



Governor Newsom has Vetoed Wiener's Safe Consumption Sites Legislation

This legislation has wrongly portrayed that California is allowing the consumption of harmful things and is not doing enough to eradicate it. Already the other states have taken preemptive measures to reduce it.

Governor Gavin Newsom has announced their support for the legislation by signing the 20 pieces of legislation that the lawmakers submitted. He vetoed Senator Scott Wiener's Senate Bill 57. The legislation legalizes safe consumption sites in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Oakland.

He stated that he had extended his support for a long time over the cutting-edge harm reduction strategies. Besides, he showed his reservations regarding the operations of safe injection sites without robust, engaging, and local leadership. He also wanted this to be well documented, a thoughtful and vetted operation that offers greater sustainability.

The infinite number of safe injection sites will be authorized by the bill. This could lead to a world of intended repercussions. There is a possibility that sites will assist in improving the health and safety of urban areas. If this is done without a solid plan, this will be indigenous. Such consequences in big cities like Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Oakland can be taken for granted. We are not in a position to bear such risks in these areas.

Senator Wiener reacted to Newsom's Veto by stating that California had lost a big chance to address one of its significant problems. There has been a drastic escalation of deaths due to drug overdose. Rejection of the extensive and proven studied strategy sends a negative message out there. California seems not committed to harm reduction.

The bill has permitted the cities to pilot safe consumption sites to save lives and get the treatment of its people. The damage is massive for physicians, health experts, health workers, local electives, and others.

There is no need to determine the effectiveness. From previous studies and experience in working groups, it is evident that it will work out. Safe consumption sites have been functional in the cities for more than 30 years now. All such sites have effectively reduced overdose deaths along with the pressure on the emergency rooms in hospitals.

Moreover, other cities and states have already moved forward with this proven health model. Cities like New York, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts have already made progress. In addition, Philadelphia is also on the verge of settling, will it?

The Veto is tremendously tragic as efforts have been made for over 8 years to pass this. A drug overdose is taking precious lives. In San Francisco, almost 2 people die on a daily basis

due to it. Subsequently, the death rate is on the rise. This is a massive setback for those who intend to curb overdose deaths.

The opposition fears that these consumption sites might become the epicenter of drug activities. They express their content over the governor's Veto. They believe that people who are struggling with addiction need assistance, not the legal place to die. They believe the solution to it is the pragmatic approach to addiction. They suggest it should be done through mental and medical health treatments.