

Submitter:

Stan Vizina

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

House Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

HB4145

Opposition Testimony – HB 4145 (2026 Session)

Submitted to the Oregon Legislature

I submit this testimony in strong opposition to HB 4145, both on substance and on process.

At the time of this writing, the public record reflects 468 testimonies in opposition versus 23 in support—a nearly 20-to-1 opposition ratio. That imbalance is not incidental; it reflects widespread public recognition that this bill is ineffective, inequitable, and procedurally unsound.

Substantively, HB 4145 is flawed in several critical ways.

First, enforcement.

HB 4145 relies on compliance by people who already follow the law. Individuals engaged in violent or criminal behavior do not obey additional regulatory layers, registration schemes, or procedural requirements. Enforcement therefore falls almost entirely on law-abiding citizens, not on those driving violent crime. This misalignment guarantees minimal public-safety benefit while expanding legal risk for ordinary people acting in good faith.

Second, cost and resource diversion.

Implementing and enforcing HB 4145 will require additional administrative oversight, staff time, compliance tracking, and enforcement actions, all of which consume public resources. Those resources will be diverted away from proven crime-reduction strategies—such as targeting repeat violent offenders, addressing illegal trafficking, and supporting victims. Spending public funds to police compliance among lawful citizens is an inefficient and counterproductive use of limited state resources.

Third, unequal and disproportionate impact.

Bills like HB 4145 do not affect all Oregonians equally. They impose disproportionate burdens on rural residents, lower-income individuals, the elderly, and those who live far from administrative centers or licensed service providers. Fees, travel requirements, delays, and paperwork barriers function as de facto exclusions, effectively turning a legal right into a privilege available only to those with time, money, and proximity.

Fourth, constitutional exposure.

By layering restrictions that burden lawful conduct while lacking a clear and demonstrable connection to reducing criminal misuse, HB 4145 exposes the state to significant constitutional risk. Laws that regulate fundamental rights must be narrowly tailored and demonstrably effective. When a bill primarily restricts lawful behavior without addressing criminal actors, it invites costly litigation—expenses that will ultimately be borne by Oregon taxpayers.

Finally, the process matters.

The hearing for HB 4145 did not appear on OLIS until last Monday morning. That is not reasonable notice for legislation of this consequence. Many Oregonians cannot monitor legislative calendars daily. Late posting materially suppresses public participation, whether intentional or not, and creates the appearance of a procedural ambush designed to minimize public input.

If HB 4145 were sound, necessary, and defensible, it should withstand full transparency, adequate notice, and rigorous scrutiny. The overwhelming opposition and the flawed notice process strongly suggest otherwise.

For these reasons—

- * the failure of the bill to meaningfully address criminal behavior,
- * the ineffective and misdirected enforcement model,
- * the diversion of public resources away from real public-safety measures,
- * the unequal and exclusionary impact on many Oregonians,
- * the significant constitutional and litigation risk, and
- * the last-minute OLIS posting that impaired public participation (you Democrats just can't help yourselves but pull rotten maneuvers, can you).

I urge this committee to reject HB 4145 outright, or at minimum withdraw it and restart the process with proper notice and full transparency.

Oregonians deserve laws that improve safety without punishing compliance, and a legislative process that respects—not circumvents—public participation.

Respectfully submitted,

Stan Vizina

Portland, OR