



COMMON CLAIMS ON CANNABIS REGULATION

CLAIM	STRENGTH OF SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	BOTTOM LINE
Legalization / regulation increases the availability of cannabis.	Weak	Evidence suggests that the supply of illegal cannabis has increased under a prohibition model, and that availability has remained high among youth. Evidence does not suggest that cannabis availability among youth has increased under regulatory systems.
“[I]f marijuana was legalized, the increase in users would be both large and rapid...”	Weak	Evidence suggests that the policy environment (specifically legal status and enforcement policy) has at most a marginal impact on the prevalence of drug use, thereby suggesting that regulating cannabis markets will not inevitably cause higher levels of cannabis use.
Regulation will not reduce drug crime.	Weak	Given that the prohibition of cannabis has not been shown to reduce illegal supply, it is likely that cannabis regulation is more effective at minimizing criminal markets for cannabis, despite the fact that criminal markets will continue to represent a proportion of the total market.
“We are going to have a lot more people stoned on the highway and there will be consequences.”	Weak	While experimental studies suggest that cannabis intoxication reduces motor skills and likely increases the risk of motor vehicle collisions, there is not sufficient data to suggest that cannabis regulation would increase impaired driving, and thereby traffic fatalities.
Regulation promotes drug tourism.	Weak	While evidence suggests that, depending on the use of regulatory controls and geographic setting, regulation may in some cases lead to an increase in drug tourism, the data do not suggest that this is an inevitable consequence of regulation.
Regulation leads to a “Big Marijuana” scenario.	Weak	Available evidence regarding “Big Marijuana” is currently lacking, though regulatory controls can be introduced within regulatory systems to reduce the potential of profit maximization by cannabis retailers.