

Letter: Why I consistently voted for interim representation

Beverly Citizen - Wed Sep 30, 2009, 05:00 PM EDT

Beverly, Mass. -

To the editor:

With all of the spin and cynicism flying I want to let you know in my own words how and why I voted for interim representation both times.

In 2004, the process of filling a vacancy for an open U.S. Senate seat was changed to allow voters to choose a replacement by special election. This position provides a very powerful voice for the people as it makes each state equal in debate and carries a six-year term. This process has not changed as a result of the recent vote. It remains the same today. A special election will be held to fill Sen. Kennedy's position beginning with the primary on Dec. 8th and concluding with a final January 19th.

In 2004, the Republican minority leader offered an amendment to the bill then being debated to include an interim appointment until the special election was held. The argument made at the time included continuity of representation and constituent service, the same arguments being made today. Given that we live in a democracy where our voice is our power, I support the principal of full representation and I supported this amendment in 2004. I did not think we should choose not to be represented. The amendment did not pass at that time.

Last week, the exact same provision was before the legislature. I again voted for the interim replacement provision for the same reasons I voted for that provision in 2004. My vote was consistent regardless of who was to be the interim appointing authority (Democrat or Republican) because I believed it was in the best interest of the public to maintain such a voice. It was the same vote. My vote also reflected the wishes of a strong majority of constituents from Beverly who contacted me regarding the issue.

Mary Grant
Hale Street
Beverly
State Representative
6th Essex, Beverly