

Submitter: Michael Antonis

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4145

I oppose HB4145 for multiple reasons. One of the main ones are all the exemptions for what is considered “law enforcement” (such as parole and probation officers), both currently active and retired.

The section related to magazine capacity and those exempt clearly state:

A 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, who acquires, possesses

or uses a large-capacity magazine, regardless of whether the acquisition, possession or use

is related to activities within the scope of the person’s official duties or occurs while the

person is off duty or after the person’s retirement.

If these items are so dangerous that common citizens are not allowed to possess, access or use them, why does the above allow “retired law enforcement” the ability to possess or use (Regardless of whether it is related to the scope of their official duties or active status)?

This seems to unfairly allow a certain portion of our citizens access to rights, while disallowing another group access at all. This would appear to be a blatant violation of the Oregon Constitution, Article I Section 20; The core principle being Laws must not grant preferential treatment to one group over others. Why should retired “officers/agents” be exempted from a law, especially if possession or use is in no way related to their “official duties”?

This unfair exemption is carried into many other sections as well (such as the requirement for a permit). It is unbelievable that a RETIRED anything is allowed so much more freedom and exemption from laws, over other law abiding citizens. If permits and restrictions “save lives”, why would any retired agent be exempted from them?

Also, increasing allowed costs for the permit creates financial barriers for citizens to exercise their federally protected second amendment rights. Blocking a citizen of their rights based on the arbitrary cost of a permit is wrong on many levels and allows someone of a higher economic status rights and access, that are a barrier to those in a lower economic status/group. To me, this is also a violation of the above Oregon

Constitutional issue related to Article I, section 20 (allowing preferential treatment to a group that can AFFORD to exercise their federally protected rights).

This Bill is poorly envisioned and written, as currently proposed and is a clear and blatant violation of the Oregon Constitution. For this and so many other reasons, I do not support House Bill 4145 and urge you to oppose it as well.

Thank you for the consideration.