

The adult use cannabis legalization bill has now traversed all the legislative committees in both houses, taken lots of testimony and is in some ways is a better bill and in other ways not at all. It is time for a pause in the legislative process to analyze, review and consider what this cannabis legalization bill gets us into. As the former medical director of the child and adolescent state hospital where we treated, for many months, teens who became and stayed psychotic from cannabis, this bill is not doing enough to reduce this risk to young people. Disappointing, is the failure to heed public health experts' warnings about establishing a legal age of purchase of 25 years to prevent life changing brain alterations or to cap product potency to facilitate recreational enjoyment but prevent toxic behavioral and emotional reactions.

At this point in the legislative process, I want to make just three points that jump out of the fiscal note that was released just two weeks ago. To start, how much is requested for public health safeguards? Four million for education and warnings to pregnant woman whose fetus will be adversely affected when mother uses cannabis during pregnancy or when breast feeding. If this is the standard, then we will spend almost \$90 per pregnant woman. This year the state will spend eleven million six hundred and eighty seven, one hundred and seventy seven dollars for youth tobacco use prevention. That is almost 40 dollars per high school student. Yet the proposed amount of about three million dollars to educate youth about the harms of cannabis comes to just \$10 per student. The appropriation for the treatment of the kinds of mental health disorders that I saw linked to cannabis ZERO. :Lessons learned from other states says that cannabis associated disorders will increase 4-6 fold with the availability of high potency cannabis.

The cannabis industry will surely follow the tobacco industry blueprint. This new industry is looking for a customer base that will start early in life, use regularly, and increase their use as they become tolerant to the effects of the drug. It appears the bill that spends so little on high school students may facilitate exactly that.

Second, I want to convey to you the concerns from the legislative budget office that prepared the fiscal note. Here are two quotes: P73 of the fiscal note. There are multiple sections in this bill that DHS would be unable to implement.

The Department of Human Services is unable to estimate the cost because the language is unclear as for what is needed.

My third point: Let's look at some of the big numbers that our tax dollars will support beyond public health and addiction health. We will get an office of cannabis management with a price tag of seven million five hundred and ninety-five dollars. Also, there is four million dollars to start up retail shops to sell cannabis. One million nine hundred thousand dollars to help those trying to start those business with support to navigate the regulatory process that the bill established. About two point two million to the people who want to start a business, who were able to navigate the regulatory process but need to be trained to handle the products responsibly. And when the business is finally going, there is another million dollars in grants to employers of the new industry.

My conclusion is that this is not a good bill. It is tilted to the cannabis industry and very expensive. Tax revenues from sales are unlikely to cover the costs. It falls short of resources for addiction and mental health treatment and fails teen's need for education and prevention. Yet it provides a kind of state venture capital support to start a new industry to expand the availability of an addictive drug. Where the money is spent speaks best for what is considered most important. .