GABRIEL D. DOUGHERTY

March 16, 2023

VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY

The Honorable Floyd Prozanski Chair, Senate Committee on Judiciary 900 Court Street N.E., S-413 Salem, Oregon 97301

RE: Strong support for Senate Bill 1061 to direct the Oregon Liquor and Cannabis Commission and the Oregon Health Authority increase access to get all that grass

Dear Senator Prozanski:

Please find and accept the undersigned's written testimony attached hereto in lieu of personal appearance at the Senate Committee on Judiciary's public hearing on Senate Bill 1061. As you are probably aware, this measure directs the Oregon Liquor and Cannabis Commission and other agencies to evaluate, among other things, access to cannabis and cannabinoid products in Oregon. The undersigned appreciates your consideration of his remarks and is eternally grateful to the committee's serious attention to this matter.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (503) 339-6823 or via email at gabe@doughertyfamily.io.

Sincerely,

Their Touchett

Gabe Dougherty

Encl.

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY OF THE

82nd LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

IN SUPPORT OF

SENATE BILL 1061

Chair Prozanski, Vice Chair Thatcher, and Members of the Committee:

My name is Gabe Dougherty for the record. I live and smoke the reefer in Salem, Oregon.

I support Senate Bill 1061. This measure, among other things, requires the Oregon Liquor and Cannabis Commission (OLCC) and other agencies to improve education, access, and affordability of cannabis and cannabinoid products and to establish frameworks of cannabis-related research. With the introduction of this measure, the state could be a leader in robust cannabis regulation relative to other states that decriminalized personal possession of cannabis and cannabinoid products.

You may recall a film in the late seventies, where Cheech Marin, playing Pedro De Pacas, nervously asks his companion played by Tommy Chong, "Is that a joint, man? That there looks like a quarter-pounder." Who knows what it was or what, *exactly*, was in it? Several decades after American cinematography canonized Messrs. Marin's and Chong's cult-classic *Up in Smoke*, Mr. Chong remarked

excitedly that "[y]ou can smoke marijuana, you can eat it, you can wear it. It's a perfect plant!" That was in 2016, and you would be forgiven for missing such a strong endorsement by Mr. Chong when it was a mere two years earlier when this state's voters approved Measure 91 (2014).

Measure 91 was among those most important initiatives voters ever approved and, in a recent straw poll, ranks above Measure 5 (1990), Measure 50 (1997), and Measure 11 (1994) in terms of popularity. Unfortunately, I am afraid, voters choose bad policies and now confront perils that were hitherto unimaginable when they put the cart before the horse. For example, stoners—er, I mean, consumers—are generally in the dark about how dank some strains are with respect to others.

Uninitiated consumers rely on their honest but equally uninitiated budtenders to select the most suitable strains of cannabis according to the consumer's prevailing needs. Some strains of cannabis might be so physically sedative that the consumer may watch hours of the History or Smithsonian channels uninterrupted. Otherwise, some gummy bear cannabinoids products will lift inhibitions in the consumer to the extent that she might order one-hundred dollars of Taco Bell. And eat all of it. Your humble witness has self-imposed a period of sobriety and temperance or what is colloquially known as a "tolerance break."

This measure combats those two challenges by "ensuring that cannabis retail personnel are educated [about cannabis]" and "ensur[ing] that cannabis product

information is publicly accessible through electronic means[.]" If the OLCC can make liquor stores' Pappy Van Winkle inventory publicly available, then it is no stretch of the imagination that inventories for the dankest live rosins offered at your nearest dispensary can be listed online as well. Not only would those provisions improve access to cannabis and cannabinoid products, but they also encourage a far more competitive market and improve affordability.

This measure is welcome and overdue. Consumers' access to current and accurate information is valuable. Not unlike unwise retail investors on r/WallStreetBets, too many cannabis and cannabinoid consumers rely too much on word-of-mouth, innuendo, and ethereal excitement to inform their decision making against an overwhelming deluge of herb at their local dispensaries. We can put an end to that kind of anxiety—not the cannabis-induced variety—today. Moreover, I cannot overstate how excited I am about how this measure provides that the OLCC, a titan of public trust and integrity, will marshal resources to improve education, access, and affordability of certain cannabis and cannabinoid products like they already do online with bourbon and other liquors.

Fellow stoner-in-arms Tommy Chong was keenly intuitive about how versatile cannabis has become. It's about time for the law to catch-up. Current and accurate information in markets is a good thing and weeds out the less desirable strains of ditch herb at retailers. I urge you to advance Senate Bill 1061.