

Mitchell Fields
Topsham
LD 94

My name is Mitchell Fields and I am writing in opposition of LD 94. I believe wholeheartedly and from an experienced standpoint that the proposed changes are from a place of disinformation and ultimately prove detrimental to the Medical Program as a whole.

Amending the definition of "Medical Cannabis" to exclude concentrate use in "Medical Cannabis products" is irresponsible and unreasonable. High dose products are necessary for a multitude of patients, conditions, and dietary restrictions. The dismantling of this definition puts damaging roadblocks in place of sensible growth and preservation of the effective cannabis program we have worked so hard to build, not to mention the edible production industry that supports families statewide. Removing "Physician assistant" from the "list of medical providers" puts unnecessary and undue strain on an important field that is already understaffed and overworked. This inevitably and inherently delays patients from accessing the care they need and could otherwise benefit from in a more timely manner.

In addition, I do not see the benefit in adding the subcategory of "adult patient under the age of 21" and I believe this aids to further complicate and delay the current system, denying patients access to important medication.

I also suggest to strike section 6.8 of "continuing medical education", until adequate education is established and offered in a way that would satisfy the amendment. As proposed, this amendment would only serve to drastically reduce the number of medical providers available to patients, delaying access and necessary care.

Finally, section 8 "add qualifying conditions for adult patients under the age of 21" further restricts, unnecessarily, adult access to medication, or delays the process until symptoms reach a level of discomfort that is not needed.

I completely disagree with LD 94 and I believe it ought not pass for many important reasons.