

Submitter: Rob Forrest
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

Dear House Committee on Judiciary,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to House Bill 3075, a measure that modifies the firearm permit provisions of Ballot Measure 114 (2022) and imposes additional regulations on firearm ownership and transfers. While I recognize the intent to address public safety, I believe this legislation infringes upon the individual rights guaranteed by both the United States Constitution and the Oregon Constitution, undermining the freedoms of law-abiding citizens without demonstrably enhancing safety.

The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution states, "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently affirmed this as an individual right, notably in *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008) and *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* (2022). In *Bruen*, the Court clarified that firearm regulations must be consistent with the nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation. HB 3075's expansion of waiting periods from 30 to 60 days, increased fees from \$65 to \$150, and stringent permitting requirements, including mandatory safety courses and background checks beyond federal standards place undue burdens on the exercise of this right. These measures lack a clear historical analogue, suggesting they exceed constitutional bounds.

Similarly, Article I, Section 27 of the Oregon Constitution declares, "The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence of themselves, and the State." Oregon's constitutional framers intended this to protect individual self-defense, a right that HB 3075 jeopardizes. The bill's extended waiting periods and heightened costs disproportionately burden low-income individuals, rural residents, and those facing immediate threats, effectively delaying or denying their ability to protect themselves. For example, a single parent in a remote area, unable to afford the doubled fees or travel to a certified instructor, may be left defenseless while awaiting approval. This practical barrier undermines the state's promise of equal protection under the law. Proponents argue that HB 3075 enhances safety, yet evidence suggests otherwise. States with permissive concealed carry laws often experience lower violent crime rates, as documented by the Crime Prevention Research Center, while restrictive permitting schemes correlate with delays that hinder self-defense without reducing crime. Oregon's existing background check system already prevents prohibited persons from acquiring firearms. Further layers of regulation target law-abiding citizens rather than criminals, who by definition bypass legal processes.

Moreover, HB 3075's emergency clause and limitation of legal challenges to Marion County Circuit Court raise due process concerns under the Fifth and Fourteenth

Amendments of the U.S. Constitution, as well as Article I, Section 10 of the Oregon Constitution, which ensures “justice shall be administered... without delay.” By fast-tracking implementation and restricting judicial recourse, the bill denies citizens a fair opportunity to contest its constitutionality, a cornerstone of our legal system. I urge you to consider the voices of Oregonians who value their constitutional liberties. HB 3075 does not strike a reasonable balance between safety and rights; it tilts heavily toward state control at the expense of individual freedom. I respectfully request that you reject this bill and pursue solutions that respect both the federal and state constitutions while addressing crime at its source, instead of overburdening law-abiding citizens.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Rob Forrest
Springfield, Oregon