

Supporters of this bill are focusing on ending mandatory minimums for our most violent crimes and giving full discretion to judges. Maybe this is fine but I think we need to answer a few questions. AND they also want to significantly lower sentences which needs to be discussed.

Judges- why do supporters of this bill paint prosecutors as demons and judges as saints and then in the same breath say the entire system is racist. I am not arguing that systemic racism exists and that our systems suffer from bias. I actually agree. But why are we demonizing one aspect and lifting up another when it suits a narrative of those who want to seriously remove systems of accountability for violent offenders. And if judges are so impartial all of the time- why is there such an extreme fight on all aspects of the political spectrum when it comes to the Supreme Court. I simply find the argument convenient for the purpose of reducing accountability for violent offenders while offering no solutions for monitoring or addressing how racial disparity may increase as a result of these changes. I would also be fine with the argument to let the judges decide instead of mandatory minimums- but that is NOT what this bill does. It gives judges the authority yes but it ALSO significant lowers the new sentencing structure ('presumptive') so much so that you could get probation for filming the rape of a child. I strongly urge you to oppose this bill, it needs significantly more work and more community input.

Concerned citizen- Aaron