

I OPPOSE [HB 3245].

How does the store / restaurant and or delivery person "know" the recipient of the booze is 21 years old?

Who does the identification check?

Who is responsible to return the alcohol back to the store / restaurant?

Who is going to be held responsible if alcohol is consumed by a minor and the drunk minor causes damage to property and or loss of life?

I just thought of something. If you must check a person identification (driver's license) to establish the lawful age to purchase and consume alcohol why isn't the same identification required to vote?

Will [HB 3245] "open the door" to "craft-distilled spirits" and marijuana home deliveries?

Now this could be very interesting, can one order some craft-distilled tequila and some really kick-as* buds and spend the day and night doing "shooters and bong-hits?"

Why don't you establish a Task Force to study this issue to death.

You could establish the "Tequila-shot and Bong-hit Fund" separate and distinct from the General Fund.

And of course, appropriate taxpayer money from the General Fund to the "Tequila-shot and Bong-hit Fund."

In a way, the home delivery system, in theory, will reduce the number of DUII drivers on the road. This is good.

[HB 3245] will create more delivery jobs. This too is good.

But, the delivery drivers must drive electric or hydrogen vehicles to reduce the carbon footprint. O.K. "green is good."

But, smoking anything increases the carbon footprint.

Smoking will also lead to lung-cancer.

Now, how does Oregon reconcile all the taxpayer monies being directed to alcohol and drug treatment centers (placed in residential neighborhoods)?

You can't.

Go ahead, be a "Buzz-Kill" and Vote "NO" on [HB 3245].

I think you should.

David S. Wall