corporations I think we also should include unions because as individuals they all have a right to contribute but I think the billions of dollars, in fact George Sorios has the right to contribute as much as he'd like too but to contribute from the union as SEIU can contribute millions of dollars I just see an unfairness and an imbalance in what is being proposed here and in fact if nonprofits also contribute greatly I really don't know that but if they did I'd want to see that language included as well but right now I'd be satisfied to make this fair by including corporations as well as unions. Thank you.

JIM KING: 149 Granite Street - The gentleman raised an interesting question and I won't attempt to respond to it per say the major difference though in this particular article is that the sinister aspects of corporate donations under the present ruling by the Supreme Court is very different than the union contributions were in fact they say that the particular union whether it's the railroad workers, the municipal workers, or whomever, their name goes in as a union as a donator. Business does not, they set up phony corporations in which they pump money into, by the millions, for example I believe that there were 260 million dollars raised, the first 120 million came from 40 donors. Having spent a life in politics before I retired to suggest that the union contributions that are public and under the counter money and this is now a legalized way to slip the dough under the door. Anyone here that doesn't think that kind of money doesn't talk, they're wrong. I would merely suggest they're not sinister themselves; they may be just a bit naïve because I've been on the other side of the door and had to kick the envelope back with enormous pain to my foot. Thank you.

MODERATOR: The motion before us today is to add the words *"and unions"* after the word corporations. All those in favor of that amendment please raise your hand. Thank you. All those opposed the same sign.

That amendment fails. We're now back to the original amendment. We can discuss that a little bit longer if we would like.

FRANCES FLEMING: I would just like to speak to the original motion if I could and I have a copy of the presenter's speech and I was struck really by a part we didn't really hear that this is important to every level of government including this town meeting because big money can reach down to the most local levels. Remember that Worcester had its ability to govern itself impaired when its partial ban on cigarette advertising was struck down as an unconstitutional because it violated a corporation's free speech rights as persons. It's difficult to win an argument when utterly a word of opposition gets struck down by the court as an attack on the free speak rights of corporations. What might we encounter here in Rockport in the future we must aggressively affirm as we did in the preamble of the Constitution that we the people rule here and that legal arrangements like corporations as beneficial and as essential as they are to our economy are not people and do not have the rights of people and I just wanted to make that point because I think it's really important and he didn't have a chance to say that. Thank you.

FREDERICK TARR: I endorse this article a 100 percent I wish it was even larger to ban all private money.

JUNE MICHAELS: Speaking for myself and on behalf of the League of Women Voters of Cape Ann. We've been gathered here at a town meeting for an exercise in pure democracy. Every registered voter has an equal opportunity to speak, every voter an equal voice in making the Town's decisions. No one can buy a larger voice. Democracy is people. Democracy is all about building a majority of voters to support an idea and then bringing them to vote their majority opinion into law. There are many ways to build a majority. Expensive advertising campaigns are just as valid a method as going door to door to talk to your neighbors. Hundreds of millions of dollars are spent on elections today by a few wealthy individuals. Can this still be