

HB 2111 Commentary – all opinions herein are my own, I represent only myself.

To the Oregon legislature reading this, please hear my thank you and consideration for reading my, and other comments on this matter and taking them to heart and mind.

I disagree with the supposed merit of this bill.

HB2111 appears to make a simple name change to an agency that is delegated managerial rights over the regulation of liquor and THC. Liquor and marijuana are very clearly, discreetly identified legal terms that have nothing to do with science, and lots to do with using legal terminology to control basic adult behavior. In comparison, cannabis is a word, not a term, meaning that it is not legally defined - it is scientifically defined and this means it can be found in an ethno-botanical index, in medical indexes, and in historical texts sourcing from western society. This is not possible in the case of marijuana in reference to the United States of America's history.

The OLCC does not regulate cannabis, it regulates THC, which is being taxed and the taxes are being redistributed based on administrative ruling. When Proposition91 became Measure91 and then became a law, there was absolutely no mention of cannabis anywhere, only marijuana. This makes sense because the government is in the habit of regulating THC which is an identifying marker for the legally defined term "marijuana" which was termed in the Controlled Substances Act that enabled prohibition across the land, making victimless crimes within a court system that was supposed to adhere to habeous corpus and mens rea. Cannabis has never been legally associated with a constituent property - be it a cannabinoid, terpene, or any other of the thousands of properties found in such a complex plant.

There are three major reasons I am fully against the Oregon administrative body adopting the word cannabis in any of it's agencies:

1. The state of Oregon regulates a legally defined entity, not a plant, and so there is a loss of congruency if the agency known as liquor control takes on the moniker of "cannabis control". It doesn't control cannabis, it controls a legally defined term, marijuana, who's legal definition incorporates the THC molecule in a very specific quantity.

In addition, the legislation that enabled Liquor Control to regulate THC only contains the legal term "marijuana", and so HB2111 inserts an obvious break in parity between the legislation that delegates power, and the agency that it was delegated to.

2. The Oregon marijuana legislative committee was consulted with in public hearing concerning the ethnophaulistic nature of the term "marijuana" and that it is a word with a historically racist past, evidenced very clearly by the quotes by Henry Anslinger and the 20th century government-employee-racists who enabled prohibition.

At no time did the legislative committee for marijuana make any attempt to remove the racist term from the Oregon legislative register, from the new law, and from the regulatory language. Undertaking this task would have created a massive schism between "legalized cannabis" and "medical marijuana".

HB2111 attempts to vainly change the name of the agency, but fails to remove the racist term from the rest of its regulatory language. If passed, there is an immediate schism between Oregon Medical Marijuana and Oregon Legalized Cannabis.

This schism is insulting at the very least, but pales in comparison to the insulting changes that were made to the Oregon Medical Program when Gov Brown signed her name on a bill that said very distinctly that no changes were to be made to the medical program.

3. If HB2111 were to be passed, there will be cost assessed to the taxpayers against the marketing and signage and literature changes that need to be made across the whole of the agency. This cost is both unnecessary and could be construed as wasteful and insulting to Oregon Medical Patients who have lost their program due to regulatory codes that continue being asserted by Liquor Control. There does not seem to be a cost schedule, cost total, or any form of approximation of the overhead required for the agency to change all of it's logos, signage and inter-office electronics and databases.

If Oregon has excess funds to spend on a pointless and incongruent name change, why is it we lack funds to keep our parks fully staffed and all of the public restrooms fully functional and fully cleaned? If Oregon has budget deficits anywhere, why would there be any logic in spending money on a pointless and incongruent name change?

Lastly - there is a basic tenant of logic that has to be dealt with in the context of a regulatory agency whose regulatory language contains only the legal term "marijuana". If this agency were to take on the name cannabis control, then logically the state is going to have to undertake the process of legally defining cannabis in terms of constituent THC, and this would enabled a quagmire and increase the mockery of our state's handling of a plant, that is only defined legally as marijuana at the federal state, and county level. Cannabis is historically the most important resource for any community, culture, society, or country wherein marijuana is an apparition used by racist people in the 20th century to create industrial rackets and the private prison complex that the USA is globally famous for. For reference, this plant is listed as an imperative "strategic resource" (See Executive Order 13603, Obama 2012).