

Submitter: Jeff Thompson
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

Oregon's HB 3075 is framed as a "Gun Violence Reduction Act," but critics argue it's an overreach that undermines constitutional rights and disproportionately harms law-abiding citizens. The bill builds on Measure 114—already stalled by legal challenges—by imposing stricter firearm permit requirements, raising fees from \$65 to \$150 (with \$110 renewals), and banning magazines over 10 rounds, effective immediately upon passage. Opponents say this creates financial and logistical barriers to exercising a constitutional right, hitting lower-income individuals hardest. Imagine a single parent in a rural area, already stretched thin, now facing hundreds in fees and training costs just to legally own a firearm for self-defense.

The discretionary power it grants law enforcement to deny permits based on vague criteria—like determining who's "likely to be a danger"—raises red flags. Historical data from other states with similar systems shows Black and Latino applicants denied at higher rates, even without disqualifying records, hinting at potential bias. Critics also point out the irony: Oregon's urban gun violence often ties to illegal guns, not legal owners jumping through these hoops. Why target the compliant while criminals bypass the system?

Then there's the legal dodge—requiring challenges to be filed in Marion County Circuit Court, a venue some see as stacked in favor of the state. Add the emergency clause, fast-tracking it without voter input, and it feels like a power grab, not a safety measure. If the goal is reducing violence, why not focus on mental health or enforcing existing laws instead of piling on rules that feel more punitive than preventive? The Second Amendment isn't a privilege to be priced out or bureaucratized away.