

Ballot Simplification Committee - DRAFT for Consideration on Monday, July 30, 2012

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

The Way It Is Now:

In 2010, the United States Supreme Court decided *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission* and invalidated a federal law that limited corporate political spending. The Court held that the free speech provision of the First Amendment protects corporations as well as natural persons. It ruled that corporations have a First Amendment right to spend money for political purposes.

The Proposal:

Proposition __ would make it City policy that corporations should not have the same constitutional rights as natural persons and should be subject to political spending limits.

Specifically, Proposition __ declares that:

- Spending corporate money is not constitutionally-protected speech.
- Political spending limits promote the goals of the First Amendment by ensuring that all citizens have an opportunity to express their political views.
- The People of San Francisco instruct their Representatives and Senators in Congress to pass a constitutional amendment to limit campaign contributions and spending and to end artificial corporate rights, reversing *Citizens United*.

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 natural persons 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: 190 [suggested word limit: 300]