

Submitter: Paul Dinardi
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4145

The Supreme Court, through Bruen (2022) and Rahimi (2024), has instructed lower courts to evaluate Second Amendment challenges based on text and history rather than intermediate scrutiny. Courts must determine if the law is "consistent with the Nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation". Oregon, nor the United States has no such history.

Supreme Court Justices, particularly Clarence Thomas and Neil Gorsuch, have cautioned that lower courts are treating the Second Amendment as a "disfavored right" or "second-class right" by resisting, circumventing, or misapplying established Supreme Court precedents like Heller. These Justices contend that lower courts frequently apply erroneous tests to uphold gun restrictions that violate the individual right to bear arms. A 60 Day wait period to exercise a constitutional right, isn't a right, it's permission. What is this was applied to any other right in the Bill Of Rights? a wait period and proof of training, a fee with a note from your first grade school teacher, that you can exercise your first amendment right.

Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon Constitution protects the right to bear arms for defense of self and state, affirming that the military must remain subordinate to civil power.

While ensuring this right, Oregon law allows for regulations via the STATE POLICE, adding additional approvals is cumbersome and redundant. including mandatory background checks for private transfers, secure storage requirements, and extreme risk protection orders.

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".

60 days, \$150 in fees without representation, class room training, permitting. Seems to be an infringement. It would seem that this House Bill does nothing to address illegal firearm use or ownership, and puts all of the burden on legal, law abiding gun ownership. I'm 62 years old and retired, I do not need to jump through hoops to prove to the state anything other than I am not a criminal, in order to exercise my constitutional right, that I have had for 62 years.

This House Bill trampled not only Oregons constitutional rights, but The U.S. constitutional rights of law abiding gun ownership.

Additionally the way these House Bills are being snuck in without proper time so that opposition can be heard by the people, is both disturbing and should be unlawful. Measure 114, which was also a package of lies being put onto voters ballots played into fears as well as miscommunication that background checks are not being done currently. All false. That measure is before Oregons Supreme Court, this House Bill is being brought to circumvent the almost certain failed ruling.