

**Supplementary
Submission
No 62a**

**INQUIRY INTO USE OF CANNABIS FOR MEDICAL
PURPOSES**

Name: Mr Andrew Kavasilas

Date received: 5/04/2013

Dear Merrin

I rang your office yesterday to seek information about questions and requests on notice put to some of the witnesses, advice was given that the responses will be published.

Having read through the transcripts I believe my evidence would have shed light on many of the inadequately addressed issues.

If the inquiry was set up to solely endorse Sativex, which may be available in "5 to 10 years", I think this has been done. Though there was no questions as to how the Sativex tincture became lawful in the first place, the simplicity of its manufacture or why is it so expensive and why couldn't a similar product be produced here for evaluation.

I have inspected the Sativex product which my friend Dr Graham Irvine has imported, (he paid \$880 for a months supply 4 x 5.5 mil bottles).

Many describe Sativex as very similar to the tinctures available through compassion clubs in Australia, 'alcohol diluted hash oil' and very easy to misuse. Though the recipe, production method and use has been around for hundreds or thousands of years, the leakage issue may well be used at a later date to further hinder and provide opponents with argument against any form of relief by using cannabinotherapies.

NSW Police evidence was lacking in reliable detail or of any assistance to the inquiry. Police comments about Nth NSW being the 'cancer capitol of Australia' or if they had more resources they would spend all their time in the north of the State just underlines inappropriate attitudes. In terms of policy direction though, Police usually oppose everything till it's legal. It should be of interest to the Inquiry that opposition was uncovered within the Force which was not evident in the NSW Expert Working Party or its recommendations.

I hope the inquiry picked up on the comments in relation to the Cannabis Eradication Strategy which isn't after small growers but who get caught as an 'aside'. It seems the Police position is in support of a misunderstood cannabis pharmaceutical, but would seem happy to continue pursuing and discouraging those who are already using cannabis, or those who will not be able to afford Sativex.

Can I just add that as with many other media reports and investigations surrounding the use of cannabis for medical purposes, its popularity goes up, awareness is raised and more people are encouraged to use cannabis for any number of ailments.

Last weeks A Current Affairs segment with Tony Bower as a medical cannabis supplier to children certainly raises issues and leaves many questions unanswered.

I think the Committee came close when questioning the NSW AG representative who tried to point out the issue of an initial lawful source of supply for any person who would be granted dispensation to cultivate or use any part of a cannabis plant.

Overall it became apparent that the Committee members may well have been beyond their depth, understandable though as the issue is ambiguous and complex.

I remain willing to assist with any critical information or provide answers to questions that may arise.

Your sincerely
Andrew Kavasilas