

Below is an email from Marty Stephens from his Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints email account ("ldschurch.org"), dated June 7, 2018.

1. The email evidences the effort of Mr. Stephens and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints to derail Proposition 2, even though Proposition 2 required a majority of votes to pass. The anti-democratic implications of Mr. Stephens's letter are manifest.
2. Mr. Stephens's and his employer's disregard for the democratic process is palpable in their effort to undermine an initiative that was going to be placed on the ballot according to the intent of the Utah Constitution that (1) **the people** are to have the legislative power to pass laws pursuant to initiatives or referendums and (2) The Church of Jesus Christ shall not have control of the State or interfere in its functions.
3. Mr. Stephens clearly contemplates, presumptuously and anti-democratically, that he and The Church of Jesus Christ are not going to accept the result if a majority of voters support Proposition 2 (which they did). He threatens a "long political and legislative fight that lies ahead if we cannot find some room to work together;" *i.e.*, if the initiative goes to a vote and the majority of voters support it.
4. Mr. Stephens purports to be among a group of insiders that will decide "how and when we involve elected officials, the medical association, and other community groups"
5. Mr. Stephens, although writing apparently as a representative of The Church of Jesus Christ, describes what he calls his "personal goals" in substituting his and his employer's ideas of what best serves the public for the views and votes of a majority of voters.
6. Mr. Stephens threatens a "5-10 million dollar" expenditure "fighting about this initiative." That amount would presumably come from fundraising efforts among its wealthy members by The Church of Jesus Christ.
7. Mr. Stephens seeks to control the composition of the group that would meet about undermining Proposition 2 and proposes "keeping everything confidential for now;" *i.e.*, hiding from public exposure the secret efforts

- of The Church of Jesus Christ to stop Proposition 2 from being presented to voters.
8. Mr. Stephens suggests that if a chosen group of people and organizations can agree to what The Church of Jesus Christ will accept, contrary to the proposal in Proposition 2, Mr. Stephens (the representative of the Church of Jesus Christ) (and no one else) “will take that document to Church leaders, the UMA, the S.L. Chamber (which apparently is inclined to push for legislative proposals, such as the two-party recording bill, on behalf of The Church of Jesus Christ^[1]), legislative leaders and the Governor’s office and try to get their support as well.”
 9. The hand-picked “supporting groups would then call upon the Governor to call a special session of the legislature to draft a bill” vastly different than Proposition 2.
 10. Finally, Mr. Stephens makes clear that if the select group can get everything done “before the election” they can “join forces in messaging that . . . there is no need for the initiative.” In other words, the intent was for these few powerful people and institutions, meeting at the behest of The Church of Jesus Christ, would substitute their will for the will of **the people**.
 11. Mr. Stephens suggested the closed group would meet at the offices of The Church of Jesus Christ, but noted that he would “consider” meeting somewhere else “that will be private.”
 12. Mr. Stephens concluded with the implicit threat that if there were not an agreement reached among the closed, secret group, “[t]here are things organizing behind the scenes that will make a compromise difficult in the not too distant future.”

This email not only displays an arrogance of power and control, but a disdain for the democratic process and a reflection of domination of and interference in State government by The Church of Jesus Christ, in violation of Article I, Section 4 of the Utah Constitution.

Good morning!

Thank you for the opportunity to get to know each of you better yesterday. I've spent a lot of time since we met trying to see a path forward and how we could perhaps be of help to each other and avoid this long political and legislative fight that lies ahead if we cannot find some room to work together.

I also have given considerable thought to how and when we involve elected officials, the medical association, and other community groups that are lining up both in opposition and in support of the initiative and are gearing up for the campaign.

First of all, my personal goals in this effort are the following in order:

1. Protect the children of our state from increased exposure to marijuana or and other harmful drug.
2. Allow access to those with true medical needs to the medications they need including marijuana based medications.
3. Prevent, if possible, the 5-10 million dollar waste of money in fighting about this initiative by finding a compromise that will allow the truly medical needy access to the medications they need, while strictly controlling access to minors and those without medical needs.

I would propose the following:

1. Let's meet together just as this group that was together yesterday, keeping everything confidential for now, and see if we can come to agreement on what a path forward might look like. I would like to see if we can work as quickly as possible as I will be out of town most of the month of July.
2. I think we should not try and write the legislation, but try and come up with a document that we can both agree to that would list the key components that whatever piece of legislation was passed would need to contain in order to have our joint support.
3. If we are able to do that, I will take that document to Church leaders, the UMA, the S.L. Chamber, legislative leaders and the Governor's office and try to get their support as well. You also would share it with your key allies and see if we can build a broader coalition.
4. The supporting groups would then call upon the Governor to call a special session of the legislature to draft a bill which would be based on the principles in our joint agreement.
5. If we are able to accomplish all of that before the election we would all join forces in messaging that the medical needs have been taken care of and that there is no need for the initiative.

If these basics seem like a good framework to work from, I would propose we meet soon with our respective lists of concerns with the initiative and basic requirements that would need to be in any agreement. We probably will need to block out 2-3 hours for the next meeting. I am happy to host you here or if you have somewhere else you'd like to meet that will be private I'd be happy to consider that.

Time is of the essence in seeing if we can come to an agreement. There are things organizing behind the scenes that will make a compromise difficult in the not too distant future.

I have the following times available in the next few days:
Monday at noon, I'd be happy to have a light lunch brought in.
Tuesday at 9:00 am.

Please let me know if you have an interest in proceeding.

I think we have a wonderful opportunity to do something special here in Utah to help those in need, protect our children, and avoid what is sure to be a very divisive and costly battle.

I am committed to working with you as a trusted partner to get this done.

Marty