

Submitter: Ian Eytzen
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4145
Chair and Members of the Committee,

I submit this letter in opposition to HB4145.

Public safety matters. Crime matters. But legislation that burdens lawful citizens while failing to address criminal behavior is not effective public safety policy—and it is not constitutional governance.

Both the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 27 of the Oregon Constitution recognize an individual right to keep and bear arms for lawful purposes, including self-defense. These rights are not conditional privileges granted by the state. They are pre-existing rights that the government is obligated to respect.

Recent Supreme Court precedent has made clear that firearm regulations must be consistent with the Nation's historical tradition of firearms regulation. Laws that impose discretionary permitting schemes, layered purchase barriers, or broad restrictions on commonly owned arms are repeatedly failing this test. The predictable result is years of litigation, injunctions against enforcement, and significant public expense—costs borne not by criminals, but by Oregon taxpayers.

Oregon has already lived through this reality with Measure 114.

Measure 114 was poorly drafted, legally fragile, and operationally unworkable. Its permitting system could not be implemented as written, lacked clear standards, and placed impossible burdens on local law enforcement. Courts recognized these flaws almost immediately, enforcement was blocked, and the state was forced into prolonged litigation with no measurable public safety benefit to show for it.

HB4145 follows the same pattern.

There is no clear, measurable evidence that permit schemes, magazine restrictions, or layered purchasing requirements reduce violent crime in Oregon. Criminals, by definition, do not comply with permitting processes. The only people navigating these bureaucratic systems are law-abiding citizens—precisely those least likely to misuse firearms.

What is certain is the outcome we have already seen:

Legal defense costs increase

Court losses accumulate

Law enforcement resources are diverted from addressing violent crime

Public trust erodes as laws are passed that cannot be enforced

Rights do not require permission to exist. No other constitutional right demands a permit, a fee, mandatory training, and government approval before it can be exercised in its core function. Oregonians do not apply for licenses to publish opinions, attend religious services, or demand due process. Turning rights into licensed activities reverses the relationship between citizen and state.

Many Oregonians own firearms for lawful self-defense, especially in rural areas where emergency response times are long and police protection is not immediate. These citizens are not a public safety threat. They are parents, workers, veterans, and small business owners exercising a fundamental right recognized by both the U.S. and Oregon Constitutions.

Legislators have a responsibility not merely to “do something,” but to do something constitutional, effective, and defensible. Passing legislation that is likely to be enjoined, struck down, or left unenforceable does not make Oregon safer. It makes Oregon poorer, more divided, and less free.

I respectfully urge you to oppose HB4145 and instead focus on policies that target violent crime directly—without eroding fundamental rights or repeating the costly mistakes of Measure 114.

Respectfully,

Ian Eytzen

Oregon Resident, Taxpayer, and Constituent