



P.O. Box 18741
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55418

Sensible policies, safer communities.

Dear Candidate,

Sensible Minnesota is a non-partisan charitable non-profit dedicated to educating the public on the uses, benefits, and relative safety of cannabis; supporting persons harmed by prohibition; and advocating for sensible policy changes. In partnership with Students for Sensible Drug Policy ("SSDP") we have developed the enclosed survey. SSDP is an international non-profit advocacy and education organization focused on reforming drug policy; SSDP is the only international network of students dedicated to ending the war on drugs. SSDP has campus chapters at Hamline University, University of Minnesota - Twin Cities, and Mankato State University.

The enclosed survey on drug policy in Minnesota hopes to provide some insight into your views on drug policy reform in Minnesota. By answering "yes" or "no" to a number of important questions, you can give Minnesotans a clear view on where you stand on the issues. Sensible Minnesota will publish the results in full, without commentary, as we receive them, so your prompt response is appreciated.

We would appreciate your answers no later than Friday, January 12, 2017. If we have not received your response by the date, we will follow-up with a phone call to your campaign headquarters. You can return your surveys by mail to Sensible Minnesota, P.O. Box 18741, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55418 or by email: survey@sensible.mn.

This survey, and the associated publication, is a joint effort between Sensible Minnesota and Students for Sensible Drug Policy ("SSDP").

If you have any questions, or need any additional information to complete the survey, please contact Gunnar Aas, Sensible Minnesota's SSDP Liaison, by email: gunnar@sensible.mn or phone: 218-343-0501.

Warm Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Maren Schroeder".

Maren Schroeder
President, Sensible Minnesota

Gubernatorial Voters Guide Survey

1. Do you support the expansion of medical cannabis in Minnesota to include the following:

a. Additional producers and retail locations?

Yes No Undecided

b. Access to whole plant cannabis?

Yes No Undecided

c. Expanded conditions, including the addition of chronic pain?

Yes No Undecided

d. Home cultivation for patients?

Yes No Undecided

2. Do you support adult-use (recreational) cannabis legalization?

Yes No Undecided

3. If you support adult-use cannabis legalization, would you support inclusion of the following provisions:

a. Home cultivation?

Yes No Undecided

b. Preference to small, locally owned and operated cultivators, processors, and retailers?

Yes No Undecided

c. Release of all persons incarcerated for cannabis-related offenses?

Yes No Undecided

d. Expungement of criminal records for cannabis-related offenses?

Yes No Undecided

e. Economic incentives for communities disproportionately harmed by cannabis prohibition?

Yes No Undecided

f. Regulations to protect individuals from employment related drug testing policies?

Yes No Undecided

g. Establishing a tax and regulate scheme for cannabis retailers?

Yes No Undecided

h. Allow sale of cannabis by small cultivators at farmers markets?

Yes No Undecided

4. If you support adult-use cannabis legalization with a tax and regulate scheme, where would you propose allocating tax revenue from sales?

SEE ATTACHMENT

5. Do you support removing unnecessary and costly requirements for industrial hemp cultivation? (i.e. security requirements)

Yes No Undecided

6. Will you be an ally in harm-reduction based drug policy reform by supporting:

a. Drug court expansion?

Yes No Undecided

b. Additional diversion programs for drug offenders?

Yes No Undecided

c. Making Narcan more widely available to first responders?

Yes No Undecided

d. Expanding needle exchanges?

Yes No Undecided

e. Allowing for safe injection facilities?

Yes No Undecided

f. Adding funding for evidence based drug and alcohol treatment?

Yes No Undecided

7. Would you support drug policy reform that includes decriminalizing drugs other than cannabis?

Yes No Undecided

Question 4—If you support adult-use cannabis legalization with a tax and regulate scheme, where would you propose allocating tax revenue from sales?

First, no other state in the Union has a right to the products of the farm or garden—only Minnesota. In Article 13, Section 7, of the Minnesota Constitution, it says, “**Any person may sell or peddle the products of the farm or garden occupied and cultivated by him WITHOUT OBTAINING A LICENSE** therefore.”

Recently, Democrats have introduced shameful legislation to constitutionally take away your farm and garden rights by disguising their betrayal as a Constitutional Amendment to legalize cannabis; limiting how much you can grow and requiring high license fees that keep the black market in business. In my view, taking away the rights of Minnesota’s farmers and gardeners and subsidizing criminals is not an option. Cultivation without taxation is a fundamental right.

Second, I strongly disagree with Democratic proposals to create a Bureau of Cannabis Oversight when we already have a Division of Alcohol and Gambling in the Department of Public Safety. This only serves to duplicate effort, waste taxpayer dollars and create a patronage spoils system that gives government public service jobs to its supporters.

Third, there seems to be a temptation to earmark a portion of the tax revenue from cannabis for certain projects like drug treatment or education. One Democratic proposal called for allocating tax revenue for the Game and Fish Fund, Natural Resources Fund, the Minnesota Zoo and so on. There is significant right-left convergence against earmarking. I believe that earmarking is contrary to sound public finance. Where would I allocate tax revenue? Tax revenue from cannabis should go directly into the state general fund and be used in proportion to the needs of the state and in competition with other demands without designation for any particular purpose. When funds are earmarked the agencies that receive that money become a powerful lobby to continue those earmarks. Earmarking? I disagree.

Question 6—Will you be an ally in harm-reduction based drug policy reform by supporting:
A. Drug Court Expansion? Yes, No, Undecided. I chose “No.” I agree with the view of the harm reduction organization The Drug Policy Alliance. Drug Courts do not reduce incarceration, improve public safety or save money compared to punitive models they seek to replace. I believe reducing the role of the criminal justice system and removal of criminal penalties while expanding demonstrated health approaches is the best course of action. In other words—Repeal Prohibition.