

I find this bill to present some interesting food for thought. I have long understood the argument that holding inventors liable for harm arising from use of their inventions creates a chill on the inventing process. Certainly, when it comes to life-saving inventions such as penicillin, this argument appears to have great merit.

And it is an example that provides a segue into the flip side, germane to the subject at hand. For who can deny that the overuse of penicillin, particularly its use as a preventative agent instead of a therapeutic agent, has also been significantly publicly damaging? Not only has the proliferation of penicillin-resistant bacteria in response to its ubiquitous wash in the food chain and environment been directly costly to human health and finances, but the domino effects of responding to that by developing and using other antibiotics similarly (swallowing spiders to catch flies, swallowing birds to catch spiders . . .) have been even more damaging.

In the case of penicillin, the legal landscape seems clear: It's inventors had every reason to believe their invention would be a boon to public health and no experience with which to anticipate that it would be so abused, so how could they be held liable for the later in the face of the former? But, with each new antibiotic over time since then, that argument has become less credible.

So less credible, for instance, that food crops Genetically Engineered (GE) to resist biocides blatantly cross the line .

If I am not mistaken, one of the arguments the patent holders of these novel gene packagings have used to obtain public approval of them has been that they would *lessen* the well-known effects of the development of pest organisms' resistance to control, and would lead to a *decrease* in both the domestic and world-wide agricultural biocide load.

That has clearly not been the case, In fact, it is becoming ever more apparent it has been significantly the opposite. The use of these GE crops, *specifically* designed to withstand greater concentrations/amounts of particular biocides, has *accelerated* the rise of resistance to those biocides in the pests of concern, leading to successful arguments for the approval of other biocides even more toxic to humans and other animals than those which they replaced.

This is what is termed a "vicious cycle". And vicious it is, because the very patent holders of the GE machinations are also the patent holders of the synthetic biocides this cycling spawns the spewing of, further toxifying our nation and the world.

All for the love of money.

The patent holders for these GE plant strains were neither at the time of application for those patents nor now unwitting nor concerned about the harmful consequences of the use of their inventions. In fact, it was and is their *business plan* that their GE creations will continue the There Once Was An Old Lady lyrics. We are fast approaching when they will ask us our regulators to allow them to offer brainwashed and/or desperate farmers to swallow a horse.

And we know what happens then. It ends with "of course".

What's more, it was and is part of their business plan that their patented geneomes will *migrate* (they have admitted in court that they cannot prevent that from happening.) Contamination of the crops of others is a means to destroy the market for non-GE crops by destroying the supply, thus

eliminating competition.) Never mind that this also destroys livelihoods and thus the "market freedoms" for others that they claim for themselves.

My discussion here has used plants as the examples, but similar arguments have been, and will be made for GE animals by such entities as the Center for Food Safety.

So, yes, the patent holders of GE species can AND SHOULD be held liable for contamination by their inventions. It part of the INTENT of their inventions that they contaminate.

They ask to be afforded the benefit/risk nod that the inventors of penicillin enjoyed from a grateful populace by claiming their intent is to save the world from starvation, but that is a bankrupt sociopathy. Not only does their business model belie it, the results on the ground are that it constitutes an acceleration of degenerative agriculture, degrading the productivity of the soils in a downward spiral only kept alive by the use of diminishing sources of external inputs extracted from far-fung corners of the planet, What known as Regenerative Agriculture is the only hope for feeding the world in the future, but only if we head that direction in earnest ASAP.

We Oregonians have a proud history of blazing trails and enshrining trails for the rest of the country to follow. As an Oregon voter, I urge you to support passage of HB 2739 to protect Oregon's farmers from economic damages due to GE contamination. Please send this bill to the House floor with a "do pass" recommendation.

Thank you,

Jim wells
18 W. Stewart Ave
Medford, OR