

Submitter: Kit Stavrum

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

I ask myself, what is wrong with democrats? If it isn't supporting killing babies by abortion, its taking away the 2A constitutional rights of American citizens. This will not stand and the supreme court has already ruled its against the constitution in many other states. Here is what the OR constitution says about this.

Violation of Article I, Section 27 (Right to Bear Arms):

The Oregon Constitution states, "The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence [sic] of themselves, and the State." Measure 114 infringes on this right by imposing a permit-to-purchase system that requires individuals to complete a safety course, pass a background check, and obtain approval from law enforcement before exercising their constitutional right to acquire a firearm. I contend this creates an undue burden, effectively turning a right into a privilege subject to government approval.

The ban on magazines holding more than 10 rounds is also an infringement, such magazines are commonly used for self-defense and thus protected under the state's constitutional guarantee. In November 2023, Harney County Circuit Court Judge Robert Raschio ruled that Measure 114 violates Article I, Section 27, arguing that the restrictions do not enhance public safety sufficiently to justify limiting a fundamental right and that the magazine ban disproportionately affects law-abiding citizens.

Here is the US constitution Argument

Arguments Under the U.S. Constitution

Second Amendment Violation:

The Second Amendment 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." NOWHERE DOES IT SAY I NEED A PERMIT. Requiring a permit to purchase a firearm infringes on this right by adding a barrier not historically required at the time of the amendment's ratification in 1791. I cite the U.S. Supreme Court's 2022 ruling in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen*, which mandates that gun regulations must be consistent with the nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation. Critics claim Measure 114's permitting system and magazine ban lack such historical grounding. NOWHERE DOES IT SAY I NEED TO ASK PERMISSION FROM THE GOV TO PURCHASE A GUN.

The magazine ban is contested as an infringement because large-capacity magazines are in common use for lawful purposes like self-defense. Opponents

argue that the Supreme Court's District of Columbia v. Heller (2008) decision protects firearms and components "in common use," and that banning them exceeds constitutional limits.

I OPPOSE THIS BILL