

Town of Hanson
542 Liberty Street, Hanson, MA 02341

State Election - Nov. 7, 2006

State Election November 7, 2006				
	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	Total
SENATOR IN CONGRESS				
Edward M. Kennedy - Democrat	779	799	779	2357
Kenneth G. Chase - Republican	509	552	566	1627
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	39	41	40	120
GOVERNOR & LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR				
Healy and Hillman - Republican	582	641	623	1846
Patrick and Murray - Democrat	605	563	550	1718
Mihos and Sullivan - Independent	114	149	180	443
Ross and Robinson - Green-Rainbow	14	18	16	48
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	12	21	16	49
ATTORNEY GENERAL				
Martha Coakley - Democrat	842	846	869	2557
Larry Frisoli - Republican	428	493	457	1378
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	57	53	59	169
SECRETARY OF STATE				
William Francis Galvin - Democrat	1024	1044	1030	3098
Jill E. Stein - Green-Rainbow	165	209	204	578
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	138	139	151	428
TREASURER				
Timothy P. Cahill - Democrat	1038	1060	1061	3159
James O'Keefe - Green-Rainbow	153	198	182	533
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	136	134	142	412
AUDITOR				
A. Joseph DeNucci - Democrat	953	948	914	2815
Rand Wilson - Working Families	226	286	313	825
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
	148	158	158	464

Blanks				
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS 9th District				
Stephen F. Lynch - Democrat	849	0	875	1724
Jack E. Robinson - Republican	405	0	436	841
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	73	0	74	147
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS - 10th District				
William D. Delahunt - Democrat	0	833	0	833
Jeffrey K Beatty - Republican	0	407	0	407
Peter A. White - Independent	0	99	0	99
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	0	53	0	53
COUNCILLOR - 4th District				
Christopher A. Iannella - Democrat	977	1020	1016	3013
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	350	372	369	1091
SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT - 2nd Ply & Bristol				
Robert S. Creedon Jr. - Democrat	991	1039	1040	3070
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	336	353	345	1034
REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT 6th Ply				
Daniel K. Webster - Republican	690	716	738	2144
Greg Hanley - Democrat	614	653	615	1882
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	23	23	32	78
DISTRICT ATTORNEY - Plymouth District				
Timothy J. Cruz - Republican	1031	1062	1083	3176
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	296	330	302	928
CLERK OF COURTS - Plymouth County				
Francis R. Powers - Democrat	702	717	707	2126
Frederick M. McDermott - Republican	518	558	569	1645
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	107	117	109	333
REGISTER OF DEEDS - Plymouth District				
John R. Buckley Jr. - Democrat	1004	1054	1045	3103
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	323	338	340	1001
COUNTY COMMISSIONER - Plymouth County				
Timothy J. McMullen - Democrat	751	794	778	2323

John P. Cafferty - Republican	418	441	448	1307
Thomas Jones - Unenrolled	47	53	53	153
Write-ins(scattered)	0	0	0	0
Blanks	111	104	106	321
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 Representatives 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 Beverages 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, the same laws that apply to issuance, renewal, suspension and termination of licenses for retail sales of alcoholic beverages which are not to be consumed on 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.				
<i>A YES VOTE</i> would create a new category of licenses for food stores to sell wine, and it would allow local licensing authorities to issue such licenses.				
<i>A NO VOTE</i> would make no change in the laws concerning the sale of wine.	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	Total
Yes	520	469	548	1537
No	772	870	779	2421
Blanks	35	53	58	146
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 court, 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 requirement 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 voted for the same candidate for the same office on multiple 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 machines 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 change in the laws concerning nomination of candidates for public office.	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	Total
Yes	424	387	374	1185
No	812	893	916	2621
Blanks	91	112	95	298
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 the state's subsidized child care system to bargain collectively with the relevant state agencies about all 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. Parts 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 provider 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 actions 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 change in the laws concerning licensed and other authorized family child care providers.	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	Total
Yes	556	603	576	1735
No	680	687	707	2074
Blanks	91	102	102	295

[illegible]