

Vote No on Question 3

Question 3 would replace Massachusetts party primaries with a single “all-party” or top-two primary. Every candidate would appear on one ballot. Only the top two vote-getters would advance to November, even if they belong to the same party. This proposed change is a solution looking for a problem that does not exist—especially for unenrolled voters.

- Unenrolled voters already have the right to participate in Massachusetts primaries. They simply choose a Democratic or Republican ballot on primary day.
- They can vote in the race that matters most in their community without joining a party.
- Voters could be disenfranchised negatively impacting turnout and distorting the will of the people on ballot questions.
- Question 3 does not give unenrolled voters a new right. It takes away a system they already use and understand.

The proposed top-two system would weaken parties and shrink real choice.

- Parties exist so voters can choose between distinct political philosophies. Question 3 removes their ability to nominate their own candidates to run in the general election.
- In a heavily partisan state, the two highest finishers would often both be of one party. Third party candidates and many independents would be shut out of the general election—the contest that draws the most voters.
- November ballots would offer less ideological diversity when turnout and attention are highest.

A PROPOSED LAW THAT FAILED IS NOW QUESTION 3 ON THE GENERAL ELECTION BALLOT.

On May 4, 2026 The MA State House of Representatives - Special Joint Committee on Initiative Petitions - voted to **TAKE NO ACTION** on H.5003, Initiative Petition for a Law to Implement to All-Party State Primaries. **TAKING NO ACTION ON A BILL LETS IT FAIL WITHOUT A RECORDED “NO” VOTE.** The majority opinion based their opinion on *“administrative and fiscal implications of implementing the proposal at both the state and municipal levels, as well as concerns that all-party primaries may result in vote splitting, reduced party accountability, voter confusion, and strategic voting, often disadvantaging less-funded candidates and producing unpredictable or unrepresentative outcomes”*

VOTE NO ON QUESTION 3