

Submitter: Charles Buchanan
On Behalf Of: Self
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

Opposition to Oregon House Bill 3075

Oregon House Bill 3075 has sparked significant debate and opposition from various quarters, and with good reason. It is blatantly unconstitutional, going against both the Oregon State Constitution and the Constitution of the United State, specifically the Second Amendment to the Constitution, which specifically states that “the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.” Infringed, according to any dictionary one would care to look at, means “violated, transgressed, or encroached upon, as a regulation, restriction, or right.” This bill clearly does all those things.

The sponsor of this bill obviously believes that there is an ongoing climate of firearms violence in the state of Oregon. This premise is, on its face, untrue. Like any state, there are some individuals who do use violence to accomplish their goals. Many of these individuals do employ firearms as their chosen tools of violence. However, the percentage of our state’s population that falls under this description is relatively minimal, and this bill would do nothing to curtail such violence but would instead place undue burdens on law-abiding citizens and would in fact make criminals out of those same law-abiding citizens simply for possessing items that the bill’s sponsor appears to be fearful of. Criminals, by definition, do not follow laws; making this bill a law would in no way stop any criminal from continuing along his/her chosen career path. It would only make it more difficult for the average citizen to defend him/herself and their lives and families.

Economic Impact

There is indeed a potential economic impact on the citizens of Oregon as well, in that the onerous permit requirements would place an undue burden on minority and low-income citizens. These citizens are already often living from paycheck to paycheck; being required to pay a currently unestablished amount of money for both the “permit to purchase a fire-arm” and the required training classes to be “allowed” to get said permit would, as stated earlier, place an undue burden on these citizens in addition to the abovementioned in-fringement on their constitutional rights.

In addition, the requirements to establish a permit to purchase program at the county level would place an economic burden on Oregon’s counties, many of which are already under-funded for the work that law enforcement is already required to do. Most counties would be required to increase taxes in order to pay for the permit program, while at the same time many counties are already stretched thin and said

taxes would most likely be voted down if brought to a ballot of the public.

Regulatory Overreach

HB 3075 grants excessive power to regulatory bodies, which could lead to arbitrary and burdensome regulations. Oregon unfortunately has a history of using firearms laws to target minorities and this bill facilitates such targeting by allowing essentially random decision making on the part of regulatory bodies such as the Oregon State Police and even county sheriff's departments.

A related concern is the obvious lack of clarity in the bill's provisions. Vague language and ambiguous requirements could lead to inconsistent interpretation and enforcement. This uncertainty could create a challenging environment for individuals trying to comply with the law, potentially leading to legal disputes and increased costs.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this bill is every bit as flawed and unconstitutional as the Measure 114 that it is attempting to supplant in Oregon's lawscape and should be opposed by anyone who values their personal freedom in our beautiful state no matter what their political affiliation might be. Making law-abiding citizens into criminals is not the way to protect the population of Oregon; prosecution of those who commit actual crimes is. HB 3075 should receive a resounding NO vote from all concerned!