

warrantoSo that means they should give in...

right...

Since political catchphrases seem to be so overused these days, I'll borrow one.

for the past ??? number of years, no one has been able to stop TERRORISM (over-dramatic music goes off). I guess we should legalize that too! After all, if you can't fight it, why bother trying?

Terrorism is a direct attack on the rights of others. Doing drugs itself is NOT impeding on someone else's rights. What don't you understand about that? How can you ban an act because it could potentially lead to something else? Should we ban automobiles because it could potentially lead to manslaughter?

warrantoGuess what, though? Drinking out on the street is illegal! Imagine that! And here you are wanting to make smoking pot legal across the board, yet the very thing used in comparison is also illegal!

Smoking in a bar, huh? Can I assume every single person that walks into that bar will consent to you doing that? If not, you are a hypocrite and pretty much proved my previous point. It shouldn't be. I drink in public on most Saturdays (during football season), and I cause absolutely no harm to those around me. In fact, most patrons have open alcohol. Little to no harm done. Hmm... imagine that.

If the bar's owner wants to allow smoking weed in his place of business, he has every right to allow it. If the patron doesn't like it, oh well. The patron can leave. It's not his business to run.

warrantoYou implied I was stupid when you sarcastically said I was doing a good job. If that is not what you meant, I suggest you stay away from using sarcasm until you understand what it is used for.

Sure, warranto, because saying "good job" sarcastically MUST mean that I think you're stupid. Or it could mean that I disagree with you...

warrantoYou may have said that, but it does nothing to defeat my argument. You can not guarantee that someone else's rights WON'T be impeded on, either. Meaning some sort of other qualification must be used.

Our police force is a responsive authority. It's not a preventative. Just because something COULD happen doesn't mean it will. Again, shall we ban automobiles because of the potential danger?

warrantoHmm... what happened to that argument that the police can't stop the more dangerous crime because they have to deal with enforcing the minor crimes? Guess you defeated your own argument there, if the police have too much time on their hands.

Yes, let's put words in my mouth, so you can use those words to make me sound like I'm contradicting myself. Well played... if only I didn't realize what I said.

warrantoRight, unfortunately being drunk or high ENABLES the act of driving drunk, etc. Why put out the resources to stop drunk driving, when you can stop it completely by not allowing people to be drunk in public (or at all, but that's my personal view)

It's called personal responsibility. Don't punish those of us that take responsibility for our actions while sober or intoxicated. I have yet to drive drunk (and I have no plan to). I have yet to steal for drug money (partly because I've never done any illicit drugs).

---