

Owen KANE
Auburn
LD 40

My name is Owen Kane, I'm a budtender, and I would like to testify in support of LD 40. I'm fascinated by the industry as a whole and try to always be learning as much as I can, and the more I learn about the current cannabis laws the more I realize how over the top it is.

For starters, the mandate for background checks in the cannabis industry is a stark reminder of the lingering "Reefer Madness" mentality that has plagued cannabis policy for decades. These checks, rooted in outdated stereotypes and fears, perpetuate the stigma against cannabis and its consumers. They unfairly target individuals with non-violent drug convictions. It's time to move away from this hysteria and towards policies that are fair, just, and reflective of the reality of cannabis as a legal and legitimate industry. Reconsidering the need for these checks is a step towards dismantling the harmful narratives that continue to surround cannabis.

The way the current cannabis statute is written, with vague and unclear language, creates significant challenges for industry participants with a desire to learn like myself who are trying to comply with the law. LD 40 seeks to address this issue by eliminating all instances of unclear language, which will provide much-needed clarity in interpreting and applying cannabis laws. One of the biggest challenges I hear about is dealing with OCP investigators who often interpret the law in their own way or simply don't know the law. This can lead to inconsistencies and biases in how the law is applied. LD 40's focus on removing ambiguity will help create a more transparent and objective regulatory framework, making it easier for businesses to comply with the law and reducing the risk of running into issues with inspectors. Overall, LD 40 will not only simplify compliance for businesses and employees but will also create a more accountable and just legal environment for everyone in the cannabis sector.

As I read into it, I find that the current state of advertising regulations in the cannabis industry resembles a tangled web of strictures and ambiguity, creating a perplexing landscape for businesses. Navigating through the intricacies of these rules feels akin to deciphering an encrypted code rather than promoting a legitimate product. Unlike other industries, where advertising guidelines are clear and conducive to creative expression, the cannabis sector grapples with unnecessarily restrictive and subjective standards. LD 40 emerges as a beacon of sensibility, offering an opportunity to align cannabis advertising laws with the more transparent and permissive frameworks observed in sectors like alcohol. Striking a balance between responsibility and creativity, this amendment has the potential to usher in an era where cannabis businesses can effectively communicate with their audience, unburdened by the perplexing constraints that currently encumber them.

The last topic I want to touch on is administrative holds. The authority granted to OCP for administrative holds, effectively allowing the unilateral freezing of the cannabis supply chain, is a matter of concern that should be repealed. LD 40 recognizes the potential overreach inherent in such powers, prompting a reconsideration of the need for such a mechanism. The proposition advocates for a more nuanced approach, contending that the cannabis industry, like any other, can effectively manage recalls without the imposition of an overarching administrative freeze. This adjustment aligns with principles of fair regulation and operational autonomy for businesses within the cannabis sector.

Thank you for considering my testimony. Please support LD 40, and have a great day.