

Policy Committee Meeting

June 9, 2020 – 6:00pm MST

Minutes

Present: D. Martell A. Nidumolu A. Hamilton C. Cull B. Watts
 P. Leger A. Bahji R. Tanguay B. Hebert (recorder)

Absent: N. Ali V. Primeau C. McPherson S. Dama

Call To Order: 6:08pm MST

Adoption of Agenda & Additions:

- No additions to the agenda.

Review of Last Minutes (Appendix 1):

- A. Hamilton & D. Martell have reviewed

Round Table Discussion

New Business:

1. Advocacy For Decriminalization – A. Hamilton

➤ Report Progress

- i. Barb and Angie looked for other CJA briefs – could not find any – Anees confirmed
- ii. Not how I accepted a policy brief to read – compelled and understand why we needed to do this
- iii. A. Hamilton – is it more medical or more policy and law or should it bbe a partnership of the two in a medical journal
 1. Talk about different strategies other countries have used, look at the totality of the other countries – C. Cull
 2. R. Tanguay – decriminalization is one piece of good drug policy
 3. R. Tanguay - Our job is to advocate for these individuals

4. R. Tanguay – should be okay to ask for help, get help and treated fairly – looking specific to decriminalization this is part of our role – initiation of treatment
5. P. Ledger – the necessary 1st step of what the evidence looks like – not a systematic review we are undertaking here – address points and results we are going in
 - a. Section against decriminalization regardless of whether or not there is overwhelming evidence
 - b. Clear evidence that current system is not working
 - c. Adi – what is our audience – well presented research evidence – need a piece that anyone is writing otherwise we get ripped apart – the audience is more of a physician audience – that piece is essentially for the medical community
 - d. A. Hamilton – from a legal and human rights and personal lived experience thing, not want in a policy brief – present both sides and then come to a conclusion
6. Is this piece on the one hand or on the other hand or is this piece we have a conclusion?
7. Need a good evidence-based peer review document we support that – rob
8. Like showing both sides – but would like a conclusion rob
9. Rob – we are beyond that drugs are okay – in our culture we have made it okay – not in a situation where drugs are taboo – any evidence support harsh criminalization
10. D. Martell – not a debate – identify the values of CSAM and come to the conclusion – have a clear purpose in a policy brief like this
11. Stick to the decriminalization side
12. We have agreement – not hiding evidence either way but we will reach a conclusion on the evidence we have
13. B. Watts – 1st step overview of the literature – needs a central argument
14. Adi – is it to educate or convenience
15. Phil – stigmata of a belief or conclusion of CSAM this is way we think this makes sense
16. The audience is a midline between policy makers and physicians
17. Where do we go from here?

- a. Phil – take a stab at the next steps – take the research from Anees
- 18. Do we want to go back to 1989? – What do you struggle with is that if you restrict it too much you can't find a lot addiction medicine
- 19. Regulation vs decriminalization – do we want to stay clear of that because they are different things
- 20. Why more comfortable with safer supply then decriminalization
 - a. Keep this to decriminalisation
- 21. Want to reduce the stigma let you will get in trouble if you ask for help
- 22. Who wants to pay for criminals but medical issues?
- 23. Landed on some next steps
- 24. Get one more draft in before the BOD meeting or acceptance from the BOD
- 25. We have momentum – Let's keep it
- 26. Put in extra pieces
- 27. Present something the BOD will support
- 28. Keeping up with the next one
- 29. Looking from guidance from the BOD – feedback loop
- 30. Phil punt it forward

Next Meeting: options for next meeting – wait to here back from Phil

Adjournment: 7:01 pm MST – D. Martell