

VOTER GUIDE

2026 BALLOT QUESTIONS

What a yes or no vote would mean for each measure along with other information to help you decide.



WITH THE SUPPORT OF:

 The Boston Foundation

AN EDITORIAL COLLABORATION BY:

EL PLANETA

CommonWealth
— BEACON —

ELECTION
2026 

THE BAY STATE
Banner

Get ready for a long ballot.

The Massachusetts House, Senate, and governor are responsible for the vast majority of what becomes law in the Commonwealth, but they're not the only ones with that power. Individuals can also propose changes to state law or the state constitution, and if supporters manage to navigate a thicket of procedural hurdles and win support from a majority of voters, their measure becomes law, just the same as anything that followed the more traditional path through Beacon Hill.

This election season, frustrated advocates and influential groups turned to the process with gusto. Nine statewide ballot questions will go before voters in November, tying a record last set in 1994. The measures in the mix range across a host of weighty topics, from tax rebates to recreational marijuana to elections administration.

Here's what you need to know:

Ballot questions are nothing new. Since 1918, Massachusetts voters have been able to make laws through the ballot box. But the high volume this time around — which would have easily set a record if not for the state's highest court tossing a pair of measures on what are essentially technicalities — has a lot to do with Beacon Hill.

Advocates who push for elected leaders to change state law are increasingly frustrated with what they perceive as legislative resistance to advancing their priorities, even when the ideas are broadly supported throughout the Commonwealth. Some groups who in past years would have devoted their energy to getting a vote in the House and Senate decided they'd rather cut out the Legislature. That list includes Secretary of State William Galvin, who is pushing a ballot question to authorize election day voter registration.

Some of the measures this year build on past campaigns. One question seeks to subject the Legislature and governor's office to the state's public records law, and the campaign is helmed by Auditor Diana DiZoglio — who two years ago secured

landslide voter approval for a law explicitly empowering her office to probe the Legislature. That law has yet to be implemented as lawmakers insist it runs afoul of the state constitution, and DiZoglio has explicitly pitched the records measure as a follow-up.

For some organizers, running a ballot question campaign can also provide significant leverage. Lawmakers might be more inclined to take up a bill, or agree to a compromise, if doing so averts a months-long, expensive political fight.

Legislative leaders, who have repeatedly criticized the surge in ballot questions as a reflection of well-funded interest groups exploiting the system, chose not to broker any deals to take proposals out of the mix this election cycle. As a result, each campaign that had enough financial or volunteer

resources to complete the drafting and signature-gathering requirements will ride out the effort all the way until voters get the final call.



**SCAN FOR MORE
INFORMATION ABOUT
THE BALLOT QUESTIONS**

Common questions

How do questions get to the ballot?

Questions must be filed with state officials by the first Wednesday in August of an odd-numbered year, about 15 months before the next statewide election. The attorney general then reviews each proposal to determine whether it meets the eligibility requirements laid out in the state constitution.

The first major test comes when backers need to collect tens of thousands of signatures (equal to 3 percent of the votes cast in the last gubernatorial election) from registered voters by mid-November. This cycle, that target was 74,574 signatures.

If campaigns are successful there, questions head to the Legislature for several months of review. If the Legislature takes no action on a question, its backers have to complete one more, smaller round of signature-gathering by mid-June.

The secretary of state's office then certifies signatures and decides in what order the questions should appear before voters, locking in each measure's spot.

How are lawmakers involved?

After the first signature-gathering hurdle, which typically whittles down the field considerably, Beacon Hill has a chance to weigh in on the ballot questions. Officially, lawmakers can only approve questions as they are drafted or take no action, allowing them to advance. Less formally, though, legislators can use their review process as an opportunity to negotiate with campaigns. It's rare, but those talks occasionally lead to compromise: The Legislature approves a bill tackling the same issue as the ballot question, and question backers agree to drop their campaign.

MAP OUT YOUR VOTING PLAN

Will a successful ballot question actually lead to change?

In theory, yes, although in practice the outcome of a ballot measure can vary. A law enacted by the ballot has the same standing as a law enacted by the Legislature. That also means that legislators can change or repeal it after the voters decide.

Approved ballot laws are also not immune to being modified or repealed by a subsequent ballot question campaign. Voters approved the decriminalization of recreational marijuana in 2016, and this year are being asked whether to undo that decision.

Laws enacted by ballot questions can also find themselves in implementation limbo. A 2024 ballot question giving the state auditor the power to audit the Legislature still has not forced much substantial change because lawmakers have spent nearly two years arguing that it violates the constitutional separation of powers without directly asking a court to issue a final decision.

What's different about Question 9?

In Massachusetts, citizens can launch a ballot question campaign seeking to undo a law within 30 days of its enactment. That's what Second Amendment supporters did shortly after the governor signed sweeping gun control legislation in 2024, but they missed the window for the question to appear on the ballot that year. It appears on this year's ballot as Question 9. Because voters are technically choosing whether to keep the law on the books, the referendum passing means the "no" votes win.

[illegible]

QUESTION

1

Expanding the Public Records Law

IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

This question asks voters whether the state's existing public records law should apply to the Legislature, which is currently exempt, and the governor's office, which often claims to have leeway to deny requests.

CommonWealth
— BEACON —

ELECTION **2026** 

YES

A YES VOTE WOULD...

Make explicit that the House, Senate, and governor's office are subject to the public records law, while exempting communications related to assisting constituents or developing policy positions.

PROPOSERS CLAIM

- Massachusetts has one of the least transparent state governments in the country. The Society of Professional Journalists awarded Massachusetts its 2026 Black Hole Award, which it describes as “an annual dishonor recognizing ... a troubling lack of transparency and disregard for the public's right to know.”
- Watchdogs and the press will be able to better hold power to account with greater access to information, including what lawmakers and the governor's office say in emails and other correspondence with figures such as lobbyists.
- Virtually all other government entities — including municipal offices, public school districts, and many offices in the state's executive branch — are subject to the public records law.

The campaign is led by Auditor Diana DiZoglio and the progressive group Act on Mass. Other groups like the Massachusetts Fiscal Alliance also support the question.

OTHER THINGS TO KNOW

- Massachusetts is the only state where the Legislature, the judiciary, and the governor's office are all exempt from public records requirements or claim to be.
- While Democratic legislative leaders have signaled opposition, Gov. Maura Healey has said she supports the idea “provided that there are certain exemptions” for some unspecified types of documents or correspondence.
- DiZoglio has pitched the measure as a follow-up to her successful 2024 ballot campaign empowering her office to audit the Legislature, which voters approved by a margin of 72 percent to 28 percent.

NO

A NO VOTE WOULD...

Maintain the status quo in which the Legislature is completely exempt and the governor's office can deem itself exempt from requirements to release records on a case-by-case basis.

OPPOSERS CLAIM

- Adding the Legislature to the existing public records law, which is managed by the secretary of state, will subject the legislative branch to executive branch oversight in violation of the constitutional separation of powers.
- Lawmakers could have their free deliberations chilled by exposing internal communications to public scrutiny, especially if malicious actors misrepresent or take out of context information acquired via records requests.
- The Legislature should not be subject to the same public records requirements as other parts of the government because it has a unique, independent standing under the state constitution.

There is no registered opposition, but Democratic legislative leaders including House Speaker Ron Mariano and Senate President Karen Spilka, have expressed skepticism.

QUESTION

2

Collective Bargaining for CPCS Employees

IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

This question asks whether workers with the Committee for Public Counsel Services — which offers legal representation to indigent criminal defendants — should be able to form a public-sector union and collectively bargain.

CommonWealth
— BEACON —

ELECTION **2026** 

YES

A YES VOTE WOULD...

Allow CPCS employees to create a union and participate in collective bargaining over working conditions like hours, salaries, and benefits.

PROPOSERS CLAIM

- Employees in more than 180 other state agencies are able to bargain collectively. CPCS workers should have the same rights.
- Massachusetts public defenders are paid “woefully low salaries,” the Boston Bar Association has argued for decades, and their inability to organize keeps their wages low.
- Collective bargaining would also allow staff attorneys — who often work long hours with unpredictable caseloads — to advocate for more consistency and fairness in workplace policies, and help with recruitment and retention of attorneys and staff.

The effort is backed by unions including the National Association of Government Employees and SEIU Local 888.

OTHER THINGS TO KNOW

- Employees of the public defender organization have tried to unionize on at least three separate occasions since 1979, but in each instance, state labor officials found they did not possess collective bargaining rights under state law.
- For six consecutive legislative sessions since 2015, bills that would allow CPCS workers to unionize and bargain died on Beacon Hill. Several advanced through committees but did not receive a House or Senate vote.
- The staffing challenges of CPCS employees were thrust onto the public stage in 2025 when bar advocates, the private attorneys who handle indigent defense cases under CPCS management, engaged in a work stoppage to protest their pay rates. More than 1,500 criminal charges were dropped during the strike.
- If passed, this ballot measure will not allow bar advocates to collectively bargain. The Legislature responded to the bar advocate work stoppage by increasing District Court rates for private lawyers to \$75 an hour this spring, which was followed by another bump to \$85 in August.

NO

A NO VOTE WOULD...

Keep CPCS employees as they are: not among the public employees in Massachusetts that are allowed to collectively bargain.

OPPOSERS CLAIM

- A legislative report from Beacon Hill’s special ballot question committee recommended that lawmakers not pass the ballot measure as written because of concerns that unionizing activity could disrupt existing management frameworks, muddle chains of authority, and create operational inefficiencies.
- Standardizing work hours could limit the agency’s flexibility to respond to an influx of cases and other court demands, the report also noted.

There is no registered opposition to the ballot campaign.

QUESTION

3

State Primary Elections

IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

This question asks voters whether Massachusetts should replace its existing primary election system, in which Democrats and Republicans each have separate ballots, with a single “all-party primary,” in which all candidates appear on the same ballot together and the top two vote-getters advance.

YES

A YES VOTE WOULD...

Create a single primary system in which every candidate in a race, regardless of their party affiliation, appears on the same ballot. The two candidates who receive the most votes would advance to the general election, even if they are both Democrats, both Republicans, or both from a third party or unenrolled.

PROPONENTS CLAIM

- Because Democrats have such strong control over Massachusetts politics, many races are effectively decided during lower-turnout Democratic primary elections. The new system could give voters at least some kind of choice in the general election, even if it's a contest between two Democrats.
- In California and Washington, states that have similar top-two primaries, the system reduced the importance of money in politics because less-funded candidates performed better than they do in states with systems like we have in Massachusetts.

The most prominent figure in support is Danielle Allen, a Harvard University professor who founded Partners in Democracy, which advocates for democratic reforms. Other supporters include former Gov. Deval Patrick, former MassGOP chair Jennifer Nassour, and the NAACP New England Area Conference.

OTHER THINGS TO KNOW

- Municipal elections, which do not involve partisan primaries, would not be affected if this measure passes. Candidates would still need to collect the same number of signatures as before to qualify for the ballot.
- Four other states have some form of multi-party or nonpartisan primary elections: Alaska, California, Nebraska, and Washington. Louisiana places all candidates on the ballot in its general election, and if no single candidate receives a majority, the top two advance to a runoff.

NO

A NO VOTE WOULD...

Keep the existing electoral system in place. Democrats and Republicans will continue to appear on their party's primary ballot. Whoever wins the respective contests will face off in the general election. Third-party candidates will only appear on the general election ballot.

OPPONENTS CLAIM

- There's no evidence that a top-two primary system increases the number of candidates in a race.
- The top-two primary system will hurt democratic participation because only two candidates will appear in November, in some cases from the same party, whereas today, general election ballots can feature a Democrat, a Republican, and multiple third-party or unenrolled candidates.
- Wealthy donors are providing almost all of the funding for the all-party primary campaign. Because primary fields will be larger, those who have the most money to spend will have an even greater advantage, giving more influence to wealthy donors.

Opponents include the Massachusetts Democratic Party, Massachusetts Republican Party, several organized labor groups like the Massachusetts AFL-CIO, and progressive activists such as Act on Mass.

QUESTION

4

Election Day Registration

IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

This question asks voters whether eligible Massachusetts residents should be allowed to register to vote and cast a ballot during the same trip to the polls on Election Day.

YES

A YES VOTE WOULD...

Permit anyone who is eligible — but not yet registered to vote — to register at their polling place on Election Day. Already-registered voters could also update the address attached to their voter registration on Election Day, but not their political party affiliation.

PROPOSENTS CLAIM

- The current 10-day cutoff creates an unnecessary obstacle that disenfranchises many prospective voters. In 2024, elections officials rejected more than 3,300 provisional ballots, and many of those could have counted if Election Day registration were in place.
- Primary elections in Massachusetts typically happen in September, when many renters change apartments. Allowing them to update the address for their voter registration on Election Day will prevent them from losing their political voice because they recently moved.

The ballot question campaign is led by Secretary of State William Galvin, the state's chief elections official, with support from voting-rights advocates such as MassVOTE.

OTHER THINGS TO KNOW

- To register on Election Day, Massachusetts residents would need to show proof of residency, such as a driver's license or residential lease, and sign an oath that they are eligible.
- If the measure passes, voter registration still would not be possible at the polls during in-person early voting periods before Election Day.
- The state Senate supported same-day voter registration in 2021, but the measure died in the House, where lawmakers are far more skeptical. Galvin decided to pitch the idea directly to voters to circumvent the lack of movement in the Legislature.
- Twenty-four other states and Washington, DC, allow voters to register and cast a ballot either on Election Day itself or during early-voting periods.

NO

A NO VOTE WOULD...

Keep the current registration deadlines in place. Under existing law, new voters cannot register — and existing voters cannot change the address at which they are registered — within 10 days of the election. Anyone who misses that window is ineligible to cast a vote.

OPPOSENTS CLAIM

- Municipal election workers are already facing significant burdens from policies such as early voting and widely available mail-in voting. Requiring them to manage new voter registrations or address changes on Election Day will stretch them too thin.
- Same-day voter registration would increase the risk of errors and threaten electoral integrity.

There's no formal campaign committee working to oppose the question, but some local officials have voiced concerns about the proposal.

QUESTION

5

State Revenue Limit & Rebate

IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

This question asks voters whether to change the formula for the state's tax cap so that it would be based on the prior year's total revenue. Under the new formula, Massachusetts would be more likely to owe money back to taxpayers in a given year.

CommonWealth
— BEACON —

ELECTION **2026** 

YES

A YES VOTE WOULD...

Update the law known as Chapter 62F so that the state's tax cap would be based on how much revenue was collected in the prior year, adjusted for the growth in wages and salaries. Additionally, surtax revenue from high-income earners would count toward the state's allowable tax haul.

PROPOSERS CLAIM

- If Beacon Hill hits a tax cap more frequently, taxpayers are more likely to get money back, helping to offset the state's high cost of living.
- More frequent tax rebates would force policymakers to budget more conservatively after a yearlong period of significantly increasing state spending at a rate higher than inflation.

The primary backer is the Massachusetts Opportunity Alliance, a coalition of business and free-market groups founded by the Massachusetts High Technology Council, the Pioneer Institute, and the Massachusetts Competitive Partnership.

OTHER THINGS TO KNOW

- Voters approved the existing tax cap through a 1986 ballot question. It has only been triggered twice: in 1987, when the state collected about \$29 million more than the limit, and in 2022, when Beacon Hill had to return nearly \$3 billion to taxpayers.
- After rebates were triggered in 2022, Gov. Maura Healey and the Legislature updated the law to require rebates to be equal for everyone. Beacon Hill also explicitly exempted funds from the voter-approved surtax on wealthy households from counting toward the cap.
- If the measure is approved, the new tax cap would go into effect on July 1, 2027, the start of fiscal year 2028.
- The Center for State Policy Analysis at Tufts University, which neither supports nor opposes the question, estimated that the change would “dramatically” increase the odds that Massachusetts hits the tax cap and would return five to 15 times as much money to taxpayers as the existing law.

NO

A NO VOTE WOULD...

Keep in place the existing tax cap formula, in which the limit is decided annually by increasing the existing cap at the same growth rate as wages and salaries. Surtax revenue would not count toward the limit.

OPPOSERS CLAIM

- Repayments to taxpayers would leave less money available for popular public programs and services, especially in periods of economic recession.
- Frequent tax rebates would make it difficult for Beacon Hill to budget because policymakers would be less certain if they might owe money back in any given year.

The opposition is led by the Raise Up coalition, a constellation of labor, faith, and community organizations that led the successful ballot question campaign in 2022 to impose a surtax on wealthy households.

QUESTION

6

Natural Resource Conservation Fund

IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

This ballot measure asks whether money collected from the sales tax on sporting goods purchases on items like camping gear, golf clubs, and fishing equipment should be directed to a state fund for conservation activities.

CommonWealth
— BEACON —

ELECTION **2026** 

YES

A YES VOTE WOULD...

Direct sales tax money collected from sporting goods purchases into a new “Nature for All” fund for expanding access to outdoor recreation and bolstering climate resiliency.

PROPOSERS CLAIM

- Massachusetts has the nation’s fastest-growing outdoor recreation economy, but more than three-quarters of residents of color live in areas considered “nature-deprived.”
- The ballot measure could direct up to \$100 million each year explicitly for land conservation without raising taxes or creating new ones. That will chip away at \$1 billion in deferred maintenance for trails and other facilities.
- The fiscal 2027 budget saw the state’s environmental and outdoor recreation programs cut by nearly 4 percent amid broader financial headwinds. The Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs also received its lowest level of funding since 2023. Passing this initiative would create political leverage for environmental causes.

Mass Audubon, The Trustees, The Nature Conservancy, and other environmental groups and nonprofits, along with a few businesses, are the main entities supporting the ballot question.

OTHER THINGS TO KNOW

- The ballot measure would phase in this change, directing 50 percent of the sales tax revenue into the fund in the first year before all sporting goods sales tax money is dedicated to the fund in the second year.
- If the ballot measure passes, it would also establish a 15-member Nature for All board that would allocate the funds.
- Virginia, Georgia, and Texas use sporting goods sales tax money for conservation and recreation. Texas has had its fund since 1993, and Georgia created one in 2018 after 83 percent of voters approved the measure.

NO

A NO VOTE WOULD...

Reject the establishment of a “Nature for All” fund and keep sales taxes generated from sporting goods purchases in the state’s general fund for budgeting purposes.

OPPOSERS CLAIM

- The measure would send a message that the public can set a budget line item via the ballot and constrict discretionary spending, particularly in the midst of a tight fiscal environment.
- The Department of Revenue would have to require businesses to separately identify their sales of sporting goods products, forcing DOR to “perform monthly reconciliations and make monthly accounting adjustments.”
- Even if the measure passes, there is no legal requirement that all the revenue go to conservation projects. State lawmakers could still allocate sporting goods sales tax money for initiatives other than conservation. They could also reduce conservation spending in other parts of the budget to compensate for the creation of the new fund.

There is no registered opposition, but lawmakers and other officials within state government agencies have expressed skepticism.

QUESTION

7

Single-Family Homes

IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

This question asks voters if the state should create a cap for how much land cities and towns can require to build a single-family home, relaxing zoning regulations in some municipalities and streamlining the permitting process to build on smaller lot sizes.

CommonWealth
— BEACON —

ELECTION **2026** 

YES

A YES VOTE WOULD...

Cap the lot size requirement for single-family homes across the state at 5,000 square feet and limit frontage requirements to no more than 50 feet in areas served by public sewer and water.

PROPOSERS CLAIM

- In Massachusetts, local governments generally have the power to set minimum lot size requirements for new construction, leading to a patchwork of zoning regulations.
- Massachusetts's high minimum lot size requirements have suppressed the construction of smaller, lower-cost homes and contributed to the state's severe housing shortage.
- Cities and towns can use lot size requirements to restrict the number of residents and exclude lower-income buyers from their communities.

The Legalize Starter Homes campaign is led by Andrew Mikula, a Pioneer Institute senior housing fellow, and supported by pro-housing organizations like Abundant Housing Massachusetts.

OTHER THINGS TO KNOW

- The Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities would be tasked with creating and enforcing regulations for compliance.
- A task force convened by Gov. Maura Healey projects that the state must build 222,000 more homes between 2025 and 2035 to meet growing demand.
- In 2021, lawmakers passed the MBTA Communities housing law, which required cities and towns served by the MBTA system to zone for multi-family districts. Several dozen communities objected to what they saw as a weakening of local control under the law, bringing a handful of lawsuits that were ultimately unsuccessful.
- Massachusetts single-family home prices were at the national average in 1980, but have since increased more than any other state. The median single-family home price jumped 10 percent between 2023 and 2024, up to \$610,000.

NO

A NO VOTE WOULD...

Leave lot size restrictions and utilities requirements as they are — largely a matter of local control. Cities and towns are generally allowed to require lots bigger than 5,000 square feet and significant setbacks for new construction.

OPPOSERS CLAIM

- Overriding local land use decisions could increase density in municipalities not equipped to handle it.
- Tailored local control over zoning preserves local character and infrastructure like school, water, and sewer systems.
- Lawmakers have also expressed concerns that this housing policy matter requires fine-tuning (around sewer access definitions, for instance) that they say is not well-suited for a ballot measure.

The opposition includes groups like the Massachusetts Municipal Association, a local government trade group that wants to preserve local control, and some local groups of residents across the state.

QUESTION

8

Prohibit Retail Sale of Adult Recreational Use Marijuana

IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

This question asks voters whether to repeal the law that legalized the sale and use of recreational marijuana, and whether to create civil penalties for the possession of marijuana.

CommonWealth
— BEACON —

ELECTION **2026** 

YES

A YES VOTE WOULD...

Nullify existing state statutes that allow for the sale, possession, and use of marijuana — doing away with the cannabis tax rules for local governments. It would also create a \$100 civil fine for possessing more than one but less than two ounces of marijuana in Massachusetts.

PROPONENTS CLAIM

- A Mass General Brigham study published in 2025 found that after legalization, rates of cannabis use and cannabis-related disorders disproportionately increased among adolescents who sought psychiatric emergency services.
- Recreational legalization has increased drugged driving incidents.
- Tax revenue from recreational marijuana sales does not make up for the increased costs on health care, lost productivity, and crime.

The Coalition for a Healthy Massachusetts, a group backed by the national anti-legalization organization Smart Approaches to Marijuana (SAM), is the main group advocating for this ballot initiative. SAM Action Inc., which is a 501(c)(4), is not required to disclose its donors.

OTHER THINGS TO KNOW

- Prior to the 2016 ballot measure that voters passed to legalize recreational marijuana, medicinal marijuana was available to residents with a written certification. Those possessing one ounce or less of the drug without certification faced civil penalties while those who possessed more than an ounce faced criminal penalties.
- Smart Approaches to Marijuana is funding a similar repeal effort in Maine.
- If passed, the ballot question would allow retail marijuana stores to either apply to become medical dispensaries or sell their inventory to one. The Cannabis Control Commission would remain to regulate medical marijuana sales.

NO

A NO VOTE WOULD...

Leave in place the existing law, which established the regulated industry of recreational marijuana cultivators and retailers. Currently, the Cannabis Control Commission has statutory authority to develop and enforce regulations of the sale and use of recreational marijuana in Massachusetts.

OPPONENTS CLAIM

- Repealing the legalization of recreational cannabis would push marijuana consumers into the illicit market where the drug would not be regulated.
- The question would dismantle an industry that grossed more than \$1.6 billion in 2025 and generated nearly \$300 million in state tax revenue in fiscal year 2025, according to the Cannabis Control Commission.
- The industry also supports 20,000 jobs across Massachusetts.

Stop the Repeal, a coalition of marijuana industry leaders, is the main group opposing this ballot measure. The campaign is backed by the Committee to Protect Cannabis Regulation, a group of cannabis businesses and trade groups that formed to oppose the ballot initiative.

QUESTION

9

Firearms Regulation

IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

This veto referendum asks voters whether to keep or repeal legislation that created an array of new firearms regulations in 2024. For this ballot question, a yes vote supports keeping the law in place and a no vote supports the repeal effort.

CommonWealth
— BEACON —

ELECTION **2026** 

YES

A YES VOTE WOULD...

Keep in place the existing law, which includes a crackdown on untraceable “ghost guns” and 3-D printed guns; strengthens the state’s “Red Flag Law” limiting who can obtain firearms licenses if considered a danger; expands the definition of assault weapons; criminalizes carrying firearms in certain public spaces; updates registration and licensing rules; and creates new policies for firearm data collection and publication.

REPEAL OPPONENTS CLAIM

- The law is a constitutional use of state power to keep citizens safe while respecting the rights of gun owners. It should be preserved as a set of common-sense gun safety measures to guard against the public health crisis posed by unchecked firearm ownership.
- The bill was an essential step after the US Supreme Court effectively threw out New York’s similar state gun licensing system.

Democratic state leaders, teachers unions, and gun violence prevention advocates support keeping the law.

OTHER THINGS TO KNOW

- The gun law was explicitly passed as a response to the 2022 US Supreme Court decision in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen*. The ruling created a sweeping new test for states that want to limit firearm licensing and possession: whether the restriction is consistent with laws from the Founding era.
- Almost immediately after the law was enacted, gun rights advocates began gathering signatures to trigger a referendum to repeal it. They met the signature threshold but missed the window to get it onto the 2024 ballot.
- Gun rights advocates have also sued Massachusetts over the law, with the National Rifle Association arguing that it unreasonably restricts the rights of adults to bear arms. In August, a federal judge in Boston upheld the provision barring adults under 21 from possessing a handgun or semiautomatic firearm. The Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court is considering cases on both the age restriction and how much leeway licensing officials should have to deny a license.

NO

A NO VOTE WOULD...

Repeal the gun law. This would revert the state’s gun regulations to their prior form, returning the weapons ban on “assault-style” weapons back to “assault weapons” and rolling back new requirements on training, licensing, and data collection. It would also remove the regulations around ghost guns and 3-D printed guns, because they were not captured under prior definitions of “firearms” in state statute.

REPEAL PROPONENTS CLAIM

- The 2024 gun law is an attack on the core Second Amendment right to bear arms because it introduces new restrictions on who can carry firearms and what kind they can carry. Repealing it would be a move to protect the constitutional right from interference by more liberal state lawmakers.

Firearms corporation Smith & Wesson and gun rights advocates, including the Civil Rights Coalition and the Gun Owners’ Action League, are the major players backing this repeal effort.