

	ILTS	
operator of a vending machine, who sells beverages in beverage containers to consumers, with a contigu- stock room space; and fewer than four locations under the same ownership in the Commonwealth. The pr health, safety, and convenience of the public, including the distribution of dealers and redemption centers. The proposed law would set up a state Clean Environment Fund to receive certain unclaimed container state Legislature, to support programs such as the proper management of solid waste, water resource prot The proposed law would allow a dealer, distributor, redemption center or bottler to refuse to accept in Massachusetts. The proposed law would take effect on April 22, 2015. A YES VOTE would expand the state's beverage container deposit law to require deposits on contair with certain exceptions, increase the associated handling fees, and make other changes to the law. A NO VOTE would make no change in the laws regarding beverage container deposits.	roposed law would require that the regulations consider by population or by distance or both. r deposits. The Fund would be used, subject to appropri tection, parkland, urban forestry, air quality and climate pt any beverage container that is not marked as being	at least the ation by the protection.
QUESTION 3		
LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PET Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House SUMMARY		
This proposed law would (1) prohibit the Massachusetts Gaming Commission from issuing any lic and slot machines, or any license for a gaming establishment with slot machines; (2) prohibit any such ca might have issued before the proposed law took effect; and (3) prohibit wagering on the simulcasting of li The proposed law would change the definition of "illegal gaming" under Massachusetts law to incluc table games and slot machines at Commission-licensed casinos, and slot machines at other Commission gaming subject to existing state laws providing criminal penalties for, or otherwise regulating or prohibitir The proposed law states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in eff A YES VOTE would prohibit casinos, any gaming establishment with slot machines, and wagering of	isino or slots gaming under any such licenses that the C ve greyhound races. de wagering on the simulcasting of live greyhound races i-licensed gaming establishments. This would make the ng, activities involving illegal gaming. ect.	commission s, as well as
A NO VOTE would make no change in the current laws regarding gaming.	1805-BLANK	<u>NO</u> 🗲
A NO VOTE would make no change in the current laws regarding gaming.		<u>NO</u> 4
A NO VOTE would make no change in the current laws regarding gaming. QUESTION 4 LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PET Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House	TTION	<u>NO</u> 4
A NO VOTE would make no change in the current laws regarding gaming. QUESTION 4 LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PET	TTTION of Representatives on or before May 6, 2014? certain conditions. nours of paid sick time per calendar year, while employe r mental illness, injury or medical condition affecting th of the employee or the employee's child, spouse, paren ent child. Employees would earn one hour of sick time f s later. Employees could begin to use earned sick time ular city or town would be covered only if, as required b	e employee tf, or parent for every 30 on the 90th by the state

employer to work the same number of hours or shifts in the same or next pay period, the employee would not have to use earned sick time for the missed time, and the employer would not have to pay for that missed time. Employers would be prohibited from requiring such an employee to work additional hours to make up for missed time, or to find a replacement employee.

Employers could require certification of the need for sick time if an employee used sick time for more than 24 consecutively scheduled work hours. Employers could not delay the taking of or payment for earned sick time because they have not received the certification. Employees would have to make a good faith effort to notify the employer in advance if the need for earned sick time is foreseeable.

Employers would be prohibited from interfering with or retaliating based on an employee's exercise of earned sick time rights, and from retaliating based on an employee's support of another employee's exercise of such rights.

The proposed law would not override employers' obligations under any contract or benefit plan with more generous provisions than those in the proposed law. Employers that have their own policies providing as much paid time off, usable for the same purposes and under the same conditions, as the proposed law would not be required to provide additional paid sick time.

The Attorney General would enforce the proposed law, using the same enforcement procedures applicable to other state wage laws, and employees could file suits in court to enforce their earned sick time rights. The Attorney General would have to prepare a multilingual notice regarding the right to earned sick time, and employers would be required to post the notice in a conspicuous location and to provide a copy to employees. The state Executive Office of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Attorney General, would develop a multilingual outreach program to inform the public of the availability of earned sick time.

The proposed law would take effect on July 1, 2015, and states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect. *A YES VOTE* would entitle employees in Massachusetts to earn and use sick time according to certain conditions.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the laws regarding earned sick time.

127-BLANK

1396 (ES + 472 NO + 72

QUESTION 5 THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of a resolution calling upon Congress to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution affirming that 1) rights protected under the Constitution are the rights of natural persons only and 2) both Congress and the states may place limits on political contributions and political spending?

615-BLANK

