

Patty Locuratolo Hymanson
York
LD 40

Greetings Senator Hickman, Representative Supica and Members of the Joint Standing committee on Veterans and Legal Affairs. My name is Patty Locuratolo Hymanson. I live in York, was Chair of HHS from 2017 to 2020 when Medical Cannabis was in the jurisdiction of HHS. This is a complex industry. My view as a physician is in treating this product as the medicine people with medical problems expect and deserve. My view is also keeping unqualified minors away.

I am here to speak against LD40. This 66-page bill just came out February 27th. As of yesterday, the bill language was not even on the legislature.maine.gov tracking page for LD 40. Because I follow the legislative efforts of the Maine Medical Association, I saw this 66-page amendment 4 days ago. I know I must be missing points I should be making because I didn't have the time to review this large bill adequately, but here are a few issues I can address in my 3 minutes:

1. Sec A-13,22 paragraph 2430-I, sub-paragraph 1C, Definitions, C: "Major Registration Violation Affecting Public Safety, an egregious violation that imminently jeopardizes public safety" does not include misrepresenting any cannabis product to a qualifying patient, covered entry or the public including its contents, its testing results or its potency. Patients who have a medical problem, may be immunosuppressed, on multiple medications, function well on a particular dosage, heavily depend on these very parameters. They do not want to smoke and take into their lungs and their compromised bodies arsenic, pesticides or toxic molds. What exactly does the word "misrepresenting" mean? Misrepresenting these parameters for a medical product is an egregious violation that imminently jeopardizes public safety and should be a major violation, not a minor one.

2. Section B-89: LD 2147 still has a ways to go in the legislative process and should not be included here until the bill has gone through to passage.

3. B-85 Labeling: A strong intention of HHS when the committee approved the labeling section was to allow labeling that did not in any way appeal to minors. This is difficult because all ages like gummy bears. But the HHS Committee at the time agreed that fierce protection of minors was worth the disallowance of human, animal or fruit and subject matter or an illustration that targets minors. These restrictions on labeling have been removed in LD 40.

I would ask you to consider how minors would be fined, who would criminalize the minor, collect the fine under what circumstance and who would pay it or not. If medical and adult use can be separated by a strip of tape or an aisle, information should be clear that adult use products are tested and medical products are not. Allowing multiple tracking systems to be used in the state is confusing and chaotic. I saw this directly when electronic medical records system came out more than 10 year ago. We still have not untangled that mess.

Medical providers who write prescriptions can cancel the prescription. This authority to cancel has been taken away in LD 40 and should be restored.

A visiting qualifying patient is authorized under 2423-D and that needs to be referenced so it is clear to all involved what authorization means.

Please go back to the original intent of this sub-committee when I listened in for the first meetings, that is, non-substantive changes to the Maine Medical Use of Cannabis Act, spend more time getting a 360 degree look and re-submit a bill for the 132nd. Thank you for your hard work on Mainer's behalf.

I'd be happy to answer any questions.