

Submitter: William Robinson  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

I strongly urge lawmakers to oppose Oregon House Bill 3075 (HB 3075), a measure that modifies the firearm permit provisions of Ballot Measure 114 (2022). While the stated intent of this legislation may be to enhance public safety, its practical implications threaten to undermine constitutional rights, impose undue burdens on law-abiding citizens, and exacerbate inequities across Oregon's diverse communities.

First, HB 3075 risks infringing on the Second Amendment rights of Oregonians by expanding bureaucratic hurdles to firearm ownership. The permitting process, as modified, appears to grant excessive discretion to law enforcement in determining eligibility. Historically, discretionary systems have led to inconsistent and subjective denials, often disproportionately affecting marginalized groups, including communities of color and lower-income individuals. This lack of clear, objective standards undermines the equal application of the law and erodes trust in our legal system.

Second, the financial barriers introduced or reinforced by HB 3075 place an unfair burden on citizens exercising a constitutional right. Increased permit fees, combined with costs for mandatory training and background checks, could total hundreds of dollars. For many working-class Oregonians—particularly those in rural areas where firearm ownership is often tied to self-defense or livelihood—these expenses create a de facto tax on a fundamental freedom. Rights should not be contingent on one's ability to pay, and this provision risks pricing out those least able to afford it.

Third, the bill's modifications to Ballot Measure 114 fail to address the practical realities of implementation. Extending the timeline for permit processing, while perhaps intended to ease administrative strain, does little to mitigate the delays and backlogs that have plagued similar systems elsewhere. Law-abiding citizens could face prolonged waits to exercise their rights, while the lack of clarity around temporary exemptions or enforcement mechanisms may sow confusion and invite legal challenges—further straining public resources.

Finally, HB 3075 does not convincingly balance public safety with individual liberty. Evidence from states with stringent permitting laws shows mixed results on reducing violence, often because such measures disproportionately target lawful owners rather than criminals who bypass legal channels. Oregon's lawmakers should prioritize policies that address root causes of violence—such as mental health support and community investment—over broad restrictions that penalize the compliant.

In conclusion, HB 3075 represents an overreach that threatens to criminalize law-abiding Oregonians, deepen inequities, and erode constitutional protections. I respectfully urge the Oregon Legislature to reject this bill and pursue solutions that respect the rights and realities of all its citizens.