

Submission – Draft Road Traffic Law (Drug Limits) Regulations 202- Anonymous 2 – 17th February 2026

To the Relevant Committee/Minister,

I am writing to formally submit my concerns regarding the "**Draft Road Traffic Law (Drug Driving) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202-**".

I am currently [REDACTED] and rely on my vehicle for my daily commute. As a medical cannabis patient, I drive every day and do so with full confidence in my sobriety; I do not drive if I feel impaired or intoxicated. The current wording of this proposal threatens to affect my life drastically. Specifically, the loss of my driving license under these terms **would lead to the immediate termination of my employment.**

This, in turn, would have a devastating domino effect on my financial stability. I have a mortgage that I have maintained faithfully, having never missed a single payment. The loss of my career would directly jeopardize my ability to keep my home.

Due to the sensitive nature of my medical treatment and the potential for professional repercussions, I request that my personal details remain anonymous in any public record, though I consent to my concerns being shared with the relevant committees.

I would like to highlight the following critical points for your consideration:

1. Consultation with Disability and Medical Experts

I strongly urge the assembly to consult with **Jersey disability charities** and the **Disability Inclusion team** (cc'd) regarding the impact this legislation will have on the right to independence. Furthermore, it is essential to engage with medical professionals and governing bodies associated with medical cannabis prescribing to ensure a robust medical perspective is integrated into the law.

2. Lack of Medical Defense and Distinction

The current draft fails to provide a **statutory medical defense** for patients. By failing to distinguish between legitimate, prescribed medical use and illicit recreational use, the legislation effectively categorizes legal patients alongside users of controlled substances like cocaine. This lack of nuance is both unjust and discriminatory.

3. Disparity with Other Pharmaceuticals

Under current Jersey legislation, there are no specific legal "limits" for other high-risk pharmaceuticals such as **opioids, neuroleptics, or antidepressants**, all of which carry significant impairment risks. Medical cannabis should be treated with the same consistency. In the UK, a **roadside impairment test** is utilized to ensure a patient is operating a vehicle safely, which supports the validity of a medical defense.

4. Socio-Economic Impact and Stigma

The proposed regulations threaten to place vulnerable individuals under extreme financial strain due to potential job loss and increased transport costs. This not only removes personal independence but risks placing an avoidable burden on the **Social Security Department**. Additionally, this legislation risks:

- **Creating Harmful Stigma:** Subjecting patients to victimization or inappropriate reporting by the public.
- **Causing Unnecessary Distress:** Leaving patients in a state of perpetual fear, as they have no way of monitoring blood THC levels despite being perfectly fit to drive.