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GOODS:

A tight knit circle of defense attorneys, led by Mr. Benjamin Davis, chief of the legal team, declared the proposal to be an assault on the First Amendment rights of the press. The they argued, the proposal would inevitably lead to self-censorship and a chilling effect on free speech.

DEALERS:

The proposal, if passed, would impose significant financial burdens on publishers and newspapers, thereby undermining the financial viability of the press. It was argued that the costs of compliance would be prohibitive, forcing many outlets to close or drastically reduce their operations.

DEFENDERS:

The defenders of the proposalcountered that the high costs of maintaining a large staff of security personnel to ensure that no banned books would be brought into the state were simply too high to bear. They also pointed out that the proposal would ensure a safer and more secure society, protecting the public from potential threats.

ATTORNEYS:

The attorneys for the proponents of the proposal argued that the legislation was necessary to safeguard the state's values and to prevent the introduction of materials that could be deemed offensive or harmful. They also contended that the legislation was similar to those already in place in other states.

The debate raged on, with both sides presenting compelling arguments. The future of the proposal remained uncertain, as it would ultimately depend on the outcome of the upcoming vote.