



MULTNOMAH COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY 2020 CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE

Candidate: Mike Schmidt

1. To build trust between law enforcement and immigrant communities and thereby increase community safety, we must protect access to justice and our courts for everyone. The current Multnomah County District Attorney said that undocumented immigrants could be safe reporting crime or showing up in court because the DA's office would not communicate with federal immigration enforcement, yet records [show](#) that the current DA's office did in fact share information about people with Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Will you commit to "immigration-safe" policies, including adopting, publishing and enforcing a non-cooperation and non-reporting policy with federal immigration authorities in Multnomah County in your first 100 days?

Please answer "Yes" or "No" and provide an explanation.

Yes. The job of a district attorney is to keep their community safe, and I believe that the Trump administration's immigration crackdowns do not make our community safer. Earlier this year, I wrote a [piece on Medium.com](#) in response to US Attorney Billy Williams' statement that sanctuary city policies make us less safe. I strongly disagree. Everyone in Multnomah County should feel safe interacting with law enforcement and visiting our courthouses, whether it be as a victim of a crime, a witness to a crime, or as a defendant.

2. Additionally, the district attorney must be mindful of collateral consequences that result from their charging decisions, including avoiding harmful immigration consequences for people who otherwise meet their criminal justice obligations to Oregon's community. Will you commit to adopting a written policy that encourages prosecutors to always consider immigration-related consequences of prosecutorial decisions at all stages of a case (charging, considering civil compromises, plea negotiation practices, sentencing recommendations and post-conviction practices); protect from public disclosure a person's immigration status; and to reach immigration-safe dispositions where possible?

Please answer "Yes" or "No" and provide an explanation.

Yes. [In the platform I published at the beginning of this campaign](#), I pledged to consider the immigration consequences of the district attorney's office's decisions.

3. The District Attorney has a critical role to play in ensuring police officers are held accountable. To avoid conflicts of interest between police and prosecutors, do you agree to create and use independent reviews of police misconduct, including police shootings?

Please answer “Yes” or “No” and provide an explanation.

Yes. My preference would be to have an outside agency handle these investigations, such as the Oregon Attorney General’s office. It is important for the legitimacy of the office to avoid both conflicts of interest and the appearance thereof in these cases.

4. Mandatory minimum sentences have driven high incarceration rates and racial disparities in Oregon’s criminal justice system for decades. Do you commit to advocating for the repeal of mandatory minimum laws, including Measure 11?

Please answer "Yes" (and your specific goal) or "No" and provide an explanation.

Yes. [I have spoken out against Measure 11](#) and mandatory minimums, in general, throughout this campaign. I believe in our adversarial system. We should trust judges to evaluate cases and make sentencing decisions based upon the prosecutor’s case and the defense attorney’s arguments, keeping the circumstances of the victims in mind.

5. Money bail is often set at levels that are far too high for many people or their families to afford to pay. Will you commit to supporting local and statewide policies that eliminate requests for cash bail as a sole condition of release and ensure that nobody languishes in jail because they cannot afford to pay for their freedom?

Please answer “Yes” or “No” and provide an explanation.

Yes. I was the first candidate in this race to [oppose cash bail](#). I believe it is fundamentally unfair to hold people in jail simply because they cannot afford to post bail. On the other hand, we also know that sometimes people who are dangerous *do* have the resources to post bail and get released - so the policy fails on both sides.

In addition to these five questions, I would add that two clear areas of distinction between myself and my opponent are the death penalty and support of Initiative Petition 44 (the Drug Addiction Treatment and Recovery Act). I began this campaign by [pledging to never seek the death penalty if elected](#). My opponent has said he will continue to seek it, despite the current moratorium and it’s exorbitant cost and potential for racial bias in its application. I have also endorsed IP44, because I believe that we shouldn’t criminalize people who have a disease and need treatment. My opponent has stated in multiple venues that he does not support the measure.