Gambling Politics, 197-198 (Lynne Rienner Publishers 2004)

³³ Reportedly, Representative Richard Ross (R-Wrentham), a member of the Joint Committee on Economic Development Committee, switched his committee vote on the Governor's bill at the last minute. The Boston Herald reported that Representative Ross “was most influenced by the arguments of Gary Piontkowski, an executive of Plainridge Racecourse, which is in Ross's district. Piontkowski has argued for a separate gambling bill that would legalize slot machines at race tracks.” Casey Ross, “Narrow Defeat For Casino Bill,” The Boston Herald, March 20, 2008, at 6. Representative Ross was quoted as stating, “When it came down to the wire, I was listening to Gary Piontkowski and some of the people very concerned with the governor's proposal,” Ross said. “The interest of Plainridge told me they wanted an adverse (recommendation).” Id. Gary Piontkowski, owner of Plainridge Racetrack is clearly in favor of expanding legalized gambling. Apparently, however, he was not in favor of casinos without slots at the tracks. See also Thor Jourgensen, Local Tracks Take Separate Paths as Casino Debate Looms,” The Daily Item, Dec. 22, 2007, at A5 (discussing Wonderland Greyhound Park's goal of adding slot machines and Suffolk Downs goal of being one of the resort casinos in Governor Patrick's bill).

Individuals who contribute to campaigns not only help a candidate get elected, they also often gain access to the candidate that ordinary citizens do not have. This is particularly true if an individual can bundle a number of contributions from other people together for a particular candidate, acting in essence as a fundraiser for the candidate. Access to a candidate after they are elected allows special interests, such as casino and gaming interests, to present and promote policies that are helpful to the special interests directly to the elected official.

At the federal level, the amount of money contributed by individuals and PACs with affiliations to the casino and gaming industry has increased significantly over the past eighteen years. According to data from the Center for Responsive Politics,³⁴ individual campaign contributions from the casino and gambling industries to candidates for federal office increased from \$247,250, the amount contributed over the 24 months from January 1, 1989, to December 31, 1990, to \$2,264,231 the amount contributed over 13 months from January 1, 2007, to January 07, 2008. Political action committee (“PAC”) contributions increased from \$472, 519 between January 1, 1989, and December 31, 1990, to \$3,821,897 contributed between January 1, 2007, and January 07, 2008. Clearly, at the federal level, casino and gaming interests are much bigger players in the campaign contribution sphere now than they have been in the past.

³⁴ Opensecrets.org website, Center for Responsive Politics, Casino/Gambling Long-term Contribution Trends, <http://www.opensecrets.org/industries/indus.asp?Ind=N07>

TABLE 1

**Casino/Gambling Long term Federal Campaign Contribution Trends
Individual and PAC Contributions**

Election Cycle	Contributions from Individuals	Contributions from PACS	Total Contributions from PACs and Individuals
1990	\$247,250	\$225,269	\$472,519
1992	826,368	298,543	1,124,911
1994	1,219,247	394,083	1,613,330
1996	1,943,190	1,071,651	3,014,841
1998	1,416,289	1,058,129	2,474,418
2000	2,644,291	2,304,163	4,948,454
2002	2,054,411	4,426,661	6,481,072
2004	4,203,423	7,101,289	11,304,712
2006	3,688,574	8,014,187	11,702,761
2008	2,264,231	3,821,897	6,086,128
TOTAL	\$20,507,274	\$28,715,872	\$49,223,146

Based on information from the Center for Responsive Politics, www.opensecrets.org, downloaded on January 30, 2008. The Center's data is based on contributions of \$200 or more from PACs and individuals to federal candidates, as reported to the Federal Election Commission. The election cycle years shown in the chart represent two-year periods. For example, the 1990 election cycle runs from January 1, 1989 to December 31, 1990.

Based upon a review of contributions by individuals with ties to the key casino and gaming interests that, according to public statements reported in the press and based on lobbyist reports, were most interested in Governor Patrick's casino bill, total annual campaign contributions by parties with ties to casino and gaming interests in Massachusetts also appear to have increased since 2002.³⁵ Total campaign contributions by these individuals to candidates for state office in Massachusetts increased from \$63,700 in 2002, the first year that electronic filing of campaign reports was required,³⁶ to \$127,140 in 2005 and \$123,765 in 2006.³⁷

³⁵ Massachusetts campaign contribution limits are much smaller than they are at the federal level. In Massachusetts, individuals and political action committees (PACs) are only allowed to contribute up to \$500 a year to political candidates and up to \$5000 a year to state party committees and town party committees. There is no limit on the amount of funds that can be contributed by individuals to ballot question committees. Registered lobbyists can only contribute up to \$200 per year per candidate. Corporations are prohibited by law from giving money directly to elected representatives.

³⁶ Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 55, §18C(e).

³⁷ All Massachusetts campaign contributions data for this report was obtained from the Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance ("OCPF") and its website, <http://www.mass.gov/ocpf>.

TABLE 2

Total Annual Campaign Contributions by Individuals With Ties To Casino And Gaming Interests Active In Massachusetts Politics During the Past Year

Casino and Gaming Interest	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	TOTAL
Aquinnah Wampanoags	200	0	70	600	460	650	1,980
Delaware North	500	0	5,125	1,700	2,750	0	10,075
GTECH	250	0	0	2,500	2,500	1,500	6,750
Harrah's	0	0	0	500	1,000	0	1,500
Mashpee Wampanoags	0	3,400	1,900	4,400	2,400	250	12,350
Massasoit Greyhound Association, Inc.	16,950	25,050	37,425	47,325	37,550	25,800	190,100
Ourway Realty d/b/a Plainridge Racecourse	2,550	6,000	5,400	9,725	18,000	6,000	47,675
Palmer Group	9,875	13,950	12,625	17,715	24,355	8,200	86,720
Scientific Games	0	0	6,750	2,500	3,500	6,250	19,000
Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC	21,525	18,775	26,775	24,350	21,700	10,350	123,475
The Trump Group	350	0	0	0	0	0	350
Westwood Group, Inc.	11,850	7,050	7,900	15,825	9,550	4,450	56,625
TOTAL	\$64,050	\$74,225	\$103,970	\$127,140	\$123,765	\$63,450	\$556,600

Based on data from the Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance.

However, assuming all reports have been filed for 2007, total contributions decreased last year to \$63,450. This may have been because 2007 was not an election year and because attention was focused on lobbying efforts around Governor Patrick's legislative proposal. Contribution levels were highest in 2005, the year the legislature was considering a proposal to put slot machines at the race tracks, not surprisingly since a majority of the campaign contributions listed are from individuals with ties to one of the four racetracks. In fact, the group which contributed the largest amount of total contributions for every year except 2002 were individuals with ties to the Massasoit Greyhound Association, Inc., which operates the Raynham Park racetrack.³⁸

Based on data from the Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance, the top twenty-five recipients of total campaign contributions from 2002 to 2007 from individuals with ties to the casino and gaming entities interested in Governor Patrick's bill are set out in Table 3.³⁹

³⁸ Interestingly, during those same years, the Massasoit Greyhound Association reported no expenditures on lobbyist fees.

³⁹ Totals for each year are set out in Table B to the Appendix.

TABLE 3

**Top 25 Recipients of Campaign Contributions
From Individuals With Ties to Casino and Gaming Interests**

Six Year Total: 2002 –2007	amount
Reilly, Thomas F.	43,450
Cahill, Timothy	31,175
Democratic State Committee, MA	26,250
Travaglini, Robert E.	16,100
Romney, Mitt	14,425
Menard, Joan M.	14,325
Murray, Therese	13,550
Murphy, Stephen	12,300
Petrolati, Thomas M.	11,575
Wagner, Joseph F.	10,450
Lees, Brian	9,425
Brown, Scott P.	9,250
Fagan, James H.	9,050
DiMasi, Salvatore F.	8,975
Healey, Kerry Murphy	8,250
Berry, Frederick E.	7,775
DeLeo, Robert A.	7,750
Reinstein, Kathi-Anne	7,550
Pacheco, Marc R.	7,500
Flynn, David L.	6,675
Bosley, Daniel E.	6,325
Canessa, Stephen R.	6,300
Morrissey, Michael W.	6,275
Patrick, Deval L.	6,250
Murray, Timothy P.	5,930

Based on data from the Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance

Topping the list are State Treasurer Cahill and former Attorney General Tom Reilly. Also on the list are former Governor Mitt Romney and former Lieutenant Governor Kerry Healey, as well as the current Governor and Lieutenant Governor. About 80% of Treasurer Cahill's casino and gaming related contributions were from employees of two entities: GTECH and Scientific Games. Both companies have contracts with the Massachusetts State Lottery which is overseen by Treasurer Cahill.⁴⁰ Over the past few years, Treasurer Cahill has stated his support of allowing casino gambling into Massachusetts. About seventy- five percent of former Attorney General Tom Reilly casino related contributions were from parties with ties to two race tracks: Raynham Park owned by Massasoit Greyhound Association, Inc., and Suffolk Downs, owned by Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, Inc. During

⁴⁰ See Massachusetts Lottery website, <http://www.masslottery.com/news/index.html> (last visited May 5, 2008), and Press Release, "GTECH Chosen to Provide the Massachusetts Lottery with New Instant Ticket Vending Machines (ITVMs)," (April 10, 2007) at <http://www.gtech.com/news/2007news/0410.asp> (last visited May 5, 2008).

his campaign for Governor in 2006, Tom Reilly's campaign stated that he was open to expanding gambling in Massachusetts.⁴¹

Lobbyist Expenditures

"Lobbying is an important feature of the gaming industry. Because of the large stakes and highly regulated nature of the industry, gambling interests spend significant amounts of money lobbying legislators and key regulators."

Rappaport Institute Report at 29, Appendix 4.

An individual may gain access to an elected official by contributing to his or her campaign, but hiring a well-connected lobbyist guarantees access. Many lobbyists are former elected officials, including former legislators, and have personal or long term relationships with current public officials. The lobbyists hired by casinos and gaming interests during the past three years include Charles Flaherty, a former Speaker of the House; Theodore Aleixo, a former state senator; and Robert H. Quinn, a former attorney general and Speaker of the House. In addition, lobbyists make campaign contributions to a lot of candidates. Even though lobbyists are only allowed to contribute up to \$200 per year to each candidate, campaign contributions by lobbyists hired by casino and gaming interests totaled over \$200,000 per year from 2002 to 2007.

TABLE 4

Total Campaign Contributions by Casino and Gaming Lobbyists

Year	Amount
2002	\$212,362
2003	208,392
2004	233,335
2005	258,621
2006	291,293
2007	258,222
TOTAL	1,462,225

Because of their access, lobbyists are able to provide legislators and other public officials directly with information about policy proposals that is favorable to their clients' interests. Sometimes

⁴¹ Scott Helman, "Governor, Candidate Weigh the Pros, Cons," *The Boston Globe*, February 20, 2006, at B5. ("Reilly is open to expanded gambling in Massachusetts and ready to work with the Legislature to make sure it's done right.")

they provide legislators with the policy proposal itself. Lobbyists can be very helpful in ensuring that special interests, such as the casino and gaming interests, are listened to and considered.

Although campaign contributions by individuals to a candidate cannot exceed \$500 a year and corporations are prohibited from making any contributions, there is no limit on the amount of money corporations or individuals may spend on lobbyists. Total spending by corporations and groups to lobby the Massachusetts state government has increased from \$31,052,702.00 in 2004 to \$70,955,161.00 in 2005 and \$78,960,743.00 in 2006, according to the Center for Public Integrity.⁴² For at least the past ten years, however, expenditures by entities which designated their interests as “casino & gaming” have fluctuated from year to year, but have remained relatively high.⁴³ Lobbying fees reported over the past ten years by each entity that designated their business interests as “casino & gaming” is set out in the appendix, Table A.⁴⁴ The total lobbyist fees paid in each year for the past ten years are set out in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Total Lobbyist Fees Paid Per Year
By Entities with Casino and Gaming Interests

Year	Amount
1998	\$ 490,537
1999	726,400
2000	654,609
2001	603,551
2002	768,750
2003	1,469,893
2004	350,628
2005	894,314
2006	817,971
2007	1,485,734
TOTAL	\$ 8,262,387

Based on data from the Secretary of State's Lobbyist Section

⁴² The Center for Public Integrity, Hired Guns, A Comprehensive Look at Lobbying in the 50 States, “State Lobbying Totals, 2004-2006,” <http://www.publicintegrity.org/hiredguns/chart.aspx?act=lobbyspending>.

⁴³ All Massachusetts lobbying fees data was obtained from the Secretary of State's Lobbyist Section and its website, <http://www.sec.state.ma.us/lobbyist/lobbyist>.

⁴⁴ The entities and the lobbyist fee totals include Grey2k USA which describes itself on its website (<http://www.grey2kusa.org/>) as an organization whose goal it is to pass stronger dog protection laws and close down existing greyhound race tracks. This is one of the few entities on the list that is opposed to expanding legalized gambling.

Not surprisingly, gambling interests spent the most on lobbying in those years in which significant legislation was introduced to allow either slot machines or casino gambling or both in Massachusetts. In 2007, the year Governor Patrick drafted and proposed his casino legislation, lobbyist expenditures totaled \$1,485,734, an increase of \$667,763 or 82% over the previous year. Similarly, in 2003, the year the legislature considered legislation to allow two casinos and legislation to allow slot machines at the race tracks, lobbyist expenditures totaled \$1,469,893, an increase of \$701,143 or 91% over the previous year.⁴⁵ The biggest spenders in 2007 were Sterling Suffolk Racecourse (\$460,101), TER Development (Trump) (\$137,500), Mashpee Wampanoag Indian Tribal Council (\$135,120), and the Westwood Group (\$122,000).⁴⁶ The top ten total spenders for the past 10 years are set out in Table 6.

TABLE 6

**Top Ten Biggest Spenders On Lobbyists
Over the Past Ten Years**

Casino and Gaming Related Entity	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	TOTAL
The Westwood Group and Subsidiaries	132,000	142,833	132,000	114,500	97,000	97,000	48,500	127,000	97,000	122,000	1,109,833
Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC	17,000	24,000	42,000	48,000	90,000	90,000	45,000	110,000	90,000	460,101	1,016,101
Mashpee Wampanoag Indian Tribal Council, Inc	—	—	12,500	5,000	12,000	190,000	60,000	120,000	120,000	135,120	654,620
Ourway Realty, LLC DBA Plainridge Racecourse	0	12,825	47,579	71,851	91,500	102,000	49,650	69,000	50,000	68,518	562,923
Scientific Games International, Inc. ¹	—	81,000	96,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	30,000	45,000	30,000	31,000	493,000
Oberthur Gaming Technologies Corporation	58,182	60,000	60,000	52,000	0	0	12,000	60,000	60,000	30,000	392,182
Harrah's Operating Company, Inc.	—	—	—	—	65,000	121,500	30,000	60,000	45,000	60,000	381,500
Aquinnah Wampanoag Gaming Corporation ²	—	—	—	40,000	120,000	120,000	0	0	5,000	75,396	360,396
GTECH Corporation	30,000	40,000	48,000	44,000	0	—	—	60,100	60,450	60,000	342,550
Park Place Entertainment Corporation	—	—	—	—	100,000	240,000	0	—	—	—	340,000

Based on data from the Secretary of State's Lobbyist Section. If no value is shown, then entity was not listed as having a registered lobbyist for that year.

⁴⁵ According to *The Boston Globe*, lobbyist fees by casino and gaming interests also were high in the early 1990s. The *Globe* reported that the total lobbyist fees paid by casino and gaming interests in 1993 were \$1,028,904 in 1993, in 1994 were \$722,258, and in 1995 were \$1,153,645. David C. Habfinger, "State's Race Tracks Top Tribe In Spending For Game Lobbying," *The Boston Globe*, Jan. 26, 1996, at 40.

⁴⁶ See Appendix Table A.

THE FUTURE

“It has become an annual State House event, the sideshow of the season in Gardner Auditorium, as cast members step into all-too-recognizable roles for the annual public hearings on casino gaming bills before the Legislature.”

Brian C. Mooney, “For Lobbyists, a Sure Bet,” The Boston Globe, March 22, 1997, at B6.

So far, attempts to significantly expand legalized gambling in Massachusetts have failed, despite millions of dollars being spent on campaign contributions and lobbyist fees by casino and gaming interests. Similarly, ballot initiatives to expand legalized gambling in other states have failed despite overwhelming amounts of money being spent by casino and gaming interests.⁴⁷ It would be wrong, however, to conclude that the money spent by gambling interests has no effect on the process. As then Attorney General Scott Harshbarger stated in 1996,

I think the reason we don't have a casino today in Massachusetts is because, in fact, the people have decided....The only people that won't accept it are the people who want the casinos. Because they figure they can stay at this longer. The Legislature and the governor move on to other issues, but they never stop. They're constantly focused with highly paid lobbyists-- the best in the state-- whose job it is to stay focused on one central goal: to get that door open.

David M. Halbfinger, “Harshbarger Facing Tough Odds In Gambling Fight Casino Bill Delay Gives Gaming Foe Time to Regroup for Uphill Battle,” The Boston Globe, July 5, 1996, at 53.

There have been repeated attempts to get “the door open” in Massachusetts over the past twenty-five years. The state and local governments have spent considerable time and effort on numerous proposals to expand legalized gambling. There are, however, opportunity costs in politics, just as there are opportunity costs in business. Time and effort to consider casino and gaming legislation takes away from time available to spend on other issues. Professor Richard Hall of the University of Michigan, who has studied the role money plays in politics, has concluded that “[c]ampaign contributions and lobbyists do not buy politicians' opinions as much as they buy their

⁴⁷ The National Institute on Money in State Politics researched the amount of money that was spent by proponents and opponents in six gambling related ballot initiatives in five states. Four of the ballot initiatives were to expand legalized gambling, and they failed, despite the fact that proponents of the measures spent considerably more money on the campaigns leading up to the votes. Scott Jordan, “High Stakes: Gambling Ballot Measures, 2006” National Institute on Money in State Politics, Sept. 13, 2007, www.followthemoney.org.

priorities.”⁴⁸ The problem, as Hall sees it, is “that by focusing on some constituents, the politicians no longer has time to focus on issues that help other constituents.”⁴⁹

Even in states that have allowed some form of casino gambling, lobbying for further expansion of legalized gambling or for a change in the original legislation has continued, particular if competition arises from facilities in neighboring states. For example, in 1989, after five years of lobbying, Iowa allowed gambling on riverboats under certain restrictions, including bets limited to \$5.00 and maximum losses limited to \$200.⁵⁰ Only five years later, in 1994, legislation was passed that removed many of the restrictions placed on the riverboats, including the betting and loss limits, and allowed slot machines at the race tracks.⁵¹

The unanswered question is how much time and effort has been spent on proposals to expand legalized gambling in Massachusetts that could have been spent on other policies, some of which might have accomplished the same stated public goals of increasing public revenue and job growth. In other words, are some policies that would benefit the public as a whole not being adequately addressed because of the time and effort being spent on proposals to expand legalized gambling in Massachusetts? If the answer is yes, then it is the public that ultimately is paying the price.

⁴⁸ Shankar Vedantam, “Campaign Contributions Change Priorities, Not Beliefs,” The Washington Post, July 16, 2007 at A3.

⁴⁹ Id.

⁵⁰ Robert Goodman, The Luck Business 95-96 (Simon & Schuster 1995).

⁵¹ Id. At 99; Edward A. Morse and Ernest P. Goss, Governing Fortune: Casino Gambling in America 124-125 (The University of Michigan Press 2007).

APPENDIX

Source Of State Data Used In Report

The state data in this report was obtained from two main sources: The Massachusetts Secretary of State's Lobbyist Section and the Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance.

1) Secretary of State/Lobbyist Section Data

The Lobbyist Section maintains an online database which contains information from annual and semi-annual reports filed electronically by lobbyist and lobbying entities since 2005. Any entity employing a lobbyist must file a client registration form indicating its business interests by checking off one or more of 23 listed categories, including "Gaming-casinos & gambling." The data used in this report for the years 2005 to 2008 was downloaded from the Lobbyist Section website by searching for all entities within the category of "Gaming - casinos & gambling." Similar data from 1998 to 2004 was obtained through a public records request. A list of the entities, along with their total lobbying fees and expenses reported to the Lobbyist Section for each year from 1998 to 2007, is set out in Table A to this appendix. The entities with registered lobbyists for 2008 as of January 23, 2008 are also noted.

2) Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance ("OCPF") Data

Obtaining data concerning campaign contributions from parties with ties to casino and gaming interests is a little more complicated than obtaining data on entities that designate their interests as "Gaming- casinos & gambling." Although campaign contributors are required to provide their occupation and their employer when giving campaign donations, there is no requirement for individuals to indicate any other affiliations or relationships. In addition, some records obtained from the OCPF database do not contain occupation or employer information, making it more difficult to obtain information about contributions of individuals with ties to casino and gaming entities by simply doing an employer search.

Searches of the OCPF database were done by individual names and by employer names. The individual names that were searched were obtained from newspaper reports, corporate filings, and the websites of various casino and gaming entities. The employer names that were searched were obtained mostly from newspaper accounts of parties interested in applying for a license under Governor Patrick's casino bill and from the list of entities that resulted from the search of the Lobbyist Section database described previously.

Contributions by employees, officers, or owners of casino and gaming entities or related entities and by family members of employees, officers, and owners have been included in the data presented in

this report. For example, the Palmer Group data contained in Table 2, includes contributions by members of the Picknelly family and members of the Dragone family, all who have an interest in the family businesses succeeding, as well as contributions by the employees of their businesses. Similarly, the Sterling Suffolk data includes contributions from Sterling Suffolk employees, owners, and members of its Board, as well as contributions from employees of the owner's and board member's affiliated closely-held companies. It also includes contributions from family members of Sterling Suffolk's owners, members of the Board, and employees.

APPENDIX TABLE A

Reported Lobbyist Fees And Expenses For Entities With A Designated Business Interest Of "Gaming-casinos & gambling"

Entity	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	TOTAL
Aquinnah Wampanoag Gaming Corporation*	—	—	—	58,000	120,000	120,000	0	0	5,000	75,396	N/A	378,396
Aramark Sports & Entertainment Services, Inc.	—	75,000	0	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	75,000
BELL, Dorchester MA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30,000	—	30,000
Brockton Agricultural Society	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16,000	20,000	—	—	36,000
Carnival Hotels and Casinos	6,250	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6,250
Committee for Palmer Growth & Development	—	—	—	—	10,000	0	—	—	—	—	—	10,000
Delaware North Companies, Inc.- Boston	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	60,233	25,261	64,286	N/A	149,779
Farsight Marketing, Inc.	0	0	36,500	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	36,500
Gaming Laboratories International, Inc.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	N/A	0
Grey2K USA	—	—	—	11,000	15,000	16,949	7,978	38,468	52,739	30,062	N/A	172,196
GTECH Corporation	30,000	40,000	48,000	44,000	0	—	—	60,100	60,450	60,000	N/A	342,550
Hall Properties, Inc	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	70,000	N/A	70,000
Harness Horseman's Association of New England	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	25,000	—	—	25,000
Harrah's Operating Company, Inc.	—	—	—	—	65,000	121,500	30,000	60,000	45,000	60,000	N/A	381,500
Harvey's Casino Resorts	70,000	55,000	10,000	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	135,000
Hinsdale Holding Co., Inc.	50,961	49,038	0	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	99,999
Horizon's Edge Excursion, LLC	—	—	—	—	—	3,500	0	—	—	—	—	3,500
Hotel, Restaurant, Institutional Employees & Bartenders Union, Local 26	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30,000	27,500	—	—	57,500
HWCC Development Corp.	500	34,650	20,500	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	55,650
Hyatt Development Corporation	—	0	0	0	—	60,000	—	—	—	—	—	60,000
Interlott	—	15,762	23,000	12,000	12,000	0	0	—	—	—	—	62,762
International Game Technology, Las Vegas, Nevada	9,000	13,500	15,750	13,500	0	30,000	15,000	44,013	41,956	48,502	N/A	231,222
Jonathan Goodson Productions	—	16,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	12,000	—	—	—	—	124,000
Leisure Time	11,000	27,000	0	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	38,000
Mandalay Group Resort	—	—	—	—	—	32,444	0	—	—	—	—	32,444
Mashpee Wampanoag Indian Tribal Council, Inc	—	—	12,500	5,000	12,000	190,000	60,000	120,000	120,000	135,120	N/A	654,620

Based on data from the Massachusetts Secretary of State's Lobbyist Section, as of January 23, 2008.

*Aquinnah Wampanoag data is listed under "Acquisition Strategies f/Wampanoag Indian Nation/Tunica-Biloxi Ind. Nat." for the years 2001, 2002, and 2003; and under "Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head/Aquinnah/Tunica Biloxi Tribe of LA/Keysto" for 2004.

TABLE A (continued)

Reported Lobbyist Fees and Expenses For Entities
 With A Designated Business Interest Of "Gaming-casinos & gambling"

Entity	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	TOTAL
Mass. Gaming Association	2,750	3,000	1,500	0	0	0	0	—	—	—	—	7,250
Mass. Lodging Assoc	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12,065	—	—	12,065
Massachusetts Thoroughbred Breeders Association	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	3,000	0	—	—	—	—	N/A	12,000
Massasoit Greyhound Association, Inc	35,200	25,200	5,200	5,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	70,800
Media Drop In	24,194	4,092	1,080	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	29,366
New England Horsemen's Benevolent & Protective Association, Inc .c/o Suffolk Downs	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	42,000	42,000	—	N/A	84,000
New York Life Investment Management LLC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	0	—	—	0
Nipmuc Nation Tribal Council	—	—	—	63,500	59,500	54,000	28,000	0	0	—	—	205,000
Northeast Gaming Group	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	N/A	0
Northeast Resorts, Inc	—	—	—	—	—	120,000	0	—	—	—	—	120,000
Norton Management	—	—	—	—	—	90,000	0	—	—	—	—	90,000
Oberthur Gaming Technologies Corporation	58,182	60,000	60,000	55,000	0	0	12,000	60,000	60,000	30,000	—	395,182
Ourway Reality, LLC DBA Plainridge Racecourse	0	12,825	47,579	71,851	91,500	102,000	49,650	69,000	50,000	68,518	N/A	562,923
Park Place Entertainment Corporation	—	—	—	—	100,000	240,000	0	—	—	—	—	340,000
Penn National Gaming, Inc, Wyomissing, PA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	19,250	—	19,250
Poker4charity, Inc,	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	26,000	N/A	26,000
Riverside Park	15,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15,000
Scientific Games International, Inc, Alpharetta, GA	—	81,000	96,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	30,000	45,000	30,000	31,000	N/A	493,000
Standardbred Owners of Mass., Inc., Plainville, MA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	N/A	0
Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC, East Boston, MA	17,000	24,000	42,000	48,000	90,000	90,000	45,000	110,000	90,000	460,101	N/A	1,016,101
TER Development Co., LLC, Atlantic City, NJ	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	137,500	N/A	137,500
The Mohegan Tribe, Uncasville, CT	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3,000	N/A	3,000
The Visions Group	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—	—	—	—	0
The Westwood Group and Subsidiaries, Revere, MA	132,000	142,833	132,000	114,500	97,000	97,000	48,500	127,000	97,000	122,000	N/A	1,109,833
Western New England Fairgrounds, Inc.	10,000	20,000	40,000	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	70,000
Wonderland Greyhound Owners Assoc., Lynn, MA	15,500	24,500	36,000	18,000	9,750	18,500	12,500	12,500	14,000	15,000	N/A	176,250
TOTAL	490,537	726,400	654,609	603,551	768,750	1,469,893	350,628	894,314	817,971	1,485,734	N/A	8,262,387

Based on data from the Massachusetts Secretary of State's Lobbyist Section, as of January 23, 2008.

"N/A" means that the entity has a registered lobbyist, as of January 2008, but no fees or expenses have been reported yet for 2008.

APPENDIX TABLE B

Top 25 Recipients Of Campaign Contributions From Individuals With Ties To Casino And Gaming Interests By Year

2007		2006		2005	
Cahill, Timothy	8,500	Democratic State Committee, MA	11,000	Reilly, Thomas F.	11,250
Menard, Joan M.	4,400	Reilly, Thomas F.	7,125	Cahill, Timothy	6,500
Pacheco, Marc R.	4,000	Cahill, Timothy	5,500	Menard, Joan M.	5,525
Fagan, James H.	2,300	Murray, Therese	5,050	Travaglini, Robert E.	5,350
Patrick, Deval L.	2,000	Republican State Committee, MA	5,000	Murphy, Stephen	5,000
Mariano, Ronald	2,000	Murray, Timothy P.	4,680	Lees, Brian	4,000
Brown, Scott P.	2,000	Healey, Kerry Murphy	3,750	DiMasi, Salvatore F.	3,825
Menino, Thomas M.	1,750	Patrick, Deval L.	3,750	Petrolati, Thomas M.	3,500
DeLeo, Robert A.	1,700	Travaglini, Robert E.	3,100	Reinstein, Kathi-Anne	3,200
Petrolati, Thomas M.	1,600	Brown, Scott P.	3,000	Romney, Mitt	2,900
Murray, Therese	1,350	Canessa, Stephen R.	2,600	Jones Jr., Bradley H.	2,800
Walsh, Steven M.	1,250	Goldberg, Deborah	2,500	DeLeo, Robert A.	2,400
Flaherty, Timothy	1,250	DeLeo, Robert A.	2,250	Wagner, Joseph F.	2,375
Buoniconti, Stephen J.	1,250	Menino, Thomas M.	2,250	Leone Jr, Gerard T.	2,200
Basile, Carlo	1,250	Morrissey, Michael W.	2,150	Callahan, Michael J.	2,100
Berry, Frederick E.	1,200	Candaras, Gale D.	2,125	Canessa, Stephen R.	2,000
Ryan, Charles V.	1,100	Atsalis, Demetrius J.	2,000	Mackey, Joseph K.	2,000
Quinn, John F.	1,000	DiMasi, Salvatore F.	2,000	Buoniconti, Stephen J.	1,800
Murray, Timothy P.	1,000	Murphy, Stephen	2,000	Wallace, Brian P.	1,650
Jones Jr., Bradley H.	1,000	Scaccia, Angelo M.	2,000	Murray, Therese	1,600
Dempsey, Brian S.	1,000	Lees, Brian	1,600	Fagan, James H.	1,500
Bradley, Garrett J.	1,000	Binienda, Sr., John J.	1,500	Bosley, Daniel E.	1,400
Binienda, Sr., John J.	1,000	Buoniconti, Stephen J.	1,500	Costello, Michael A.	1,400
Petrucelli, Anthony W.	900	Howitt, Steven	1,500	Menino, Thomas M.	1,400
Wallace, Brian P.	750	Petrolati, Thomas M.	1,500	Walsh, Steven M.	1,400
Spkr DiMasi's Com. for a Dem. House PAC	750	Timilty, Walter F.	1,500		
Peterson Jr., George N.	750				
Nyman, Robert J.	750				
Murphy, Stephen	750				
Leone Jr, Gerard T.	750				
Falzone, Mark V.	750				

Based on data from the Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance

If more than one candidate had the 25th highest contribution level for a particular year, all candidates at that level are included in the table for that year.

APPENDIX TABLE B (continued)

Top 25 Recipients Of Campaign Contributions From Individuals
With Ties To Casino And Gaming Interests

2004		2003		2002	
Democratic State Committee, MA	15,000	Reilly, Thomas F.	9,750	Birmingham, Thomas F.	5,750
Reilly, Thomas F.	13,825	Romney, Mitt	5,000	O'Brien, Shannon P.	3,600
Cahill, Timothy	6,875	Wagner, Joseph F.	4,500	Romney, Mitt	3,525
Petrolati, Thomas M.	3,750	Menard, Joan M.	4,000	Murphy, Stephen	3,050
Romney, Mitt	3,000	Melconian, Linda J.	3,500	Cahill, Timothy	2,925
Brown, Scott P.	2,800	Travaglini, Robert E.	2,500	Slattery, John P.	2,700
Murray, Therese	2,750	Murray, Therese	2,400	Flynn, David L.	2,500
Fagan, James H.	2,500	Finneran, Thomas M.	1,900	Finneran, Thomas M.	2,375
Travaglini, Robert E.	2,450	Naughton Jr., Harold P.	1,900	Travaglini, Robert E.	2,250
Wagner, Joseph F.	2,350	Berry, Frederick E.	1,750	Joyce, Brian A.	1,500
Coughlin, Robert	2,200	Bradley, Garrett J.	1,750	Reilly, Thomas F.	1,500
Rogers, John H.	1,900	Flynn, David L.	1,700	Glodis, Guy William	1,300
Joyce, Brian A.	1,875	Wallace, Brian P.	1,550	Bosley, Daniel E.	1,225
Bosley, Daniel E.	1,850	Murphy, Stephen	1,500	Melconian, Linda J.	1,200
DiMasi, Salvatore F.	1,700	Rogers, John H.	1,500	Reinstein, Kathi-Anne	1,100
Flynn, David L.	1,575	Fagan, James H.	1,250	Timilty Jr., Walter F.	1,100
Canessa, Stephen R.	1,500	Glodis, Guy William	1,250	Grossman, Steven	1,000
Healey, Kerry Murphy	1,500	Healey, Kerry Murphy	1,225	Lees, Brian	1,000
Toomey Jr., Timothy J.	1,350	Brown, Scott P.	1,000	Lewis, Maryanne	1,000
Finneran, Thomas M.	1,325	Com. for a Democratic Senate PAC	1,000	Morrissey, Michael W.	1,000
Lees, Brian	1,325	deMacedo, Vinny	1,000	Rogers, John H.	1,000
Atsalis, Demetrius J.	1,250	Lees, Brian	1,000	Segel, James	1,000
Fresolo, John P.	1,250	O'Brien, Thomas J.	1,000	Dubois, Robert J.	900

Based on data from the Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance. If more than one candidate had the 25th highest contribution level for a particular year, all candidates at that level are included in the table for that year.