

Opposition to Oregon HB 4145 — Misuse of Emergency Powers and Legislative Overreach

To Whom It May Concern:

**I strongly oppose Oregon
House Bill 4145 in its current
form. While framed as a
modification to ballot**

Measure 114's firearm permitting and restrictions, the bill represents a deeply flawed and coercive legislative strategy that undermines democratic principles, the rule of law, and fundamental rights.

1. Misuse of an Emergency Clause to Sidestep Public Scrutiny and Referendum

HB 4145 includes an *emergency clause* that would make the bill effective immediately upon signature by the Governor. This tactic is fundamentally inappropriate for legislation with such sweeping impacts on constitutional rights and public policy. An emergency clause is intended for true emergencies – unexpected, urgent public safety threats – not politically contentious policy changes. Its inclusion

here appears designed to prevent meaningful public review and *to evade the safeguards of Oregon's referendum process*, effectively denying voters the opportunity to challenge the law.

Using emergency language as a legislative shortcut undermines transparency, accountability, and the public's trust in our democratic institutions. It sets a dangerous precedent

where any majority in the Legislature could declare ordinary policy disputes to be “emergencies,” abolishing meaningful civic engagement and voter oversight.

2. Substantial Expansion of Bureaucratic Power and Burden on Law- Abiding Citizens

HB 4145 does far more than correct technical issues — it

fundamentally alters the structure and burden of firearm permitting. It doubles the permit processing time from 30 to 60 days and raises permit fees dramatically, imposing significant financial and administrative barriers on lawful firearm ownership. These changes were *not* presented to Oregon voters directly and represent a substantive policy shift.

3. Unjustified Exemptions and Inequalities

The bill reportedly contains broad exemptions — including for active and retired law enforcement — allowing them to possess large-capacity magazines even in off-duty or recreational situations while imposing restrictions on ordinary citizens. This creates a tiered system of rights and privileges,

contravening the principle of equal treatment under the law.

4. Reduction of Legal Recourse

HB 4145 also appears to require that legal challenges *must be brought in Marion County*, regardless of where an individual resides. This arbitrary jurisdictional limitation is a thinly veiled attempt to impede access to justice and

discourage challenges by creating geographic barriers to litigation.

5. Undermining Citizen Ballot Measures

Measure 114 was approved by Oregon voters, albeit narrowly, and remains subject to judicial review. Rather than allowing the legal process to play out, HB 4145 seeks to legislate around the courts and to *rewrite a voter-approved measure without*

direct consent of the people.

Immediate enactment via an emergency clause circumvents the very referendum protections that are central to Oregon's constitutional framework.

Conclusion

HB 4145, as drafted, is not a mere technical cleanup or public safety enhancement. It is a partisan, heavy-handed rewrite of firearm policy that:

- Exploits emergency

legislation mechanisms to bypass public scrutiny and referendum rights.

- Imposes new financial and bureaucratic burdens on lawful citizens.**
- Grants unequal privileges to select classes of individuals while restricting others.**
- Limits access to justice through forced venue provisions.**

For these reasons, I urge legislators to oppose HB

4145 outright, remove any emergency clause, and instead engage in a transparent, deliberative legislative process that respects both the rule of law and the rights of all Oregonians.

