1	
2	HOUSE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE
3	PUBLIC HEARING ON HOUSE BILL 1393
4	August 19, 2010
5	University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Public Health
6	130 Desoto Street
7	Room G-23
8	Pittsburgh, Pa 15320
9	
10	Subcommittee Chairman on Human Services
11	Chairman John Myers
12	Subcommittee Chairman on Mental Health:
13	Chairman Jake Wheatley
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	WEBER REPORTING

1	INDEX	
2	WITNESSES	
3	Dr. Cyril Wecht	3
4	Dr. Lester Grinspoon	18
5	Ronald Owen	28
6	Jack Cole	38
7	Dr. Neil Capretto	55
8	Patrick Nightingale	72
9	Matthew Wright	80
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	WEBER REPORTING	

1 CHAIRMAN MYERS: Sorry, I don't have a microphone. 2. Can you hear me? Good. 3 My name is John Myers, I'm a representative from 4 Philadelphia and we are here in Pittsburgh today because we want to hear, you know, what the constituency has to say about 5 6 the issues. Because sometimes we think we know all the answers. And as you can see, we don't. Therefore, we want to 7 hear what you have to say to help enlighten us around this 8 9 very, very critical issue. 10 I know I can say for one I had about a thousand 11 e-mails and I'm not an e-mail guy, you know. I was wondering 12 why my computer wasn't working. Had all the messages on 13 there, you know, like saying look, we need to ask you some questions about medical marijuana. 14 15 I'm hoping that some other members choose to show up. If not, 16 we will just do it ourselves. We are going to get started, Dr. Cyril Wecht. Okay. 17 18 DR. WECHT: How are you, sir? 19 CHAIRMAN MYERS: I'm okay for an old man. 2.0 DR. WECHT: Representative Myers, pleasure to welcome you to Pittsburgh, sir. Thank you for this 21 22 opportunity to testify before the Health and Human Services 23 Committee. I hope your colleagues find a place to park. 24 is almost as bad as downtown Philadelphia.

Especially when you don't know

CHAIRMAN MYERS:

25

where you are going.

2.

2.0

DR. WECHT: Well, that's right. I think most
Pittsburghers don't know the Forbes Fifth Avenue corridor in
Oakland area is the third most congested thoroughfare if the
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. But we are too busy building
special conduits to the Northside to take care of the Steelers
to worry about Oakland.

CHAIRMAN MYERS: We will discuss that at another hearing. Subject for another day.

DR. WECHT: Well, I wanted to start off, sir, by saying I do not represent any group or organization. I was contacted by Mr. Patrick Nightingale who I do believe does represents an organization. I'm not a member of that group. I was pleased to hear from him to receive his invitation and I'm delighted to have this opportunity.

I am a forensic pathologist. And I have been doing autopsies since I started my training in pathology in 1957. I finished my five years of pathology training which came after a year of internship and of course four years medical school in 1962. For the past 48 years I have been working as a private forensic pathologist, hospital pathologist, government pathologist and medical-legal forensic scientific consultant for attorneys and organizations throughout the country doing autopsies including some in foreign countries. I myself have done about 17,000 autopsies in these 53 years

1 going back to '57. And I have reviewed, supervised or signed 2. off on about 36,000 additional autopsies. As I sit here 3 before you, sir, I have never signed out a case of death due 4 to acute marijuana or acute cannabinoid toxicity, not one. Nor have I seen in the 36,000 other cases such a diagnosis as 5 6 the cause of death. I have seen references to acute 7 cannabinoid toxicity based upon the level of THC, delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol found in the postmortem 8 toxicological analyses, but just as a kind of an incidental 9 10 finding. 11 With all due respect to my colleagues in medicine, 12 all the clinicians whether they are the pediatricians, 13 internists, neurologists, psychiatrists and then psychologists 14 and then sociologists, etc. who have valid opinions, I'm not 15 suggesting that mine is more erudite or intellectually cognizant than theirs, however, I do believe that the most 16 17 significant determinant in talking about things that are 18 relevant and important in the medical sphere are death, mortality and morbidity. That is the bottom line. The rest 19 2.0 of the stuff is interesting and exciting and relevant and 21 intellectually challenging, but let's get down to what kills 22 people. 23 So, here I'm sitting and I do autopsies currently, I'm former coroner of Allegheny County but not now. 24 25 autopsies for coroners in four surrounding counties. About 40 percent of the autopsies that I do for these four counties are cases of acute combined drug toxicity. Two to eight drugs, you can just right across the board.

2.

2.0

These are the drugs that are killing. And the fascinating irony and if it weren't so serious it would almost be ludicrous and humorous is that these drugs are all legal.

I love it when the news media people, many of whom I have a chance to deal with nationally on these shows and they start off by saying that so and so died and no illicit drugs were found. What they mean is that all the drugs that were found were prescribed, so, that means everything is okay.

Well, no, people aren't dying that many now from heroin, shoot them up in the back alley in the middle of the night in some area of the metropolitan zone. They are dying from drugs like the various analgesics that are all legal, morphine, demerol, fentanyl and Pantopon and methadone, and then the new ones Vicodin and Hycodan and so on. These are powerful drugs. I mean, you know, I remember taking one of these drugs had some kind of knee or ankle problem and so on and my wife is telling me later on in the restaurant everybody was looking at me like I was totally spaced out.

We went to a movie that night, a movie I wanted to see very much, JFK, which I had something to do with. And I didn't know a thing, I didn't even know I had been to the movie. These are powerful drugs.

Then you have all of the tranquilizer and you have all of the antidepressants, then you have all the anxiolytic drugs. And these are the drugs that are killing people. They are not limited to Anna Nicole Smith, her son Daniel Smith or Michael Jackson or Heath Ledger. These are drugs that are found with everyday people, you know, you and me and our neighbors and our friends. Nobody knows about it because we are not Anna Nicole Smith and Michael Jackson. We are just plain, ordinary folks.

2.

2.0

So the idea of restricting a drug which can have therapeutic medicinal purposes in specific instances which does not lead to morbidity and mortality, just makes no sense when all of these other drugs are accepted and are out there. Medical marijuana prescribed in appropriate fashion for people with metastatic malignancies, carcinomas, and other kinds of diseases lymphoma, sarcoma, etc., people with advanced AIDS, HIV, people with severe glaucoma, people with various neurological disorders like amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, so on, there have been proven benefits.

They are ameliorative, they are not curative. But they help these people and they ease the physical and emotional pain and suffering.

It makes no sense at all to withhold this drug. I believe that the basis, Representative Myers, for this especially people of my generation, much more so than now

days, they don't even realize it, is we were inculcated with 1 2. this propaganda that emanated from Washington D.C., it was a guy named Harry Anslinger, and he was the federal czar and he 3 4 was interested essentially only in marijuana. Well, heroin was out there, it was viewed as a problem for 5 6 African-Americans. This is just something blacks were doing 7 in ghetto areas. But marijuana, now it is getting into our high schools and it is affecting the little girls and boys and 8 so on. I remember I grew up in what we call the Hill District 9 10 and used to walk up to play ball at the Irene Kaufmann 11 Settlement, and there were two movie houses the one was called 12 the Roosevelt and I remember as if I saw it yesterday a 13 picture with a pretty little girl and, of course, in those days it was just incredible her skirt was two inches above the 14 15 knee. That was, you know, the name of the movie was Reefer 16 Madness. And this is what was sold, and this is the 17 18 philosophy, the attitude. If you go to older people, you ask

philosophy, the attitude. If you go to older people, you ask them what is your problem, what is your hang up, man, well, marijuana, you know, it is a terrible, horrible drug. And I think that we have to get over that mindset.

There are I think 14 states as of this time who have adopted this kind of legalized utilization of marijuana. As you know, in California they are pushing for total legalization. In some other countries of the world they have done that. In

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

many of the western nations which we would think of in a comparable sense to ours from an overall social-political-economic fashion, England, Italy, Israel, so forth, you know, marijuana has been used legally and so on.

I'm not here to suggest that we become another Amsterdam, Holland where people line up to buy marijuana like buying a pack of cigarettes. I'm not suggesting that.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

But I do think the time has come for us to get over this hang up for which there is no sound pathological, clinical, experiential basis and say that marijuana should be available on a legalized basis prescribed by physicians. Now, it is going to be a step-by-step procedure. I think eventually and similar to alcohol and prohibition, people will come to realize the drug should not be criminalized at all. But taking it one step at a time and addressing in focused fashion upon House Bill 1393 which you an your colleagues are dealing with, this I think is the subject for the day. So, I urge you, the Pennsylvania Legislature beginning with your committee and then General Assembly and State Senate to adopt this. I know that Pennsylvania, because I have been involved in the medical-legal field in various fashion, various fashions and context that we have not been among the leaders in a lot of things which I considered to be appropriate and necessary. But eventually we get there. So, I would suggest in the words of a wise philosopher whose

name I think was perhaps never even identified, if it was, I have forgotten it, or never knew it, and that is "be not among the first by whom the new is tried nor yet the last to lay the old aside."

1

2.

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Fourteen states have gone out there. Schwarzenegger a good, solid Republican is pushing for total legal possession. And in the context I will close, I appreciate your patience, I want to say I have submitted to you, sir, and to your colleagues a few things, some comments of my own and then some interesting articles you will see by top-notch people, big psychiatrists, something referencing the use of marijuana as it has been approached and dealt with by a large national Jewish organization, getting into the religious field, so on. And something that I do want to point out that I think is very pertinent because you said in your opening remarks, what do you folks in Pittsburgh think that both newspapers, sir, not only -- New York Times, USA Today, yes, they editorialized also, both newspapers, sir, Pittsburgh Post Gazette and the Pittsburgh Tribune Review have editorialized. Now, the Pittsburgh Tribune Review, a very solid conservative newspaper but in a responsible fashion, they have an editorial from July 29 of last year, "Legalize Marijuana" which is I think the strongest editorial they said it is time to legalize marijuana, note we did not say it is time to decriminalize and we did not say it is time to legalize nationwide for medicinal

purposes only, it is time to flat out legalize the production, possession, sale and use of marijuana.

2.

2.0

And they refer to, I'm not of that political ilk, although I have many friends and respect the Tribune Review, but within that group of responsible conservatives, the two foremost icons I think if you took a vote among those people would be William Buckley and Milton Friedman, both of whom are quoted in this editorial with regard to the issue of marijuana.

So, for those people who are reticent, and I don't want to get into politics, Democrat, Republican but I have read and I'm not talking about your committee and I'm not talking Pennsylvania, but I know in other states some of the more conservative lawmakers while not intellectually attempting to defend the continuing ban on marijuana have been extremely reticent in going along with its legalization for medicinal purposes because they are fearful of what their constituents will believe.

Well, poll after poll has shown that that simply is not true. The public acceptance of medical marijuana continues to grow each and every time. And no better example of that in my opinion, certainly in Pittsburgh, and I don't speak for the Tribune Review their editorial speaks for themselves. I hope you will have a chance to read it.

Because nothing could be more dynamic and forceful than the

wonderful editorial and the Post Gazette a very strong
editorial too some six months later of last year. So with
that I am open if you have any questions, sir, or anything you
would like me to comment upon, I would be happy to do so.

CHAIRMAN MYERS: Thank you very much.
Representative Jake Wheatley.

DR. WECHT: I know this gentleman, fair.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MYERS: This is actually his hearing. I just didn't say nothing.

DR. WECHT: So he can't be fined for being tardy.

CHAIRMAN MYERS: I won't speak for him now.

DR. WECHT: He had a great distance to travel.

CHAIRMAN MYERS: He is a big guy now. When he comes to Harrisburg, he represents Pittsburgh it is his way or the highway. We are going to Pittsburgh you see just where I'm at. I don't necessarily plan to spend the whole day here, but I want to make sure that my young mentoree gets off to the right track.

There are a couple things you said I thought were interesting. I had shared with Karen yesterday and sometimes I have a bad habit of not writing things down. And I got caught on it yesterday. I was watching a judge, a retired judge from California who was taking the same position that you say Buckley and them was taking and he said the only way that he could find enough courage to speak about it was after

he retired.

2.

2.0

He also felt that the amount of money that is being poured into this quote, unquote war on marijuana, not war on drugs, on marijuana, certainly has been way off the mark.

He had talked about the guy's name, Mason, Mason. Mason is locked up in jail in solitary confinement. And they had to move him for selling drugs. Mason can get a hold of them, what is going to stop somebody on Fifth th Avenue from getting it. He felt that the alternative program in there and support systems certainly was the way to go.

DR. WECHT: Billions of dollars, sir, billions.

CHAIRMAN MYERS: The number one cash crop in California.

DR. WECHT: I did not want to touch upon this because I did not want to appear to be solicitous, it is a fact that needs to be mentioned, that is that the number of minority groups, African-Americans, Latino, and so on that are being arrested and booked on these things the overwhelming majority are for possession not even use, but possession so on is two, three, four times as high as it is in the white community. And you know, that is very bothersome too.

It may not be the primary reason, but it gives you pause and makes you wonder what is going on here too. And what are cops looking for to bust and don't they have more important things to do than arresting people for having a little bit of pot.

CHAIRMAN MYERS: It is interesting you would say that because he also said that he watched his case load for homicides decrease. And it wasn't because it was less homicides, it was because there are less resources. That the money was being spent in the wrong place.

2.0

If you check somebody around with a joint, nickel bag or joint and somebody get just killed somebody and you don't have resources to put your staff on the case, I mean, the last thing I want to say to you is that of course you see I haven't taken a position on this, right? You know, but he also talked about the hemp industry, hemp, the industry. Not just the joint. I thought it was interesting for him to say that ethenol, you can get a higher burn out of ethenol by using hemp as opposed to corn.

DR. WECHT: If I may, sir, to be presumptuous enough you just you opened up the one door too, this has been a favorite subject of mine, ethenol, ethenol. The whole word drinks, drink, drink, drink, drink, drink, because priests and rabbis and ministers drink and school teachers and parents, everybody drinks. Alcohol is killing people.

I haven't seen homicides and accidents and suicides related to marijuana, but boy I would like to have one hair on this bald head for every homicide, accident and suicide I have seen that is attributable to somebody's use of alcohol, the victim and/or the assailant. And nobody cares about ethanol, that is

okay. Drink, drink, drink and drink, drink, drink that all right but God forbid that marijuana should be out there. It is so absurd, really. It is almost like we are sitting around --

CHAIRMAN MYERS: You can tell nobody in here is for it.

DR. WECHT: I don't make that statement because never touched any booze. Well, any way, that's the story.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MYERS: Look, it has been a pleasure for me to meet you, I saw you a million times on TV and you didn't know I was watching you. I don't know if Wheatley has any questions. I will turn the meeting over to him.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Well, I want to thank my colleague and Chairman Myers for one, allowing for the hearing to be held out here. I actually had it on my calendar for 3:30 for today. So I must have mistyped it so on so forth. Thank you for taking it and running.

I just have one, I came in after your testimony, I didn't really get a lot of your testimony, but I did want to make sure that I asked this question because it was one given to me a couple weeks ago and so help me understand, this is, you know, for me this is more the issue of trying to figure out the facts of why it is valuable to do or don't do it. But many have said, and I know we are really debating the concept of a medical marijuana. Some have said that if you were to

legalize marijuana, it is just a slippery slope around something that you really, from a policy perspective you can't necessarily regulate.

2.

2.0

How would you respond to the concept or the ideology legalization of marijuana in any capacity one, sets the stage up for society to start to slide down this slippery slope and where does it end?

DR. WECHT: Well, first let me address that,

Representative Wheatley, from a medical, pathological,

physiological and psychological standpoint. Marijuana, which

is a mild hallucinogen we categorize it analgesics, sedatives,

tranquilizers and depressants, antidepressants, anxiolytics,

etc., it is a mild hallucinogen.

It does not lead to the kind of physical addiction and tolerance that these other drugs, you know, you take some today and you take some more and more you need it. The first case I think I ever did when I was starting my training in Baltimore, I walked in one day there's former Steeler "Big Daddy" Gene Lipscomb. And, you know, how much you say could this guy have handled, and we came to learn that he wasn't much of a drug user. But there he was dead. It is unpredictable.

And that is another problem. So, from a medical standpoint that argument is faulty because marijuana does not lead to that kind of physical dependence and what we call

tolerance, you know, the need for the body to get more and more.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

fallacious argument.

Now, is there any kind of a psychological dependence? That is conceivable. Because people who use drugs you can argue, you know, have some psychological need. And I personally believe that people should not use any kind of drug. That has always been my perspective. Somehow, you know I grew up in the Lower Hill, Jake, I went to 5th Avenue High School and we never had drugs so we did okay, four kids 70 percent African-American and nobody used drugs, really it is another world. I don't need drugs, I didn't need it then, I don't need it today. But it is not that kind of drug. From a legal perspective, that kind of argument slippery slope, well, then we already addressed this on slippery slope business of using drugs and compounds, you know across the board. Those are very slippery because they slide all the way into the realm of Hades, that is how far they slide down, the precipice, they go all the way down there, okay? So, the slippery slope, what do you mean by slippery slope? Somebody uses, I know a lot of people use marijuana today and tomorrow using heroin. It doesn't work. It is a

So, and as I say, when you look around what is happening in the country look around what is happening in the world, etc., and Chairman Myers touched upon the economic

1	aspect and the, also the criminality and then you see all of
2	these brutal killings and so on, it is all related to this
3	incredible profit motive, so on.
4	So, these are other things we might say of an
5	ancillary nature that need to be logically considered and
6	thrown in to the overall pot that you folks will be
7	addressing.
8	CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN MYERS: When you go home call somebody in
10	California and tell them to vote for Proposition 19. I
11	probably shouldn't have said that so anybody from the press
12	office.
13	Okay, we are going to have Dr. Lester Grinspoon be
14	our next presenter.
15	DR. GRINSPOON: Hello. I have, I have a wide
16	screen with a question mark here. I don't have a picture yet,
17	maybe I will not get a picture.
18	CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: We have you.
19	DR. GRINSPOON: Well, so far all I see is my image,
20	there we are. There you are. Okay.
21	MR. NIGHTINGALE: Dr. Grinspoon, I will be
22	repeating to you any questions from the committee. Please go
23	ahead, Doctor.
24	DR. GRINSPOON: Okay. I'm going to read a very
25	short statement. The subject is pretty vast I and thought if

WEBER REPORTING \_\_\_

1 I provided a short statement and then it might generate 2. questions which this might be the best way to do it. Because 3 I really want to know what you want to know about this. 4 So let me read this statement. In 1967 because of my concern about rapidly growing use of the dangerous drug marijuana, I 5 6 began my studies of the scientific and medical literature with 7 the goal of providing a reasonably objective summary of the data which underlay it prohibition. Much to my surprise, I 8 found no credible scientific basis for the justification of 9 10 this prohibition.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

The assertion that it is a very toxic drug is based on old and new myths. In fact, one of the many exceptional features of this drug is its remarkably limited toxicity.

Compared to aspirin which people are free to purchase and use without the advice of a physician or prescription for that matter, cannabis is much safer. There are well over 1,000 deaths annually from aspirin in this country alone. And there has never been a death from marijuana anywhere. In fact, when cannabis regains its place in the U.S. public appeal, it gets lost after the passage of the Marijuana Tax Act in 1937, it will be seen as one of the safest drugs in that companion.

Moreover, it will eventually be hailed as a wonder drug just as Penicillin was in the early 1940s.

Penicillin achieved this reputation because for three reasons: It was remarkably non-toxic; it was once

produced on an economy of scale, quite inexpensive; and it was effective in the treatment of a variety of infectious diseases.

2.

2.0

legally.

Similarly, cannabis is exceptionally safe and once free of the prohibition tariff, it will be significantly less expensive than the conventional drugs it replaces.

And it already has an impressive record of versatility, a record which continues to expand. Given these features of this drug, it should come as no surprise that its use as a medicine is growing exponentially. Although individual states have established legislation which make it possible for patients suffering from a variety of disorders to use the drug

Beginning with California in 1996, 13 other states and the District of Colombia have followed suit and others are in the process of enacting such legislation. Unfortunately, because each state abrogates the right to define which symptoms and syndromes made with a written recommendation from a physician be lawfully treated with cannabis, many patients with legitimate claims to the therapeutic usefulness of this plant must continue to use it illegally and, therefore, endure the extra layer of anxiety imposed by its illegality. Although states which now allow medical use of cannabis, New Jersey has imposed medical criteria which are so restrictive that I would estimate that only a small fraction

of the pool of patients who would find marijuana to be as or more useful than conventional drugs it would displace will be allowed access to it.

2.

2.0

Regardless of the symptoms or syndromes for which cannabis is useful, it is invariably less toxic than conventional drugs it displaces.

It is most important not to make any legislation aimed at making it easier for patients to use marijuana as a medicine not be too restrictive less it substantially defeat that goal.

I would be delighted to answer questions about this medicine.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Any questions from the committee?

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Yes, I'm just leafing through
his document that he shared with us that we have here and he
talks about the fact that currently there is only anecdotal
data about medical marijuana for medicinal purposes. Can you
tell me has there been any recent information that has taken
it from anecdotal to now something more substantive to kind of
show its impact on patients in their position.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Certainly. Doctor,

Representative Wheatley has a question. He is referring to

one of your 2005 publications that cited anecdotal evidence in

support of medicinal marijuana. Is there now medical

evidence, scientific evidence, clinical evidence to support

your conclusion that marijuana has beneficial medicinal --

2.

2.0

DR. GRINSPOON: Yes. Let me answer that question first Representative Wheatley, I would remind you that, you know, in the days of Sir William Osler, let's say from the last half of the 18th century through the time when large scale double blind studies of drugs, the present gold standard for the acceptance by the FDA of a drug as a legitimate therapeutic substance which can be distributed, all the clinical data that we have up until that time was anecdotal. So, medicine did begin with a double blind study. And the use of treatments fortunately didn't tell us for example, didn't have to wait until large double blind studies nor did aspirin nor did Penicillin nor did insulin. These were evaluated on the basis of clinical medicine.

Would you believe that the first trial of
Penicillin took place in 1941. It was given to six patients
with different Gram-positive infections like pneumonia, what
have you. And all of them were treated successfully and on
that basis it was immediately accepted as an antibiotic.

Now, when you consider marijuana, the fact is that we have
mountains of anecdotal evidence. And if you wish to see a few
little peaks of that mountain, you could take a look at my
medical marijuana website, WWW.rxmarijuana, as those RX
marijuana were one word, dot com.

1	the Forbidden Medicine, there were no studies, it was all
2	based on anecdotal evidence, it was like a book that could
3	have been written in Sir William Osler's time said the
4	treatment of marijuana, of migraine headache with marijuana,
5	it is the superior treatment. It is the primary treatment.
6	Now, so, my book was based on anecdotal evidence. But what is
7	happening now is that we are getting these double blind
8	studies. They are few and far between and many of them are
9	involved, are carried on by the GW Pharmaceutical Company in
10	Britain which produced Sativex which will be a drug which I
11	expect to be approved in this country very shortly.
12	But, they have done large double blind studies to satisfy the
13	authorities in Canada and Spain and some other nations and
14	soon in the United States and Britain. Britain already and in
15	the United States I think soon, these studies show in only one
16	of the many symptoms and syndromes that marijuana is effective
17	what we say in marijuana this is a superb drug for treating
18	the facticity, the pain and even some of the other symptoms
19	like urinary incontinence in multiple sclerosis. And the
20	other studies that have been done are all, they got their,
21	they got the idea maybe we should look at this, for whatever
22	other pharmaceutical cannabinoid they developed, they got the
23	idea from looking at this anecdotal evidence.
24	And each time they have taken one of those things
25	that has been demonstrated through anecdotal evidence, the

1 study has affirmed that this has a place in the treatment of 2. that disorder whether it be multiple sclerosis, migraine, 3 ulcerative colitis, glaucoma, a whole host of different 4 symptoms and syndromes, the list of which grows as we speak. MR. NIGHTINGALE: Thank you, Doctor, any other questions? 6 7 CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: One more. 8 MR. NIGHTINGALE: One more question, doctor. One 9 second. 10 DR. GRINSPOON: Sure. 11 CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: In his testimony I'm reading 12 right here he talks about what he thinks is the real reason 13 government, the reason why federal government doesn't want to 14 legalize or recognize it as this particular drug, and he talks 15 about it because once people get to see that it doesn't have 16 any ill impact that then they would want to legalize it for 17 any and all purposes. 18 Can he help me understand his thought on that 19 process, his statement that the federal government to an 2.0 extent state governments are more inclined to not legalize or 21 recognize this as a medical drug because of not what it does 22 for the patient, but what it means for -- I asked the previous 23 question about the slippery slope, so since he is kind of 24 addressing that, I wanted to hear that.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Dr. Grinspoon, Representative

25

Wheatley had a question about statements that you made in your 2005 publication that federal and state governments are reluctant to acknowledge medicinal benefits of marijuana because of the fear that once medicinal benefits were shown and the drug was otherwise proven to be relatively harmless then there would be push for complete prohibition repeal. Can you comment on that, please?

2.

2.0

DR. GRINSPOON: Well, I can simply say well, if it is completely harmless, why should it be prohibited to people who want to use it for other reasons. And there are other reasons that people use it.

I think one of the things that you know I first published the book Marijuana the Forbidden Medicine, after you, one of the first letters I got and one of the few negative comments was the letter said oh, Doctor, you wrote this book as a Trojan horse for the legalization of marijuana. Well, I can assure you I had no such thought in mind. But, in fact, what is happening in this country now is that more and more people are having the opportunity to see a relative or a friend or an acquaintance using it as a medicine and observing for themselves how limited the toxicity is, how relatively, how relevant to the conventional drug it displaces it is not only less toxic, but almost invariably even at the inflated prices in those states that do not have, particularly those states that do not have medical marijuana legislation,

- 1 it is still less expensive than conventional drugs.
- 2 Now, I started this whole enterprise of looking at this in
- 3 | 1967 researches have been published, I was convinced it was a
- 4 | very bad thing. I am no longer convinced so that for example,
- 5 I get a lot of e-mails from around the world now the book is
- 6 translated into 14 languages and people will say to me,
- 7 Dr. Grinspoon, I suffer from let's say, let's just stick with
- 8 Crohn's disease, would marijuana help me. Now take Crohn's
- 9 disease, it is an inflammatory disease of the bowel where
- 10 | segments of the bowel get very inflamed to the point where
- 11 people can't eat and they are nauseous, and they have extreme
- 12 diarrhea and they lose weight.
- Now, there are drugs that are given for this and
- 14 | not terribly effective, and unfortunately it gets so bad that
- 15 surgery is sometimes required to take out that segment of the
- 16 bowel that has become inflamed.
- 17 Unfortunately, that doesn't ensure in fact these people
- 18 regularly will get another episode later down the line and
- 19 they will be in the same position. Marijuana relieves in
- 20 | every patient I have had experience with, marijuana relieves
- 21 those symptoms.
- 22 And, you know, so I will get an e-mail from someone
- 23 in New Zealand asking me about marijuana and Crohn's disease.
- 24 Now every case I've been involved with, I always say this, I
- 25 | say look, I don't know if marijuana will give you relief for

Crohn's disease. But, I can tell you, you could certainly, if I were you, I would try it. Because I know -- well, maybe it won't work, but it isn't going to hurt me.

2.

2.0

Primum non nocere, first of all, do no harm. That is how it is with marijuana. The only situation -- I was just talking to someone in Colorado about this because I have written a paper called A Note of Caution about people who believe they have cancer who are taking a concentrated form of marijuana and I am very concerned about this because, you know, in Crohn's disease, if it doesn't work, it doesn't work. You go on with surgery, whatever drugs you are taking and it doesn't hurt.

But in cancer, and maybe it will prove to be useful in some caners it has already been proved by a man by the name of Guzman in Spain that it does shrink some tumor cells.

But that doesn't make a cure. And maybe it will sometime in the future. The risk here is that a person will self diagnose, I got cancer. And people are writing that marijuana will cure cancer. And it has become so, you know, people who get cancer get all frightened and sometimes do, will do anything. Look at Bob Marley, he went over to Switzerland, it didn't work, of course.

But if they do approve this drug, instead of getting the kind of cancer protocol for that particular cancer which is prescribed by aliphatic medicine, they may miss the

opportunity to have that treatment which seldom can actually cure a patient, but it does. But usually is some prolongation of life.

As far as I'm concerned, there has never been even an anecdotal case of cancer which is cured by marijuana. And in that case anecdotal for me is here you cannot just, you got to have it, there is no pathological evidence for me to see before and after, before I would believe that.

So, there is no question. You run the same risk from anything. There are people who believe if they take, you know a lot of aspirin it will cure this, that and the other.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Thank you, are there any other questions? Dr. Grinspoon, thank you very much. We will close now. Thank you.

DR. GRINSPOON: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Next up is Ron Owen.

MR. OWEN: Obviously, it is a pleasure to be here.

18 Good afternoon, Representative Myers, Representative Wheatley.

19 My name is Ronald Owen. I'm here today as a long-term

Pennsylvania resident, a corporate executive, community

21 | volunteer, a trustee of a college, a board member of a bank,

22 co-chair of a subcommittee with the Office of Mental Health

23 and Substance Services, member of the Pennsylvania Parent

Advisory Council and it was formed in 2006, a husband, a

25 father and a grandfather.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

2.0

24

I am not here as a paid spokesperson for any organization. I'm not here to present myself as a medical expert or someone who has spent months and years following attempts by organization or paid lobbyist in a small number of states to get this controversial issue of the legalization of marijuana for medical purposes into law.

2.0

I'm here mostly as a father, a father whose life changed forever on November 24th, 2003 when my 23-year-old daughter, Sarah, died.

She didn't die a peaceful death. She died a painful and anguished death at the hands of a wicked and tenacious disease of addiction. Sarah was a loving daughter, granddaughter, sister and mother of a beautiful five-year-old daughter, Taylor Rose.

She was not an angry, mean-spirited person even though she was caught in the grip of a relentless illness. She was always kind, respectful and sympathetic to the needs of others.

She enjoyed life to its fullest. She didn't want to have this illness. She struggled mightily to concur the demons. But they were victorious in the end.

I'm only one voice here today. But I'm representing tens of thousands of families who will not get a voice today but who certainly deserve to have their voice heard at the ballot box on this issue. This important

landscape-changing legislation should not in my opinion be decided by Legislators and a Governor who has five months left in his term.

2.

2.0

I'm here today to voice strong opposition to House Bill 1393 for my deceased daughter whose life was taken away. For the thousands of families whose lives have been adversely affected by a drug-related illness in their families. And on behalf of our children who do not need to grow up in a future Pennsylvania if this bill is enacted where using illegal drugs, not legal drugs, illegal drugs is condoned.

I challenge any intelligent person here today to argue that this bill will unquestionably not increase abuse in our state. The focus of my comments today is not to present theories or opinions about medical marijuana, but to simply present the facts that I have gathered from my own personal review. Let me mention a few.

Number 1, the Federal Drug Administration, FDA, opposes medical marijuana. Modern medicine does not condone smoking. I have not found another medication that is smoked to cure an illness. If there is one available, please make me aware of it.

Our country follows a process through the FDA to assure that medications are safe and effective. I read of many studies that concluded that there is no scientific evidence that substantiates benefits from smoking marijuana.

- 1 Marijuana, medical marijuana has never passed safety tests by 2. In fact, in the early 1990s, the FDA allowed a 3 limited number of seriously ill patients to smoke marijuana. 4 The program was terminated in 1992 when no evidence was discovered that marijuana was assisting patients. 5 In fact, the FDA, the organization that regulates medicine in 6 7 our country issued a warning that it actually could be harmful to some patients. 8 Number 2, current federal law categorizes marijuana 9 10 regardless of the reason for its use as having high potential 11 for abuse. As such, the federal law does not allow or permit 12 the use of marijuana at this time. 13 Let me say that again. Federal law does not allow or permit the use of medical marijuana at this time. 14 15 For my review, the passage of 1393 would likely be challenged 16 as to its legality on the federal level. Number 3, the use, distribution and trafficking of 17 18 marijuana continues to be an illegal activity according to 19 federal law. Use, distribution and trafficking of marijuana 2.0 continues to be illegal according to federal law. Number 4, in a number of states who have passed 21 22
  - Number 4, in a number of states who have passed this legislation of medical marijuana with strict statutes, the marijuana lobbyists have worked to liberalize the rules later.

23

24

25

Next, few legitimate medical groups are supportive

of the availability of marijuana as a medicine.

2.

2.0

Next, THC is available as a medicine in pure oral preparation. Marinol which treats nausea and vomiting that goes along with certain treatments and Nabilone which also treats nausea. There are many other approved drugs to assist cancer patients.

Next, open acceptance of marijuana for medical purposes interferes with enforcing drug screening. Will the use of medical marijuana allow workers to come to work high? Will employee productivity increase or decrease with this condition?

Lastly, it is proven to be difficult and expensive to regulate the other medical marijuana states and the amount of additional costs due to fraud, crime and other costs will be exorbitant.

Let me relate one small incident that I'm aware of, some of you might remember it. It occurred in February of this year. A flight from Philadelphia to Los Angeles needed to be diverted to an emergency landing in Pittsburgh because a passenger on board the plane began screaming, dropped his pants and attacked the airline crew. He was removed from the plane and arrested. Travel plans of the 100 passengers on board were interrupted because of this incident.

The alleged reason for the incident? This person consumed two marijuana cookies which was double the normal

dosage that he had been taking. The unnecessary expenses to the various groups that were incurred as a result of this were high. Do we believe, do I believe that this is an isolated incident? Who could not expect many more of these types of occurrences if marijuana usage for medical reasons is allowed. I didn't have the luxury because of the short notice of this hearing of less than one week to become aware or to study who else would be speaking before you today, Representatives. I assumed that you will probably not hear today from one very important group who are involved every day in helping parents formulate future opinions, our school administrators and teachers.

2.

2.0

This influential group to our children and grandchildren need to be heard from as to how they would instruct our young people on the dangers of marijuana use but at the same time explain to them that although illegal, it can be used in the State of Pennsylvania.

How many law enforcement officers have you heard from that will support this bill? Do you have a stable of Pennsylvania judges who believe this House Bill is in the best interest of Pennsylvania?

My wife and I belong to a fraternity of parents who tragically have lost a child as a result of a drug problem.

You will probably not hear today from someone, you will probably hear today from someone that there is no scientific

1	proof to substantiate a claim that marijuana is a highway to
2	other drugs. I can tell you that my daughter had exposure to
3	marijuana during her high school years in Pittsburgh.
4	This exposure led her to other recreational drugs.
5	Has any supporter of this House Bill that is here today or
6	that you heard from in other hearings had a death in their
7	immediate family due to a drug addiction? My belief is if
8	they did, they would not be supporting this dangerous piece of
9	legislation.
10	Representative Myers, Representative Wheatley, I
11	urge you not to legislate medical marijuana for Pennsylvania.
12	Please protect our families, our youth, our communities, and
13	the citizens of Pennsylvania from this dangerous change.
14	Pennsylvania is a leader in many ways in America. Do not
15	allow us to become the California of the east. Please do not
16	support this bill. Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Hold on, hold on, hold on.
18	Wait, wait, wait. We have to have some order. We have to
19	have some order and everyone is allowed to present their ideal
20	and we all need to respect that. There will be no booing in
21	this hearing or we will clear the hearing room and we will go
22	from there.
23	I do appreciate your testimony. Do you have any
24	questions?

CHAIRMAN MYERS: I don't have any questions, I

25

certainly support what Representative Wheatley just said, this
is not one of those kind of get-togethers, you know. We want
to make sure that every individual is heard based on their own
personal position. We just want to hear testimony when we go
back to Harrisburg, you know, talk to other lawmakers and
stakeholders and public policy people and to see where we can
go with this.

It kind of reminds me of social issues are always very controversial. You always have 50 percent for it and 50 percent against it. You know, right to life, police protection. I mean there are a number of issues that we have camps that are very solidly committed to their side of school of thought. And I will share with you.

2.0

I have my own feelings about whether drugs should be legalized or not. Me being from Philadelphia you probably don't know, my son was kidnapped three years ago and I know they killed him. My son wouldn't be missing for three years, because of drugs. I have a view about drugs too. And I have a view about what I think ought to happen with it. And I have a view about how I feel about them snatching up my son and doing what they did to him, whatever they did to him.

And not having the gumption or the guts to at least tell me where he is at so he could have, so I could put him away the way he is supposed to be put away.

So do I want to see drugs stopped? Absolutely, by

any means necessary. But my view may not be yours. And I'm not going to try to shove it down your throat. When you ask the questions does anybody know anybody that died because of drugs, yeah, my son, 27 years old. I watched him be born, I rocked him in my arms. So I know the feeling of a parent who lost a child to drugs.

2.

2.0

I just necessarily don't agree on what the solution ought to be. And there ought to be a solution. That is why I'm here. I want to hear solutions. Everybody has an opinion. You know the old saying about opinions, everybody got one. I aint going to expose mine.

But I will tell you that what I want to hear are solutions because just like Brother Owen got a story to tell, so do I. Many probably didn't expect to hear me say what I'm saying. I'm a state law maker, how did my son get caught up in drugs and die? Kidnapped, his mother shot in the head. His sister shot three times. And the people who did it are still out doing what they do.

Now, if there was a stronger war against drugs, my son may be alive today. If drugs were legalized, my son might be alive today. Because we know that profit is what brings corruption.

Corruption is profit driven. If there aint no profit, there aint no reason to be corrupt. So I thank you for your testimony. I just wanted to as the kids say kick it

back with you, you know.

2.0

2 MR. OWEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Mr. Owen, I really do
appreciate you sharing your story. I really don't have a
question, but I am interested in hearing your, when you talk
about the teachers and school administrators having them
testify, you brought up this interesting at least in my own
head type of question.

You may see no reason, I want to make sure I get your perspective right, for us to in a medical situation provide marijuana as an option for patients to have, a legal option for patients who through their medical professional have the option to be prescribed that. Because that is really what the bill is essentially trying to get at. So you see no reason at all under any circumstances that you can see Pennsylvania or any other state allowing that as a process, is that correct?

MR. OWEN: My assessment is that the federal government has established a bureau to regulate how people are treated for illnesses. If I walk in tomorrow with a banana peel and say if I start scraping the banana peel on my mouth it will make me better and I have had three friends that do it, if the FDA says doing that process, I'm fine. What I'm saying is, the Federal Government regulates what is right and what is approved. Many drugs never get to the table. They go

through an extensive process. There is research, there are tests, there are studies. There is a process.

2.

2.0

every other drug. And as I say I'm not aware in my research, and I'm not an expert, that are there other drugs that allow people to smoke to cure them. I have not been able to find one. I haven't spent the last years, I have been doing, very involved in this since my daughter passed. But I'm saying we have a device to protect every citizen against medications. And I want the best medications available for my wife and my daughter and my granddaughter. But I don't want somebody who thinks they have a solution to something outside of the process that our government has established to implement it. I don't think legislators are responsible to legislate medicine.

We have a device. We have an organization. It is not a new organization. It works. Why not use that process. That is my position.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: I can understand, thank you.

CHAIRMAN MYERS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Mr. Jack Cole, Law Enforcement Against Prohibition.

MR. COLE: My name is Jack Cole. I do not use nor do I intend to use marijuana or any other illegal substance.

I retired as a detective lieutenant after a 26-year career

with the New Jersey State Police. For 14 of those years I worked as an undercover narcotics officer. My investigation spanned cases from street drug users to international billion dollar drug trafficking organizations.

2.

2.0

I'm here today to respectfully encourage this committee to support replacing the current failed marijuana prohibition laws with a workable system of providing for the medical use of marijuana.

Bills such as H 1393 when enacted across the U.S. will reduce the harms prohibition has imposed on our society. They will allow hundreds of thousands of patients suffering from various diseases to legally access medicine vital to maintaining a decent quality of life.

But that is far from the only good reason for passing such bills.

They will also help police to return to the important jobs such as tracking down violent criminals. They will save billions of tax dollars while creating additional revenue of billions more. They will remove a large portion of the obscene profits currently collected by the violent Mexican drug cartels. And they will ultimately reduce the number of underage people using marijuana recreationally.

This is a great start but it is only a start. I'm a founding member and chairman of LEAP, Law Enforcement Again Prohibition. It is an organization founded by five former

cops to give voice to law enforcers who believe the war on drugs is not only a dismal failure, but worse. It is a self-perpetuating constantly expanding policy disaster.

In the eight years of LEAP's existence, this organization has grown to represent more than 30,000 people and we are no longer just cops. We are police, judges, prosecutors, prison wardens, DEA and FBI agents and others who know that a policy of regulation and control of drugs is much more efficient and ethical than a policy of prohibition. Nothing can be regulated or controlled while it is illegal.

2.

2.0

By the way, one of these people that I'm talking about I represent here is a friend of mine former retired lieutenant, Fred Martens, also from New Jersey State Police who worked with me under cover in narcotics. And who went on to become the commissioner of the Pennsylvania Crime Commission and you will probably hear from him if you have any of these back in Philadelphia.

For 40 years with the budget of one and a half trillion dollars the United States has fought the war on drugs by implementing every harsher policies. During those years we have made 41 million arrests for nonviolent drug users, drug offenses in this country.

Nearly half of those arrests were for marijuana violations. This is a lot of people you are talking about.

Currently 2,300,000 people are imprisoned in the United

States, far more per capita than any country in the world.

And what do we have to show for all these ruined lives, all
this misspent money? Today drugs are cheaper, stronger, and
far easier for our children to access than they were when the
war began in 1970 when I started buying those drugs as an

under cover officer.

2.0

That is the very essence of a failed public policy. As public servants, we all work to ensure the quality of life of our citizens and we seek and support decisions that favor the greater social good. Let me suggest that having an arrest record of any kind is certainly a life-altering event. It will impact social status, possibly employment status, the ability to secure housing, and it will certainly increase stress within a family unit.

Drug charges and conviction will also destroy a college student's opportunity for continued federal financial aid. According to the government sources, more than 97 million Americans currently admit to having tried marijuana. How fortunate we are, I believe, in many ways that they were not all arrested and prosecuted.

Nearly 1,000 people experimenting with drugs went to jail as a direct result of what I did out there as one under cover agent, something I'm sure not proud of today.

Because of what the last speaker said about lobbyists and such, let me suggest to you that, let me just tell you, I'm

not here as a lobbyist. I'm here as a founder of LEAP. And I'm not here because I make money at it, I don't get paid anything. I do what I do to try to correct a lot of wrongs that I caused in 26 years in the State Police.

2.

2.0

Many of them were self-medicating with marijuana. I can't say how many of those folks would have gone on to have, become available citizens had I not intervened, but I am sure that my intercession caused nearly all of them to be sucked into that whirlpool of incarceration which it is almost impossible to escape.

And it was not only the fate of those individuals arrested, their whole families suffered greatly as a result of these arrests.

I would just ask the commission to think of all the people you know personally who ever used an illegal drug when they were young and then put those drugs behind them, went on to live perfectly happy, productive lives. You know you can do that if you haven't been arrested.

You can get over an addiction. You will never get over a conviction. A conviction will track you every day for the rest of your life because it is on a computer. Every time you apply for a job it is over your head like a big ugly cloud. Employers look at your record and say, druggie, we don't want you. The only place those folks can find

acceptance is right back in the drug culture, the very group we say we are trying to save from drugs.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Current drug policy prevents police from solving significant crimes because police spend so much time and energy chasing marijuana law violators.

In 1963 before we had a war on drugs, our police were correctly credited with solving 91 percent of all murders in this country.

But in recent years they have solved only 61 percent of those murders. The crime rate in the United States has dropped 40 percent since the 1990s. But even with this tremendous reduction in workload, police still fail to solve 40 percent of the murders, 60 percent of rapes and arson, 75 percent of robberies. We have far more police per capita than we did in 1963. They are better paid, they are better educated, they are better trained and they have technology at their disposal like they came from Star Wars. So what could cause this terrible drop in our being able to solve crimes? The police, judges and prosecutors of LEAP believe since the war on drugs started police have to spend so much time and energy chasing nonviolent drug offenders that we no longer have time to protect citizens from these violent criminals. H 1393 and similar bills will by implementing a system of legalized regulation of medical marijuana effectively reduce a large number of arrests for marijuana violations and will

1 allow, therefore, police to work on far more important issues. 2. The financial repercussions of drug prohibition of staggering. 3 A 2008 report commissioned by LEAP and written by Harvard 4 University economics professor Jeffrey Miron estimates that drug legalization and regulation would reduce the U.S. 5 6 government expenditure by \$44 billion annually with roughly 30 7 billion of that accruing to state and local governments. And about 14 billion accruing to the federal government. 8 Approximately 13 billion of the potential savings annually 9 10 would result from the legalization of marijuana alone, \$13 11 billion. 12 Dr. Miron further estimates that drug legalization 13 would yield a tax revenue of \$33 billion annually, assuming that the then legal drugs would be taxed at rates comparable 14 15 to those placed on alcohol and tobacco. 16 Approximately 7 billion of that annual tax revenue 17 would be a direct result of the regulation and taxation of the 18 only drug, marijuana. 19 Dr. Miron also estimates that Pennsylvania 2.0 currently spends \$408 million yearly on marijuana 21 interdiction, and that legalized regulation of all marijuana 22 would result in an additional revenue source to Pennsylvania 23 of \$88 million. So, the savings and the revenue yearly to 24 Pennsylvania could amount to nearly \$500 million.

Sadly, current policy also results in children telling us it

25

is easier to buy marijuana than it is to buy beer and cigarettes. Of course, the reason for that is no drug dealer on the street is going to card them and say are you old enough to buy this stuff.

2.

2.0

This bill will reduce marijuana use in Pennsylvania. Reduce. In every country where illicit drugs have been decriminalized and regulated, the rate of drug use has been reduced when compared to neighboring countries that did not decriminalize. For instance, Portugal. In July 2001 Portugal decriminalized all drugs for adults. Not only did they decriminalize, they said you can have up to ten days supply of your personal drug of choice on your person and you won't get arrested.

And obviously a ten-day supply is different depending on who you are talking to. So virtually nobody gets arrested over there for the drug violations. The drug lawyers both there and in the United States prophesied chaos if this policy came into effect. It did come to effect. The resultless were exactly the opposite of what they said. They said if you allow adults to use any drug they want, everybody will be using drugs. Exactly the opposite happened. Drug use in every age group went down after they decriminalized drugs, but especially among the young. For children from ages 13 through 15 years old, drug use declined by 25 percent.

That is significant. For young people from age 16 to 18, drug use declined by 22 percent. There is this fruit of the forbidden tree and when you say to a young person you can't have that, the reaction is often I think I will give it a taste.

2.0

This is not only true in other countries, it is also true in the United States. This reduction in marijuana use by juveniles has also held true in all the U.S. states where they passed medical marijuana bills or where they decriminalized a certain portion of marijuana. Drug use among young people went down far more than it did in other states when they didn't decriminalize or pass medical marijuana.

I don't know why that might happen. Maybe it is just for a young person it is not quite as cool to smoke a joint when that is what grandma does for glaucoma.

In closing, I would like to thank the committee for allowing me to speak in support of H 1393. This bill is an important step in reducing the harms of drug prohibition.

By supporting it, you are speaking out in favor of a public policy that will be far more effective, more ethical, less damaging and far less costly than that of marijuana prohibition. Thank you for your time, I will take any questions.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: I do have a couple of questions. I'm just, off the top of my head, you were talking

about the relationship in these states that have either decriminalized or legalized some portion or aspect to marijuana and the impact to the youth.

2.

2.0

Now, is that the impact to the number of youth being identified and prosecuted for marijuana-related incidents or is there some other scientific number of they had an amount they were using and the actual users have gone down, do you understand what I'm saying? Has the arrests gone down or the use gone down?

MR. COLE: Both have gone down. But there is a survey that is done every year which is escaping me right now. Frontier -- I forget the survey, I'm sorry. It is done by the Whitehouse drug czar's office. And that survey shows that drug use has gone down across the United States for teenagers. But for teenagers in these states where they legalized medical marijuana, or decriminalized a certain portion of marijuana, it dropped significantly more than in the states where they haven't done it.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: That is what I'm kind of struggling with because if, not that it is wrong, just if medical marijuana is made available to those patients who are prescribed the use of the drug, it does not necessarily make it available to everyone else. So, everyone else who is still interested in smoking it for whatever reason, it would still be illegal for them. So why would that activity diminish if

you made it more available for those who are legally able to get it from a doctor? Unless there are some crossovers and some abuses of the system that allows for folks who haven't been prescribed to get access to it.

2.

2.0

MR. COLE: It is counter intuitive but it is a fact that when you decriminalize drugs you have less use of those drugs by young people. This is true as I point out in Portugal. It is also true in the Netherlands. The Netherlands decriminalized marijuana 34 years ago. Some years ago our presidential administration thought gee this would be a perfect example to show the public and the United States what terrible things can happen when you loosen up drug laws. So they sent some of our scientists to the Netherlands to do a survey of their 10th graders and find out how many of those little rascals had used marijuana, and they found 28 percent had used marijuana.

And marijuana there, it is not legal but it is decriminalized to the point where if you are an adult, an adult is 18 in the Netherlands, you can go into a coffee shop and buy up to five grams of marijuana or hashish every time you walk in the door. They found that 28 percent of their 10th graders had used marijuana. And somebody said don't you think you better do a comparison test on our 10th graders and they did and they found out 41 percent of our 10th graders tried it.

So that wasn't what they were looking, that wasn't the answer they were after at all. They went back to Netherlands and they spoke to the drug czar of the Netherlands who happens to the minister of health because in the Netherlands they treat drug abuse as a health problem and not a crime problem.

2.0

When they asked him how could it be that where marijuana is virtually legal your 10th graders 28 percent use them and in the United States where we treat marijuana as the devil's own weed, 41 percent of our 10th graders are using.

And I think his answer to that was right on. He said you know, I think in Holland we managed to make pot boring.

He said, you know, young people aren't likely to act out against authority figures by doing something that is just ho-hum. And they know when they turn 18, they can walk in to any coffee shop they want and get all they want. So what he said what this means is that they don't start using drugs at the tender age of 14 which is entry level age for drug abuse in this country.

And he said if you can just prevent those young people from deciding will I or won't I use a drug for those four very formative years of your life, 14 to 18, so many fewer of them will ever decide to use that drug. Then he pointed out on a per capita basis the use of soft drugs, marijuana, hashish, in the Netherlands is one-half the use in

the United States. One-half.

2.

2.0

And the use of hard drugs, heroin, cocaine, methamphetamine is one-fourth of what it is in the United

States per capita. And he said the reason they believe it is so much less for hard drugs, is because young people experimenting with drug use who want to turn 18, want to try a soft drug go into a coffee shop where they want to sell them a soft drug and not go to a criminal on the street who would much rather hook them on heroin, cocaine, methamphetamine.

The murder rate is one-fourth what it is in the United States. Apparently they are doing something right. Let me suggest it is not by making harsher drug policies.

In the Netherlands, as a matter of fact, in all of Western Europe, they imprison their population at or below 150 per 100,000. In Netherlands it is 127 per 100,000. We imprison our population at the rate of 1,009 per 100,000. That means that one out of every 100 people in this country is imprisoned or jailed or awaiting. That's almost unbelievable to me.

Either we have the most vile, criminal, horrible people in this country or we are doing something wrong.

Something wrong. That is all we are talking about. And most of these people are in those prisons because of drug prohibition.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Just a last question from me,

your history as a law enforcement officer, how many of those,

I think you said 1,000 cases, direct cases that you put away.

How many of them were placed away based on marijuana or did

you see a combination of marijuana and other drugs again going

back to marijuana, or is marijuana some time of gateway?

MR. COLE: An excellent question Representative

Wheatley. Let me preface this by saying I started my undercover work at the beginning of the war on drugs in 1970. We really didn't have much of a drug problem in this country in 1970.

2.0

My belief is that the drug problem was virtually created out of whole cloth by the war on drugs. Here is the way that worked.

I joined the New Jersey State Police in 1964. We had 1700 troopers. We had a seven-man narcotic unit which seemed perfectly adequate for the job we needed to do. Six years later we had exactly those same numbers until October of 1970 when I went into narcotics when thanks to the fact that Mr. Richard Nixon had created his own war on drugs. He is the one that coined, created the phrase and got the U.S. Congress that year to pass massive funding bills that would give tremendous amounts of money to any police department willing to hire officers to fight the war on drugs. Thanks to that bill overnight we went from seven-man narcotic unit to 76-person narcotic bureau.

We increased the number of police doing that one job by 11 times its size. When you do something like that, you set up a great deal of expectation. The following year we were expected to arrest at least 11 times more people for drug violations than we did the year before.

2.0

We had to justify our existence. And there just weren't a lot of drug dealers out there in 1970.

To get most of your drugs you had to go to the big city, you had to go to New York City, Newark, Philadelphia. I was working about 30 miles outside of New York City and since there weren't many drug dealers, they targeted me the other 35 people that went undercover for the State Police against small groups of friendship groups, 10 to 15 people in a group, kids in college, kids in high school, kids in between.

Come Friday night somebody in that group, you know, they are out of school, they are off work somebody would say hey, you want to get high. Of course, if nobody said that, that was my job.

If anybody took me up on that offer, one of the friends in that little friendship group who happened to have access to the family car or something to make the trip to New York City to get the drugs would go to others and say hey, want to get high tonight? No, I got a test Sunday, I don't think so. How about you, yes, give me a couple joints while you are there, will you? How about you? Well, if you run

across anyone that has some acid, give me a hit of acid while you are there. When they come to me I would put the order in for the same little piddling amount of drugs, right? They jump in the car off they go to city they come back and when they handed that out to their friends they got to me, when they handed it to me they became a big time drug dealer because that is what we labeled them that is what stuck.

I might be working 10 of those friendship groups at the same time. Every 45 days me and the other 35 undercover agents would have a raid. We would round up about 100 people that we had with charges like this.

2.

2.0

We would go in five o'clock in the morning with 350 cops kick their doors down and drag them out in chains. When we get them down to the police station we already called the reporters, the reporters would be there to take their pictures and that perp walk and destroy any credibility, respectability they had in their communities. When we got them all lined up against that back wall, my boss would come out and say you see that, there is 95 major drug dealers we took out of your community. That is what he would tell the reporters. Major drug dealers.

We need more police, we need more money, we need harsher laws. We have to stop this, this is terrible.

The reason they did it was they needed to prove that the war on drugs was so essential that the federal people would keep

paying for the money for those police. We hired 76 new police officers that year, that first year, they were all paid by the feds. We had to make it look so bad that the feds would keep paying for it and that is what we did. We virtually lied about everything that happened in the first years.

2.

2.0

And it is a shame. It is a shame. Because those people back then, those people might have sold me marijuana or they might have just given me marijuana. You remember that quy that used to smoke but didn't inhale?

Let me tell you about it. If Mr. Clinton would have been in that friendship group this is right when he was smoking but not inhaling, it wouldn't matter whether he inhaled or not. That is a very social thing, especially soft drugs. You stand around in a circle with a half dozen people, you spark up one joint, hand it take two tokes hand it to the person on the right. They hand it to me I pretend to take a toke, keep it going around. Next time it came around everybody is getting high, the joint is getting slower, when they hand it to me I would knock the flame off that I stick it in my pocket.

And that night I would submit that as evidence, as evidence that the person who handed it to me was a drug dealer because the way the laws are written, it doesn't say anything about getting money. The mere handing from one hand to the other, one of these illicit drugs makes you a drug dealer.

1	And had Mr. Clinton been standing in that circle and handed it
2	to me he wouldn't have been ever an attorney much less the
3	President of the United States. What are we doing out here?
4	Let me tell you what happened to those young people. They all
5	went to prison for seven years because that was, that is what
6	we were sentencing them to do back then. Back then the word
7	of a cop was Gospel, nobody got out of it.
8	You went to jail for seven years, they came out no
9	education, no chance to get a job. Who they going to turn to
10	The only place to turn to is right back to that drug culture.
11	This is terrible, we have to stop it sometime. And what you
12	guys are working on is so important, it is so important.
13	CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Thank you for your testimony.
14	Dr. Neil Capretto.
15	DR. CAPRETTO: Yes. I would like to thank this
16	group for being invited. I would like to thank
17	Representatives Myers and Wheatley. I don't have the loudest
18	voice. I will try to speak up.
19	And a panel, everyone here I believe really does,
20	is concerned about the life an welfare of citizens of
21	Pennsylvania. I have been a lifelong resident, I grew up in
22	steel town Vandergrift, I went to medical school in

I started with Dr. Abraham Twerski, my mentor at

Philadelphia, I trained at St. Francis in Pittsburgh. I have

been in the field of medicine over 33 years.

23

24

25

St. Francis in the addiction field over 29 years ago. I have been full-time at Gateway Rehabilitation Center for over 21 years now.

2.

2.0

We now treat over 1500 patients a day in our region for addiction. The problem is growing. I end up treating a lot of the people that other people don't want to treat. My friends who are colleagues and physicians say how can you work with those people. I work with the IV heroin addicts who have HIV, hepatitis, who are homeless and people doing cocaine. Yes sometimes people are addicted to marijuana. We do see marijuana addiction.

But I also try to push the envelope. Until we get 100 percent success, I say we need to look for more tools in our tool box. I have been a big advocate for needle exchange, harm reduction in terms of lock zones. And in terms of the issue with marijuana. I would like to start off by saying I do believe that marijuana more correctly some of the components in marijuana do have medicinal value for a number of conditions from nausea and vomiting to appetite stimulation with age wasting, to a number of neurologic conditions pain, headaches to seizures.

I also believe that people who are trying to receive help for legitimate medical conditions and the health care providers trying to provide that should not have to fear prosecution in trying to do that.

Obviously, I believe in compassionate care for people who are suffering. There are many people suffering, we may hear from some coming up that they are suffering and marijuana does help them. And we owe people suffering our best.

2.0

Yet I am against this legislation for the reason that I believe there are more responsible ways to provide for that, to provide for medical care. I will give you some, what I think are some solutions. I know you are looking for that. We have some time and I have a lot of information here. If this is truly a medical issue and we are trying to call marijuana medicine, then why don't we try, why don't we treat it like we do any other medication? For instance, if you are sick tomorrow and you go to your physician with certain symptoms, the physician is thinking of a medicine to use. Well that medicine has been FDA approved.

How does that happen? First of all, there has to be information, anecdotal stories that say that something can be helpful. There has to be some studies showing that. Then the FDA approves a phase system. Phase 1 trials are limited, you look for is there toxicity, is it safe to continue with it.

Phase 2 are larger trials that look for is it effective, is it doing what we say it does. Is it still safe. You are always looking for safety and toxicity.

Phase 3 are larger studies that really try to tease out things like what is the best way to give it, by mouth, by spray, by some other form, maybe IV medicine. Is it, is there — what doses work best, what are some side effects. And then it gets approved. So your doctor has that available.

And if he has questions about you, he has books that he can go to and look at what is the proper dose, what are the risks and benefits, what medicine interactions does it have with other drugs.

This bill is going to by-pass all that. It is going to say, it will say no, we are going to, that is not going to available to your doctor.

2.0

The next thing your doctor gives you a prescription. You go to a licensed pharmacy that has quality controls that make sure you will get that dose that your doctor ordered. You have a pharmacist there who is going to be able to check with your database with other medicines. Your doctor may not know you are getting prescriptions of Xanax and Vicodin from another doctor down the street. The pharmacist, there is a safety mechanism built in place through pharmacy. This is going to by-pass that. And I'm saying that is not responsible.

Now why are we at this point? Again, it is a medical issue. Part of the reason has been the federal government, I think people are at this point because the

- federal government has made it hard to do the legitimate research over the years, both parties historically.
- 3 And a lot has been driven by Dr. Wecht said the Reefer Madness
- 4 hysteria. The time for that come, should end now.
- 5 I think our current administration I know is much more open to
- 6 looking at this logically. The errors of the past restricting
- 7 | adequate study are wrong. But it is also wrong to by-pass
- 8 that and say we are going to do an end run, we will go rogue
- 9 on this and by-pass the system.
- Two wrongs don't make a right. I'm sorry, most
- first graders know that. I offered you an op-ed that I wrote

to the Pittsburgh Post Gazette. I just found out I would be

- involved with this yesterday. I had patients to see late in
- 14 the evening and today. So I didn't have time to refine it.
- 15 Where I make some of my comments. I should say after, the
- 16 | week after I sent in this op-ed there was a reply came I
- 17 believe mainly from the marijuana lobby. And they actually
- 18 posted it on their website being critical. They said I had
- 19 important factual errors.

12

- 20 Well, actually there was only one sentence of which
- 21 | they said I had factual errors, and they commented on three
- 22 points. I did say use of marijuana can make you a more
- 23 dangerous driver. Is that a factual error? Does it make you
- 24 | a safer driver if it reduces reaction time, coordination?
- 25 There is such a thing called drug driving. The

Rand Corporation did a study on what could be the impact of legalizing marijuana in California which is pretty conservative with their information, at least I believe they are.

2.

2.0

They estimated that if marijuana goes totally legal in California, there would be a minimum of 60 more fatalities a year. That is a big state, that is maybe not a big percentage of people but it is certainly relevant to those people.

And yet when you for regular users of marijuana their impairment of driving lasts beyond 24 hours from their last use. So I think that is an accurate statement.

I also made the statement it may increase your rate of respiratory illness and they challenge that said it has never been proven that it causes lung cancer. That is controversial. There has been some studies that say it does cause long cancer. Most experts do believe that there is a connection with lung cancer. It is hard to separate there are so many people that also smoke cigarettes.

But clearly, this is a plant you are lighting on fire that you ingest over 400 chemicals that has four times the amount of tar and nicotine. It can contribute to respiratory infections, pneumonia, bronchitis. I think any 9th grader in health knows that smoke in your lung is not a good thing. So I would think that is also a concern.

These aren't reasons to say we should not look at marijuana as a medicine. They are reasons to say we should look at it in responsible way.

2.0

The last thing I commented on is it may increase your rate of schizophrenia. I really that is the most controversial one. There has been a variety of studies. They cited one study that just said well, it causes funny thoughts in some people. Funny thoughts can be hallucinations, delusions, depersonalization. They may not be so funny to people getting them.

There is a study in Sweden that looked at 50,000 people that showed a significant increase, a study in Great Britain of another 1,000 people looked at 10 percent increase. Especially with young people in developing brain, the last speaker was correct in saying it is a critical time in development. Harvard psychiatry show that teens who use marijuana as little as 10 times more than doubled their, excuse me, Harvard Mental Health letter more than doubled rate of schizophrenia, an area of controversy.

And the expert they used to comment on it was a Dr. Mitch Earleywine, Ph.D. from Albany, New York. A very engaging speaker, I agree with a lot of things he says but not on this issue. He did disclose that he is a psychologist from Albany. He didn't disclose he is on the advisory board for NORML. He also didn't disclose that he is on the advisory

board for Cannabis Science, Inc., a for profit company that makes marijuana products and makes, has public stock that sells and they make money for selling marijuana to states that provide it.

2.

2.0

I'm not saying that that biases his opinion but I think that should be available. I will admit and I disclose that because I work in addiction I may see the world from a different point of view. I may very much have a skewed point of view because of what I see a part of the world every day that a lot of people don't see. The people who work in emergency rooms tend to wear seat belts also.

Let's just talk for a minute about the elephant in the room here. Most marijuana use in this country is not for medicinal purposes, it is to get high. That's the point.

People don't use marijuana to increase their heart rate or their affect lungs or lymphatic system, they use it to get high. If you want to make that a legal thing to do, that is a separate issue from the medical issue. Yet, there are many other medical conditions and conditions in drugs being studied that don't have anywhere near, you wouldn't get more than two people in this room to support some of those.

And I wonder if that is because you can't get high from those things. That might be something. That again is not a reason not to study marijuana as a medical, but it is a reason to look at it responsibly.

The Institute of Medicine, I encourage you to look at this book thoroughly, probably one of the best written marijuana and medicine, big study that was in 1999. The sad thing is the science has moved very little since then because of restrictions in the federal government.

2.0

They did conclude that there are medicinal properties. We are not living in the year 10,000 BC, we are not on the moon. We have many other medicines. They conclude although there are medicinal properties to it, that for the most part there are other ingredients that are more, there are other medicines in almost every instance which are better than the effects of marijuana which at best are modest. We do have other medicines.

They also said there is little future in smoked medicine. And smoked medicine is harmful.

The active ingredient in marijuana, THC, and Dr. Wecht said, tetrahydrocannabinol already is available in FDA-approved medicine which went through all those steps that is indicated for nausea and vomiting associated with chemotherapy and age wasting symptom to help stimulate appetite. There are people who do benefit from it but because is an oral pill, you have to wait for it and many people prefer other forms, especially people with nausea. It is a tough medicine to take.

It is one of my patients said who took it said it

was helpful he did smoke marijuana. I said which did you think were better, he thought they about equally as good although marijuana is more fun. That is okay but that's not science.

1

2.

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

We also you heard from Dr. Grinspoon about side This is a medicine that has been approved in Canada, recently in Great Britain. It contains THC, cannabinol, other ingredient in marijuana. And it is very promising. It shows, a good study shows helpful for a lot of the neurologic conditions, for pain, for multiple sclerosis, nausea and vomiting, and comes in an oral mucosal spray which is a big advantage over the Marinol use.

But one thing about it though, the way they have the ingredients combined it seams to lean heavier on giving medical aspects but minimal on getting high from it.

So, but because this is so effective, I'm wondering where is the outcry to move this ahead? Why isn't there so much energy about let's move this medicine which can accomplish the goal of helping people who have these symptoms? Maybe it has something to do with well, you can't get quite the high from it.

If that's the point of what we are trying to do, is this a Trojan horse? I think for some people it is, for total access to marijuana. But again, that is outside of medicine.

25 You are dragging doctors into this. I would rather stay with this, I would say inside the ropes. To just kind of wind it up, is marijuana addicting? For some people, yes. Lifetime rates of addiction, that means having continued use in spite of adverse consequences is about nine percent. It is lower than for other drugs, even slightly lower than alcohol, certainly lower than cocaine and heroin. But for those people that are affected. With higher THC concentration we are seeing physical withdrawal symptoms in about 50 percent of people with marijuana. We weren't seeing this 25 years ago.

2.0

Now they are mild, they are jittery, not having seizures, or TDs, but they are mild. Also as far as meeting criteria for what is called abuse, for people who used marijuana last year about 16 percent abuse, meet criteria for abuse. That's harmful use. That is operating machinery that is dangerous, maybe driving a car, about one in six. It is not a reason to not study marijuana, but it is a reason to study it responsibly and stay within the ropes.

The last speaker made comments about the effects on, in states that made it legal and teen drug use and I frankly disagree with his statements. I have evidence that the statements that he was saying, I have right here and I will be happy to show them to you from SAMHSA, the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse. This is the most recent available data of 2009.

And the devil is in details often with data. In many of the states where marijuana has been used as medicine, the rate of marijuana use in teens has gone down. But it went down nationally, went down much more, went down twice the rate in states that did not do that.

2.0

Let's look at in 2006 when there were ten states.

They list the states with the highest rate of ten drug use. If ind little comfort in seeing that the top three Maine,

Montana and Vermont are states that have medical marijuana.

In fact, Maine in 1999 before it was ranked 28th, it went up to number 1. In fact, five, when only is only ten, five of the first eight were states that legalized that.

I can't predict what is going to happen in Pennsylvania. But for people to say no it is not going to have an effect on our youth or guarantee you that it will go down, that is very flawed.

One of my concerns about Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania and Maine have a lot of similarity in terms of older population, working class population. In terms of the OxyContin and problems like that, they saw similar things.

Just a word of concern, yes, we see problem with other medicine like OxyContin and Vicodin but that is within the current safety system. Can you imagine the problems we would have if we went outside of that system and went rogue with that? That is why I'm saying it is better to stay within the

system.

2.

2.0

The big question is should we cast aside the concept that drug safety and efficiency should be assessed scientifically on the basis of risk versus benefits and just open it up to popular vote? We don't do that with other medicines, we shouldn't do that with this.

What are my suggestions? My suggestion are we push for more research for pushing medicine. And I have no stoke don't work for the companies that make any of these products. Push for approval of the medicine like side effects. Look at some guidelines from the American College of Physicians. They have an excellent paper, a very rational approach supporting studying marijuana as does the Institute of Medicine. And I agree with their conclusions, that we need more research.

They also say while we are waiting for that research side effects, I can even open up the possibility of allowing smoked marijuana for certain people that are properly evaluated to make sure that no other products have been really effective for them. That it is of an urgent nature and it be studied for a limited period of time until there are better things. That would account for very low amount of people, not just open the up the door.

When I talked to my patients from other states,
many of them say it has become somewhat of a farce. You go to
a doctor, you say you are stressed, you have headaches, people

in their 20s and 30s get it because they want to use it for recreational use.

2.

2.0

If that is what you want to do, have a different bill, a different discussion. For medical use let's stay within the ropes. For stories like Ron Owen and his daughter, I think we owe it to people, owe it to the safety of our citizens to do that. And if you need my help which I volunteer for you, you may not ask for it or want it, but I would be happy to go over in more detail some of these suggestions in these booklets to do it in responsible way. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: I certainly will follow up with you because some of the things you said did have me thinking about maybe the bill, ways to address the bill try to get at some of the concepts that I think the prime sponsor wants to get at.

But to my colleagues who brought a point, I think at some point the General Assembly as policymakers we do need to look at the overall strategy that we kind of taken on. I believe it is a public health discussion more than it is a law enforcement discussion around decriminalization of drugs, certain aspects of drugs. But you are right, under this certain scenario, that is not the issue. The issue is medical marijuana and the benefits for allowing the use of that for medicinal purposes.

I definitely will, my personal, we probably will follow up with you and try to see how we can tighten the bill up to get it to that point. Thank you for your testimony.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MYERS: I will follow Jake's lead, so, I'm sure there will be more discussion. I'm sure we will have more hearings. I know about as much as I did when I walked in here. Because again, I say for a lot of people this is a moral question more so than criminal or a medical question. It is a moral question. Do you want to do it just because you want to get high.

I will go back to Philly. I will turn the meeting over to Jake totally. When he was talking for some reason what kept going across my mental state was the TV and the prescription drugs and the disclaimer at the end. If you take this drug, you might chop your head off, you might go kill your dog. You going to be stretched for 10 days. You know, talk to your doctor about this prescription drug.

DR. CAPRETTO: Your doctor can tell you what are the odds of that happening.

CHAIRMAN MYERS: You won't cut your head off, but be sick for nine days. But the point I'm making is the disclaimer, the side effects and the tertiary situations that arise out of drug use, I agree, you caught my attention when you said that there ought to be a protocol. You actually caught my attention on that, you know. Because some of these

drugs people are taking now when they decide to retest them they found out they are doing more harm than good.

2.

2.0

DR. CAPRETTO: That is part of FDA follow-up phase 4 you do ongoing monitoring.

CHAIRMAN MYERS: They had a prostate drug people have been taking and said you should never have been taking it and you have been taking it for nine years. So, I do support the notion that it needs to be looked into. When we get back to Harrisburg, we will continue to have this dialogue. There are many people in Harrisburg that feel the same way that Brother Owen feels that if you got to smoke it why would you call it medicine. Therefore, this should not be a measure or described or discussed in medical vocabulary. If you got to smoke it.

Of course, I was thinking about some of those Italian westerns.

DR. CAPRETTO: Spaghetti westerns.

CHAIRMAN MYERS: Yes, Italian westerns. Yeah. You know, where they would be riding down the street smoking something, you don't know what it is but the music start playing, you know. But in all seriousness, I'm glad I was able to come to Pittsburgh today. I'm glad I heard what I heard. And I know we will do another one in Harrisburg. Hopefully we will get some more insight, I'm serious, this is not going to go away. This is not going to go away.

There will be some winners, there will be some
losers. But I do believe marijuana is going to get wrapped
into the medical profession some kind of way. I know there is
a strong move against it from the pharmaceutical companies
because they can't patent it. They can't say well, you know,
this is Merck, Sharp & Dohme's joint, you know.
DR. CAPRETTO: We can go do it in a way to keep big

2.0

DR. CAPRETTO: We can go do it in a way to keep big pharm out of it, that would be fine.

CHAIRMAN MYERS: They can't figure out profit so they aint going to try to corrupt it, they try to keep it off the table. And use Megace instead of a joint to increase your appetite. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for being here.

CHAIRMAN MYERS: Good meeting you all.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: I have a question as relates to you, I wanted to ask you about the gateway, you talked about 90 percent of the folks said addictive, have you found in your, your practice that this somehow can be a gateway for folks?

DR. CAPRETTO: The whole gateway drug theory is one of debate and a controversy. It is true most people who use marijuana do not go on to do heroin and cocaine and harder core drugs. Of course, most people who do use hard core drugs started with marijuana. They also maybe started with milk and

water too.

2.

2.0

But we know this, regular users, heavier users especially teenagers the more you use the more likely you are to continue to use. And the more a drug becomes available, the more people are going to use. Look at what happened with prescriptions like opioids like OxyContin, you know, which is Oxycodone, Vicodin. Their prescriptions went up 500, 600 percent from '98 to 2005. What did we see, we saw addiction rates that actually went up about 400 percent locally, they went up. We have been seeing 400 percent drug overdose because things become more available.

Something that is more available, it generally trickles down and becomes available to use. It is an area of debate. I don't know if medical marijuana is approved if that is going to increase. But that is an area of concern, that is the increase being -- we need to be, we need to be careful about that.

I do know that unlike milk or water, marijuana does work in the part of the brain, the reward system and activates especially for people that may have genetic predispositions to conditions of addiction, it may make them more likely and people with genetic predispositions to mental illness, may make them more likely to tip the scales for them.

Maybe not in people who don't have that, but a lot of people up front don't know. You are not born with a report

card, here is your genetic risk. Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Sure, thanks. Next we have

Patrick Nightingale and Matt Wright. Matt is a veteran from

Iraq, right?

MR. WRIGHT: Correct.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: I thank you for your service.

Thank you for being here.

MR. WRIGHT: My pleasure.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Good afternoon, Representative Wheatley, thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to be heard. I would like to preface my comments by offering my admiration and respect to Dr. Capretto and the work that he has done at Gateway Rehabilitation.

I'm a practicing criminal defense attorney and I know that Gateway has kept a lot of my clients out of jail, not merely because they were referred to Gateway at the point of their probation officer's gun necessarily. But that they learned how to act in recovery and how to deal with the disease of addiction whether it is opioid addiction or alcohol addiction. So Dr. Capretto I would thank you very much for the excellent work you are doing here in Allegheny County.

I would like to offer my sympathy and condolences to Mr. Owen. I too am a bereaved parent. I understand that that is a pain that stays with you every day, almost every minute of every day, and sir, I'm very sorry for your loss.

I'm here testifying to urge the passage of the Compassionate Use Act or 2009, House Bill 1393.

2.

2.0

I'm the executive Director of Pittsburgh NORML, a chapter of the national organization for the reform of marijuana laws and I'm on the board of directors for Pennsylvanians for Medical Marijuana.

Professionally, I'm a criminal defense attorney

practicing in both state and Federal Court. Prior to

practicing criminal defense, I spent six years as a prosecutor

with the Allegheny County District Attorney's office.

I'm stating the obvious when I say that marijuana is illegal in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania regardless of the purpose or intent of the person possessing or consuming it. While the penalties for mere possession can be relatively light, a misdemeanor conviction for even possession of a small amount of marijuana is a criminal conviction that will remain with the individual for the rest of his life.

Even where the prosecution ultimately agrees to withdraw or reduce the criminal charge to a non-traffic summary citation, the individual has likely already incurred legal fees, attended criminal hearings, and paid summary fines.

Those Pennsylvania's possession of a small amount law is one of the less serious offenses in the Pennsylvania Criminal Code, possession with intent to deliver is a felony

with additional serious consequences.

2.

2.0

mandatory sentence for selling two pounds of marijuana.

Rather, I'm talking about the medicinal marijuana users who turn to home cultivation thinking it better than entering the world of illegal narcotics trafficking. One such client of mine suffers from temporal mandibular joint disease, TMJ. He suffers from severe chronic pain on daily basis and is prescribed morphine, Oxycodone, Valium and Lidocaine patches for migraine headaches. Yet despite the medications he continues to suffer severe spasms and tremors in his face rendering him until able to eat. He cultivated 24 marijuana plants in his residence and baked marijuana into cakes. He noticed an immediate decline in his facial spasms.

He unfortunately suffered a seizure which brought emergency personnel including law enforcement to his residence. He now faces a three-year mandatory minimum sentence for manufacturing over 20 marijuana plants. I'm certainly not suggesting that all growers are benevolent medicinal users. As I represent many legitimate drug dealers whose grow operations were discovered by law enforcement. However, I met numerous law-abiding, hard-working people who have unwittingly subjected themselves to mandatory minimum sentences and felony convictions because they believed it better to try and grow marijuana at home instead of entering

world of drug dealers and drug trafficking.

2.

2.0

A felony narcotics conviction in Pennsylvania will deprive one of the right to vote, serve on a jury and possess firearms. Any drug conviction, misdemeanor or felony also brings with it a loss of one's operating privileges and as Jack Cole testified, will subject a student to the loss of federal financial aide.

For many people who must be able to drive in order to work, this collateral consequence of a, even a small amount of marijuana conviction can be especially devastating.

Reflecting the risk of resident's prosecution facing medicinal marijuana patients, registered nurse Ken Wolski and Executive Director of the Coalition for Medical Marijuana New Jersey points out in written testimony that I have submitted to this committee that in 2004 the American Nurse's Association, ANA, adopted a position statement on providing patients safe access to marijuana and cannabis. The ANA recognized that marijuana has been used medicinally for centuries. That marijuana has been shown to be effective for a wide range of symptoms and conditions and patients should have safe access to therapeutic marijuana cannabis.

The ANA supports legislation to remove criminal penalties including arrest and imprisonment for bona fide patients of therapeutic marijuana cannabis. The ANA supports federal and state legislation to exclude marijuana and

cannabis from classification as a Schedule I drug, a position that has recently been adopted by the American Medical Association and the American College of Physicians referred to by Dr. Capretto.

2.

2.0

The ANA represents 2.7 million registered nurses in the United States and as Mr. Wolski points out, registered nurses are the largest group of health care professionals in the nation and we are, according to his testimony, the most trusted profession in the nation.

An obvious and legitimate concern for this committee is whether passage of House Bill 1393 would increase the risk of illegal drug abuse. Any such increase would necessarily impact the medical community and the law enforcement community.

A number of medical professionals have submitted written testimony and provided live testimony for this committee's consideration. I would like to take a couple of moments of your time to share some of their testimony that may address some of this committee's concerns of the risks of drug abuse.

Edward Pane is the CEO and President of Serento

Gardens Alcoholism and Drug Services, Incorporation, an

addiction treatment facility in Hazleton, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Pane is a certified addiction counselor and faculty member

of the University of Scranton. He is also on the staff of

Hazleton General Hospital.

2.

2.0

In his December 2, 2009 testimony before this committee, Mr. Pane addressed the gateway drug myth. He said, the gateway theory was found without merit in a report commissioned by the federal government. In 1999, the Institute of Medicine published an extensive research study on medical marijuana, marijuana medicine assessing the science base.

Their study was commissioned by the United States

Office of National Drug Control Policy in 1997 in the wake of

medical marijuana initiatives that had begun during the prior

year.

Weighing in on gateway theory they concluded there is no conclusive evidence that the drug affects of marijuana are causally linked to the subsequent abuse of other illicit drugs.

Mr. Pane also testified about a 2000 study of certified addictions counselors he conducted in conjunction with the Pennsylvania 46certification Board. Of the 69 professional substance abuse counselors who responded, 78 percent said that marijuana had legitimate medical use and 62 percent said they did not believe medicinal marijuana would hinder drug prevention efforts.

Dr. Leonard Krivitsky who also submitted written testimony has worked as a physician in field of addictions in

the Philadelphia area since 2000. He is certified by the American Society of Addiction Medicine. He addressed the gateway drug myth in his testimony. He said I worked for years with seriously drug addicted patients in Philadelphia who have experience ranging from methadone maintenance therapy for opioid addicts to an inpatient detox rehab primarily for opiate, alcohol and prescription drug dependencies.

2.

2.0

The only patients, and there were very few of those with marijuana addictions were those referred by the justice system after someone on parole or probation was found positive for marijuana on a urine drug screen. Alcoholism does not start with using cannabis. Heroin addiction does not start with use of cannabis. Gambling addiction, internet addiction, and a host of other behavioral addictions do not start with cannabis. There is a genetic predisposition to a particular addiction and as one can hear often at Alcoholic's Anonymous meetings, people describe how at the exposure to alcohol it was as if the switch was thrown and that immediate affection for alcohol revealed itself.

I'm yet to meet the first alcoholic who blames cannabis as the gateway to his alcohol addiction.

If the gateway drug theory were true, we would all run the risk of becoming serious drug addicts as we are continuously exposed to mind altering substances of which alcohol, caffeine and nicotine are examples.

Mallory McFarland is a medical assistant and office manager at a substance abuse treatment program in North

Western Pennsylvania. Her program has five physicians with a patient load of 500. Ms. McFarland notes in her written testimony to this committee that she has never once encountered a cannabis addict. I have never taken a patient history where anyone has ever said they were in withdrawal from cannabis. I have never had some to call to report they had overdosed from cannabis or threaten to overdoes on cannabis. I have never had a patient shoot up cannabis.

Ms. McFarland states the over prescribing of opioid pain medication is overwhelming.

2.0

Currently 20 percent of our patients come in as heroin addicts. The remaining 80 percent are opioid drug addicts being prescribed medication. Several of the patients that we treat are addicted to heroin became addicted because a doctor stopped prescribing pain medication.

In conclusion, I urge to consider the real criminal consequences facing those who treat with medicinal cannabis in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Giving them the opportunity to come out of the shadow of illegality will not result in an increase in illegal drug abuse. It will save our fellow Pennsylvanians the stigma of a narcotics conviction and will save them from entering the black market of narcotics trafficking merely to seek a proven and safe treatment

alternative. Accordingly, I urge you to fully support House Bill 1393. Thank you.

2.

2.0

MR. WRIGHT: Before I begin I just want to say thank you very much for seeing us here today. It has been an issue in the United States and in general over a long period of time. Hundreds of thousands are affected by the war on drugs whether be for personal, recreational use or medicinal use and we have to get a sense of that as a great nation in this world.

My name is Sergeant Matthew Wright. I'm here to share with you my recent experience in the U.S. Army. When I joined the army it was nearly six years ago it was with the ideal to support my government in its efforts in Operation Iraqi Freedom. I missed my own high school graduation commencement because I volunteered for deployment to the Middle East. After spending nearly 15 months guarding checkpoints and participating in various often dangerous military details, I finally returned home. From that time until very recently I found it difficult to eat or sleep.

I even encountered difficulty sitting in traffic. According to army medical staff, these are all symptoms of post traumatic stress syndrome also called PTSD, a condition very common among our military service personnel who have served in capacities similar to my own.

The army provided me with medications that did

nothing to alleviate my symptoms and compounded them with the problem side effects of upset stomach and severe headaches.

These still continue today.

2.

2.0

For over three years I struggled with ongoing weight loss and chronic sleeplessness. Tired and frustrated I began my own research into homeopathic and other natural treatments. Fortunately, I met an expert herbalist who is quite familiar with my specific systems of PTSD. He explained to me that the active component of naturally grown marijuana is delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol also known as THC. THC that can offer safely relief for prescription pills that failed. I was surprised more than skeptical of the advice to use cannabis as a valid treatment option.

I have always been a respectful and upstanding citizen, proud and responsible American soldier so it was difficult for me to consider the use of marijuana until I learned that the VA accepts medical marijuana as a treatment option in states that have legalized marijuana. Again, marijuana is accepted by the VA as a treatment option in states that have legalized it.

That fact alone prompted me to follow the advice of the herbalist. I realized that I'm no less important as a VA patient just because I live in Pennsylvania and not in New Jersey. My symptoms are just as treatable in Pennsylvania.

The VA supports treatments for soldiers like me in these

states and they should be able to include Pennsylvania soldiers for a diagnosis of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

2.0

2.

Yes, I followed the advice of a qualified herbalist, the same advice offered by medical doctors in other states. Now I have these results to share with you. My PTSD symptoms have subsided greatly. I am able to maintain a healthy weight. Once more, I continued my education, worked steadily, volunteered to local armed forces recruitment centers and even promoted to sergeant in the United States Army.

Clearly, marijuana had no negative effects on my work and performance. These results, I'm sorry, but these positive results come with great penalty. Sadly, I come to you today to inform you the so-called war on drugs has struck me hard. My career with the United States Army is coming to an end. I have been formally asked to accept a general discharge. I will not be able to volunteer for redeployment with fellow soldiers as planned. I have been labeled as a drug user. This harsh label will only succeed to tarnish my image, damage my future and strip me of veteran's benefits which I earned as a defender of my country along with fellow citizens.

Unfortunately, my story is not so unique. Here in Pennsylvania many soldiers, myself included are given only two

options. Suffer and to struggle without treatment or leave the ranks of our military with nothing to show for our bravery.

2.

2.0

Please allow me to share a story of a Navy vet.

Frank Barbay served in the U.S. Navy September 15, 1988. He was stationed on an aircraft carrier and later served as a recruiter.

According to his written testimony submitted for this hearing, he states, I started having problems with my back in January 1995 and by May 1995 I had my first back surgery to de-bulk and de-tether the Lipomo at the L-4 and L-5 region. Navy doctors prescribed oral morphine for the pain. I was still in constant pain because I took the minimum I could to stand to ease of the side effects. Constipation, no appetite, feeling looped out and no drive which were some of the negative effects I suffered.

Over subsequent years I had two more surgeries hoping to get some relief. I also did many alternative methods, acupuncture, physical therapy, creams to relieve the pain. The Navy and the VA just kept handing me more and more oral medication.

In March of 2004 I could not work any more and was placed on disability. In 2008 the VA switched to methadone and Vicodin to save them money. These drugs make it easy to give up and just be left looped out. That is not why I --

that is not why I am and I must fight every day to get little relief with a lot of side effects.

2.

2.0

The VA now permits cannabis use in states with medical marijuana programs but not in Pennsylvania. If I use it here, I could lose my benefits. Any other veteran could lose their benefits such as the troubles I'm currently facing. I understand the chance that some people will abuse this new bill just like many people abuse other sources of food, for recreation.

In closing, I would like think on the words of our former President, Jimmy Carter. Penalties against drug use should not be more damaging than the drug itself. Thank you. I apologize, I don't get a chance to speak in public, people ask my opinion so this is still new to me.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Don't worry, you did a great job. I thank both of you for your testimony I just wanted to maybe follow up on a couple things.

You heard both with the prior speakers were talking about as relates to the going through the process of the FDA, getting the approvals and the last speaker actually said he wasn't in disagreement, he did concede just like the Institute of Medicine there are some medicinal purposes but allowing those to be filtered through the system.

What is your response to that instead of states carving out this process allowing this, the regulated process

to go forth to present the medicine that would rectify problems.

2.

2.0

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Marijuana is currently a Schedule I controlled substance. It is a Schedule I controlled substance in the Pennsylvania Crimes Code and in the Federal Code. It is Schedule I controlled substance meaning that it is a high likelihood of abuse and no medicinal value whatsoever. Opiates and cocaine are Schedule II because they are recognized to have medicinal value. In order for the FDA to conduct the type of studies that would be necessary to satisfy Dr. Capretto's concerns, marijuana would have to move from Schedule I to Schedule II controlled substance and there is no movement on that on the federal level whatsoever.

So, the answer then is well, I'm sorry if you are suffering from cancer, but you are simply going to have to wait years before we can address this issue in Pennsylvania.

I know they have done it in California, New Mexico, Colorado, Oregon, Washington, Michigan, Maine, Vermont, Rhode Island and New Jersey and the District of Colombia, but you unfortunately are stuck in Pennsylvania, you have got to wait.

Also, the FDA approval process has brought us such winners as OxyContin, fentanyl, Percocet and Vicodin which while effective for the treatment of pain also have a high risk of addiction, a high risk of abuse, and high risk of overdose. So, even with those components, the FDA says well,

you know, you can use them but you could die, could get addicted, so, here take your best chance.

2.

2.0

Alternatively, we have hundreds, if not thousands of years of anecdotal evidence showing that a natural plant, not a manufactured substance, not a combination of a number of manufactured chemical compounds made into a little pill, but a naturally-growing plant can be used safely, effectively and without any of the risks associated with medications that have received FDA approval.

Pennsylvania is not the first state to consider this. The United States of America is not the first country in which its citizens have considered or turned to medicinal marijuana. So my answer is, when you consider Dr. Grinspoon's testimony, when you consider Dr. Wecht's testimony, when you consider the growing body of medical evidence and the huge body of anecdotal evidence, I believe that the evidence is there for you as legislators to conclude that this can be used safely in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the confines of an established bona fide patient-physician relationship.

One of the things that I know people are concerned about here in the Commonwealth is that if we pass House Bill 1393, that we are going to have marijuana shops and marijuana doctors popping up on every street corner, you know Dr. Feel Good, come on in, all you need the driver's license and I will give you a recommendation. That is not our bill.

Our bill requires the bona fide physician-patient relationship where a physician whom we trust to make informed decisions about our medical care will have an additional treatment option to discuss with their patient. Now, clearly if a physician is treating someone in recovery and that patient comes in and says I want to try medical marijuana, that physician may very well be reluctant to prescribe medical marijuana or recommend medical marijuana with someone in opiate or alcohol recovery.

2.0

Additionally, does there exist a chance for fraud?

Of course. Right now we have people that go to their

physicians every day to complain about phantom pains in their

back and walk away with a prescription for opiate medication,

addictive opiate medication. Could that happen with medicinal

marijuana? Yes.

But really what this boils down to, what this bill boils down to is providing a treatment option to a physician and their patient that can be explored within the confines of that relationship.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: Help me, because I can't remember in this bill if it even identifies this, how would the marijuana be supplied to be offered? Would they have independent shops, would it be from the doctor's office via his relationship or the relationship with whatever supplier? How would that work.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: It provides for two sources. One is for individual patients who have been so certified by the Department of Health, the Pennsylvania Department of Health would be tasked for implementing this bill. So a legitimate cannabis patient could cultivate up to six plants of marijuana and possess up to an ounce of useable marijuana at any given time. It also calls for the establishment of compassionate use centers which would be a center that is responsible for growing, distributing, taxing and would be subject to oversight by the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue.

2.

2.0

Now, the most extreme example of this is in California where shops are popping up left and right.

New Jersey has yet to implement their law so that may be somewhere for us to look. But most recently Maine has started to license compassionate use centers. They had a lottery and took applications and licensed either between six or eight compassionate use centers. One of those was a non-profit organization from California and they established a Maine subsidiary and that organization was able to get a license from the Department of Health. They will be responsible for growing, they will be responsible for cultivating, they will be responsible for revenue collection and they will be subject to oversight from the Department of Health.

So, the model that we would envision in Pennsylvania is similar where a non-profit organization would make application to the Department of Health, the Department of Health would, of course, vet the applicants to see that there are no drug felons who are seeking the license. And then allow for the establishment of a compassionate use center.

2.

2.0

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: They can be located anywhere as long as they meet these criteria, there is not a limitation of where they can --

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Not in the bill as written. That would be up to again as we heard before, the devil is in the details, that would be up to the Department of Health to determine does Pittsburgh, for example, need one compassionate use center, do we need a dozen, do we need 100 or would one compassionate use center in Harrisburg be sufficient for the entire state.

Now, New Jersey had looked at having Rutgers grow all medical marijuana and that it would be distributed probably by the state and like in State Stores type of scenario. But Rutgers declined because of the amount of federal grants that they receive and they said we can't risk our relationship. And I would imagine that the exact same thing would hold true here in Pennsylvania at the University of Penn State or Pitt were approached for a similar scheme.

CHAIRMAN WHEATLEY: I thank you both for your testimony. I really appreciate you being here. This will

conclude our hearing today. I thank all of you for taking some time and coming, everyone who testified, I appreciate your testimony. As you all know, this is not the end nor the beginning. This is going to be, I think, a very intense process but I do want to thank you all for your contribution to it. We look forward to having you stay involved as this bill moves forward. So, thank you all for being here. (Hearing ended at 5:42 p.m.) I hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above entitled matter. William E. Weber, RDR Court Reporter \_WEBER REPORTING \_