

Submitter: Paul Furnari
On Behalf Of: People capable of critical thinking
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure: HB2006

If anyone is actually reading this, and if they are capable of critical thinking, then they know just as well as I do that the best argument in favor of this bill is that younger adults aren't as intellectually developed as older adults. We don't allow them to buy alcohol, and there are other limitations on that demographic. That's probably fair, and I would say the best evidence is that they tend to vote in lockstep for a particular party/ideology, indicating an inability to exercise rational thought or good judgment. So, where do we go from here, from a constitutional standpoint?

Easy- all or nothing. If they can't buy booze or guns, then they most certainly shouldn't be allowed to vote, either.

But! But! But! Most gun homicides are committed by people under 25! Yes, and the vast majority are committed by criminals already excluded from gun ownership (i.e., gang members). You want to eliminate those, make felon in possession an end of the road charge with hard jail time. Funnily enough, there's already a bill in front of the same judiciary committee shoving HB2005, 2006, and 2007 down our throats: HB3077 enhances sentencing for felon in possession (according to the Oregon DOJ, felons have a recidivism rate of over 57%, by the way), but because the sponsors have an R next to their name, it most certainly will never see the light of day. So, you have to ask yourself- or, better yet, Rep. Jason Kropf- is this about safety, or about control?