

Submitter: Ryan Fox  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075  
Opposing Oregon Measure 114 and HB 3075: A Step Toward Disarming Law-Abiding Citizens

Oregon's Measure 114 and HB 3075 propose stricter gun regulations, including limits on magazine capacities, expanded background checks, and mandatory education courses for firearm purchasers. While proponents claim these measures will reduce gun violence, they fail to address the root causes of crime and instead target law-abiding citizens. Criminals, by definition, don't follow the law, and these measures will do little to prevent illegal gun access through the black market or theft. Such laws will only disarm responsible citizens while leaving criminals unaffected.

#### Flawed Approach to Gun Violence

Laws like magazine capacity limits are ineffective against criminals, who can bypass restrictions by acquiring firearms through illegal channels. Cities with strict gun control, like Chicago and New York, still experience high rates of gun violence, proving that such laws do not stop criminals. Measure 114 and HB 3075's restrictions would only penalize responsible gun owners while having no real impact on crime or violence.

#### A Representative Republic, Not Mob Rule

The United States was founded as a representative republic, designed to protect individual rights, including the right to bear arms. These measures represent a dangerous shift toward mob rule, where emotion and impulsivity replace reasoned debate. The Second Amendment exists to safeguard citizens from not only criminals but also government tyranny. Restricting gun rights undermines this protection and sets a dangerous precedent.

#### Undermining the Second Amendment

The Second Amendment guarantees the right to keep and bear arms for self-defense and liberty, not just for hunting. Historical examples, such as Native Americans being disarmed and subjected to violence, highlight the dangers of a disarmed populace. Measure 114 and HB 3075 would make it harder for responsible gun owners to exercise their rights, imposing unnecessary burdens that do not improve safety.

#### Magazine Capacity Limits: A Symbolic Measure

Proponents argue that magazine capacity limits will prevent mass shootings, but this logic is flawed. Determined criminals will bypass restrictions by carrying more magazines or finding alternative ways to increase their firepower. Likewise, restricting magazine capacity won't reduce suicides, as many are impulsive and linked more to mental health issues than the number of rounds in a firearm.

### The Hypocrisy of Gun Control Advocates

The same figures advocating for stricter gun laws often support decriminalizing drugs, a policy that has contributed to the rise in drug-related deaths and violent crime. These contradictions highlight that they are focusing on symbolic measures rather than real solutions to violence, like addressing illegal drug trafficking, improving mental health care, and enforcing existing laws.

### The Right to Self-Defense

The ability to carry firearms for self-defense is a fundamental right. In situations where law enforcement cannot respond in time, citizens must be able to protect themselves. Measure 114 and HB 3075's additional requirements could make it harder for people, especially vulnerable individuals, to defend themselves. Restricting gun rights while criminals remain armed is a dangerous approach.

### A Solution Rooted in Fear, Not Fact

Ultimately, Measure 114 and HB 3075 are based on fear rather than reason. These laws target law-abiding citizens rather than addressing criminal behavior, gang violence, or societal issues that lead to violence. Instead of restricting rights, Oregon should focus on enforcing existing laws, improving mental health services, and reducing illegal gun trafficking

### Conclusion

Measure 114 and HB 3075 are misguided attempts to solve gun violence by limiting citizens' rights. The real solution lies in focusing on criminal behavior and public safety without infringing on the constitutional rights of responsible gun owners.