

Submitter: Trevor Hoagland
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4145

To whom it may concern,

There are many objections I have. However, I must first call out the hypocrisy of allowing " peace officer, a parole and probation officer, or a retired peace officer or parole and probation officer who is a qualified retired law-enforcement officer," can carry what many have branded "Weapons of War" while the law abiding citizenry cannot. I know the lawyer of measure 114 wrote that he chose 10 rounds or less as to not be out gunned by criminals with guns, but again, this assumes criminals follow the laws. Considering it was the Rodney King Riots in LA that lead to cops moving from shotguns to the Armalite Rifle Pattern 15, we outlawed machine guns under Regan, saw bills to deny black panther their gun rights, and more, such as the NFA being put in to place to specifically bar African Americans from getting guns, legislation of "gun control" shares the shared bond of systemic racism, making criminals out of everyday citizens, and not being effective on current criminal/criminal activity. E.G., we outlawed murder, yet some are killed with guns or cars, yet we ban guns and not heavy vehicles?

I must also add the hypocrisy of trying to push a bill that is still in litigation as well. "We do not know if this is allowed as it is in court, so we are going to assume it is." This follows the ruling of Honorable Immergut on "you can and cannot regulate a magazine, so we will."

Considering the ruling of the SCOTUS historically, the historic Bruin ruling, and the ongoing litigation at many circuit courts, almost none of this will past the legal muster either.

If we are to pull the "think of the women and children" argument, I would ask you to consider how long a law abiding woman who knows a lot of condemning evidence on her drug dealing ex-husband would live by following your rules outlined here and in Measure 114 to get a gun and be able to competently defend herself. FBI already said they are not reviewing for permit for even attempting to purchase a firearm, and that was under the last administration. There is no where at the time 114 was to go into effect to now, and beyond to go and apply to get said permit either. Interestingly enough, even in your dense population areas there are no facilities that meet the requirements for that either, let alone staff as we keep reallocating funds from law enforcement to staff either. Interesting coincidences of course, but not causation. Yet, that permit can take up to 60 days for approval. We are also looking at the approval for firearm purchases, strangely doing the same checks asked on the permit to

purchase.

Moral of the story, as ruled by the SCOTUS, a right delayed is a right denied. In this case of two tiered citizenry, we most likely would see the death of the woman before she was able to protect herself, let alone be competent in defending herself. As these types of items covered in this HB have been struck down at the SCOTUS level, other circuit court levels, and in our own circuit in many cases, this is a waste of both the tax payer money as well as the government of Oregon's time as it does not curtail, reduce, or effect ongoing criminal activity.

So, I am opposed as the intent should be "to reduce crime and protect Oregonians" but the execution is "make them criminals and have them pay more to the state for what is a constitutional right."