

Submitter: Trevor Hoagland
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4096

I oppose this as I do not feel it is limited enough to not be overly applied. Oregon already has felony forgiveness, and even supports the "drop the box." Yet many felonies can also be non-firearm related.

This looks to in short prosecute people who are felons for owning three or more firearms. This is confusing as you can take a typical year round hunter and get this and more:

1. Shotgun for turkey / geese.
2. Long range rifle for Deer, Elk, Bear (and really you may have two as Bears and Elk require heavier calibers than deer or wolves)
3. Mid range rifle for Deer and Elk, which in hilly country you need.
4. 22 long rifle for squirrels / varmint and "plinking".

Yet the person has a felony related to a traffic violation of non-violent offense. Ergo, they now are sentenced harder because "guns"?

I understand the intent, more safety, but the execution leaves challenges to the second amendment as if the person is not in jail are we not saying they are not a danger (released felons after their terms of service - not accounting the calculation error that released many or commuted by the governors for 'reasons' the last few years), As-applied challenges, and potential 8th amendment issues.

The long and the short is again, intent is a possible, but execution is broad, vast, and likely to be ripe for abuse. As the last DA and current seem not interested in protecting Oregonians and prosecuting the Federal Administration with the Secretary of State, I do not see this being "helpful" either based on the understanding of the text presented in this HB.