

TOWN OF TEMPLETON
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN
SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH
STATE ELECTION

WORCESTER, ss.

To either of the Constables of the Town of Templeton

GREETINGS:

In the name of the Commonwealth, you are hereby required to notify and warn the inhabitants of the precincts of the Town of Templeton, County of Worcester, who are qualified to vote in the State Election to vote at:

Narragansett Regional Middle School
Middle School Gymnasium
460 Baldwinville Road
Baldwinville, MA 01436

On TUESDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2006 from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. for the following purpose:

To cast their votes in the State Election for the candidates for the following offices and questions:

SENATOR IN CONGRESS.....FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH
GOVERNOR/ LT. GOVERNOR..... FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH
ATTORNEY GENERAL.....FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH
SECRETARY OF STATE.....FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH
TREASURER..... FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH
AUDITOR..... FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS.....1st CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT
COUNCILOR.....7th CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT
SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT.....WORCESTER, HAMPDEN, HAMPSHIRE
& FRANKLIN DISTRICT
REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT.....5th WORCESTER DISTRICT
DISTRICT ATTORNEY.....MIDDLE DISTRICT
CLERK OF COURTS.....WORCESTER COUNTY
REGISTER OF DEEDS.....WORCESTER DISTRICT

QUESTION 1: 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 Representative before May 3, 2006?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would allow local licensing authorities to issue licenses for food stores to sell wine. The proposed law defines a “food store” as a retail vendor, such as a grocery store, supermarket, shop, club, outlet, or warehouse-type seller, that sells food to consumers to be eaten elsewhere (which must include meat, poultry, dairy products, eggs, fresh fruit and produce, and other specified items), and that may sell other items usually found in grocery stores. Holders of licenses to sell wine at food stores could sell wine either on its own or together with any other items they sell. The licensing authorities in any city or town of up to 5000 residents could issue up to 5 licenses for food stores to sell wine. In cities or towns of over 5000 residents, one additional license could be issued for each additional 5000 residents (or fraction of 5000). No person or business could hold more than 10% of the total number of the licenses that could be issued under the proposed law. Such licenses would not be counted when applying the laws that limit the number of other kinds of alcoholic beverage licenses that may be issued or held. Any applicant for a license would have to be approved by the state Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission, and any individual applicant would have to be at least 21 years old and not have been convicted of a felony.

In issuing any licenses for food stores to sell wine, local licensing authorities would have to use the same procedures that apply to other licenses for the retail sale of alcoholic beverages. Except where the proposed law has different terms, that same laws that apply to issuance, renewal, suspension, and termination of licenses for retail sales of alcoholic beverages which are not to be consumed in the seller’s premises, and that apply to the operations of holders of such licenses, would govern licenses to sell wine at food stores, and the operation of holders of such licenses. Local authorities could set fees for issuing and renewing such licenses.

A YES VOTE would create a new category of licenses for food stores to sell wine, and it would allow local licensing authorities to issue such licenses.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the laws concerning the sale of wine.

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 3, 2006?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would allow candidates for public office to be nominated by more than one political party or political designation, to have their names appear on the ballot once for each nomination, and to have their votes counted separately for each nomination but then added together to determine the winner of the election. The proposed law would repeal an existing requirement that in order to appear on the state primary ballot as a candidate for a political party’s nomination for certain offices, a person cannot have been enrolled in any other party during the preceding year. The requirement applies to candidates for nomination for statewide office, representative in Congress, governor’s councillor, member of the state Legislature, district attorney, clerk of courts, register of probate, register of deeds, county commissioner, sheriff, and county treasurer. The proposed law would also allow any person to appear on the primary ballot as a candidate

for a party's nomination for those offices if the party's state committee gave its written consent. The proposed law would also repeal the existing requirements that in order to be nominated to appear as an unenrolled candidate on the state election ballot, or on any city or town ballot following a primary, a person cannot have been enrolled in any political party during the 90 days before the deadline for filing nomination papers.

The proposed law would provide that if a candidate were nominated by more than one party or political designation, instead of the candidate's name being printed on the ballot once, with the candidate allowed to choose the order in which the party or political designation names appear after the candidate's name, the candidate's name would appear multiple times, once for each nomination received. The candidate would decide the order in which the party or political designation nominations would appear, except that all parties would be listed before all political designations. The ballot would allow voters who vote for a candidate nominated by multiple parties or political designations to vote for that candidate under the party or political designation line of their choice.

If a voter for the same candidate for the same office on multiply party or political designation lines, the ballot would remain valid but would be counted as a single vote for the candidate on a line without a party or political designation. If voting technology allowed, voting machine would be required to prevent a voter from voting more than the number of times permitted for any one office.

The proposed law would provide that if a candidate received votes under more than one party or political designation, the votes would be combined for purposes of determining whether the candidate had won the election. The total number of votes each candidate received under each party or political designation would be recorded. Election officials would announce and record both the aggregate totals and the total by party or political designation.

The proposed law would allow a political party to obtain official recognition if its candidate had obtained at least 3% of the vote for any statewide office at either of the two most recent state elections, instead of at only the most recent state election as under current law.

The proposed law would allow a person nominated as a candidate for any state, city or town office to withdraw his name from nomination within six days after any party's primary election for that office, whether or not the person sought nomination or was nominated in that primary. Any candidate who withdrew from an election could not be listed on the ballot for that election, regardless of whether the candidate received multiple nominations.

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

A YES VOTE would allow a candidate for public office to be nominated for the same office by more than one political party or political designation at the same election.

A NO VOTE would make no changes in the laws concerning nomination of candidates for public office.

QUESTION 3: 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 3, 2006?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would allow licensed and other authorized providers of child care in private homes under that state's subsidized child care system to bargain collectively with the relevant state agencies about the terms and conditions of the provision of child care services under the state's child care assistance program and its regulations.

Under the proposed law, these family child care providers who provide state-subsidized child care would not be considered public employees, but if 30% of the providers gave written authorization for an employee organization to be their exclusive representative in collective bargaining, the State Labor Relations Commission would hold a secret mail ballot election on whether to certify that organization as the exclusive representative. Part of the state's public employee labor relations law and regulations would apply to the election and collective bargaining processes. The proposed law would not authorize providers to engage in a strike or other refusal to deliver child care services.

An exclusive representative, if certified, could then communicate with providers to develop and present a proposal to the state agencies concerning the terms and conditions of child care providers services. The proposed law would then require the parties to negotiate in good faith to try to reach a binding agreement. If the agreed-upon terms and conditions required changes in existing regulations, the state agencies could not finally agree to the terms until they completed the required procedures for changing regulations and any cost items agreed to by the parties had been approved by the state Legislature. If any action taken under the proposed law required spending state funds, that spending would be subject to appropriation by the Legislature. Any complaint that one of the parties was refusing to negotiate in good faith could be filed with and ruled upon by the Labor Relations Commission. An exclusive representative could collect a fee from providers for the costs of representing them.

An exclusive representative could be de-certified under Commission regulations and procedures if certain conditions were met. The commission could not accept a decertification petition for at least 2 years after the first exclusive representative was certified, and any such petition would have to be supported by 50% or more of the total number of providers. The Commission would then hold a secret mail ballot election for the providers to vote on whether to decertify the exclusive representative.

The proposed law states that activities carried out under it would be exempt from federal anti-trust laws. The proposed law states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

A YES VOTE would allow licensed and other authorized providers of child care in private homes under the state's subsidized child care system to bargain collectively with the state.

A NO VOTE would make no changes in the laws concerning licensed and other authorized family child care providers.

And you are hereby directed to serve this warrant by posting attested copies thereof in each Precinct: namely, at the Post Offices in Templeton, the Post Office in East Templeton, the Post Office in Baldwinville, at Cote's Market in Otter River, and at the Town Office Buildings located at 4Elm Street, Baldwinville, and at 690 Patriots Road, Templeton, and by delivering a copy to each of the Precinct Clerks seven (7) days at least

before the time of holding said meeting and by causing notice of the same to be published once in the Gardner News, a newspaper published in said County, in the City of Gardner.

Hereof, fail not and make due return of this warrant with your doings thereon at the time and place of said meeting.

Given under our hands this 23rd day of October in the year 2006.

SELECTMEN OF TEMPLETON
Robert Columbus, Chairman
Gregg Edwards, Vice Chairman
John Henshaw, Clerk
Gerald Skelton
Julie Farrell

A True Copy, ATTEST:

Neil A. Cullen
Constable of Templeton

OFFICER'S RETURN

WORCESTER, ss.

October 23, 2006

This is to certify that I have served the within warrant by posting attested copies thereof in each Precinct; namely, at the Post Offices in Templeton, the Post Office in East Templeton, the Post Office in Baldwinville, at Cote's Market in Otter River, and at the Town Office Buildings located at 4Elm Street, Baldwinville, and at 690 Patriots Road, Templeton, and by delivering a copy to each of the Precinct Clerks seven (7) days at least before the time of holding said meeting and by causing notice of the same to be published once in the Gardner News, a newspaper published in said County, in the City of Gardner.

Neil A. Cullen
Constable of Templeton

A True Copy, ATTEST:

Carol A. Harris
Templeton Town Clerk

TOWN OF TEMPLETON
STATE ELECTION
AGGREGATE RETURNS
NOVEMBER 7, 2006

<u>PRECINCT</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>SENATOR IN CONGRESS</u>			
Edward M. Kennedy	907	755	1662
Kenneth G. Chase	580	413	993
Blanks	29	27	56
Write-Ins/	0	0	0
TOTAL	1516	1195	2711
<u>GOVERNOR/LT.GOVERNOR</u>			
Healey/Hillman	565	383	948
Patrick/Murray	770	653	1423
Mihos/Sullivan	134	116	250
Ross/Robinson	39	30	69
Blanks	7	12	19
Write-Ins	1	1	2
TOTAL	1516	1195	2711
<u>ATTORNEY GENERAL</u>			
Martha Coakley	988	786	1774
Larry Frisoli	485	357	842
Blanks	43	52	95
Write-Ins	0	0	0
TOTAL	1516	1195	2711
<u>SECRETARY OF STATE</u>			
William Francis Galvin	1132	906	2038
Jill E. Stein	268	184	452
Blanks	114	104	218
Write-Ins	2	1	3
TOTAL	1516	1195	2711
<u>TREASURER</u>			
Timothy P. Cahill	1134	905	2039
James O'Keefe	261	185	446
Blanks	120	104	224
Write-Ins	1	1	2
TOTAL	1516	1195	2711
<u>AUDITOR</u>			
A. Joseph Denucci	995	832	1827
Rand Wilson	387	257	644
Blanks	134	106	240
Write-Ins	0	0	0
TOTAL	1516	1195	2711

REP. IN CONGRESS

John W. Olver	1039	872	1911
William H. Szych	407	265	672
Blanks	69	58	127
Write-Ins	1	0	1
TOTAL	1516	1195	2711

COUNCILOR

Thoams J. Foley	1173	960	2133
Blanks	337	235	572
Write-Ins	6	0	6
TOTAL	1516	1195	2711

SENATOR IN GEN. COURT

Stephen M. Brewer	1282	1037	2319
Blanks	230	158	388
Write-Ins	4	0	4
TOTAL	1516	1195	2711

REP. IN GENERAL COURT

Anne M. Gobi	1046	830	1401
Stephen J. Comtois, II	433	324	725
Blanks	36	41	119
Write-Ins	1	0	0
TOTALS	1516	1195	2711

DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Joseph D. Early, Jr.	1206	982	2188
Blanks	305	213	518
Write-Ins	5	0	5
TOTALS	1516	1195	2711

CLERK OF COURTS

Dennis P. McManus	1191	969	2160
Blanks	320	226	546
Write-Ins	5	0	5
TOTALS	1516	1195	2711

REGISTER OF DEEDS

Anthony J. Vigiotti	1194	975	2169
Blanks	318	220	538
Write-Ins	4	0	4
TOTALS	1516	1195	2711

QUESTION # 1

Yes	598	475	1073
No	867	662	1529

Blanks	51	58	109
TOTAL	1516	1195	2711

QUESTION #2

Yes	417	307	724
No	1003	790	1793
Blanks	96	98	194
TOTAL	1516	1195	2711

QUESTION #3

Yes	670	519	1189
No	762	588	1350
Blanks	84	88	172
TOTAL	1516	1195	2711