

**Ballot Simplification Committee - Final Digest: Packard, Fasick, Fraps, Jorgensen, Unruh - 11:41 a.m. on Monday, July 30, 2012**

**Requests for Reconsideration were due Tuesday, July 31, by 12:00 p.m.**

**Policy Opposing Corporate Personhood** (*working title only, subject to change*)

**The Way It Is Now:**

In *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission*, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the free speech provision of the First Amendment protects corporations as well as human beings. It ruled that corporations have a First Amendment right to spend money for political purposes, invalidating a federal law that limited corporate political spending.

**The Proposal:**

Proposition \_\_ would make it City policy that corporations should not have the same constitutional rights as human beings and should be subject to political spending limits.

Specifically, Proposition \_\_ declares that:

- Spending corporate money is not constitutionally protected speech.
- Limits on political spending provide an opportunity for all citizens - regardless of wealth - to have their political views heard.
- The People of San Francisco urge their Representatives and Senators in Congress to propose a constitutional amendment to reverse the *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission* decision.

**A "YES" Vote Means:** If you vote "yes," you want it to be City policy that corporations should not have the same constitutional rights as human beings and should be subject to political spending limits.

**A "NO" Vote Means:** If you vote "no," you do not want the City to adopt this policy.

word count: 185 [suggested word limit: 300]