

Submitter: Bryson Baker

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4145

Dear Chair and Members of the Committee:

I am writing as a concerned Oregon resident and law-abiding firearm owner to strongly oppose HB 4145. This bill attempts to legislatively implement and modify aspects of Ballot Measure 114 (2022), including its permit-to-purchase requirement and large-capacity magazine restrictions, despite ongoing legal challenges and voter intent concerns. While the bill delays some enforcement and adds exemptions, it ultimately advances unconstitutional burdens on our fundamental rights.

First, HB 4145 perpetuates Measure 114's core infringement: requiring government permission (a permit) before purchasing a firearm. This turns a constitutional right into a privilege subject to bureaucratic approval. The bill doubles processing time from 30 to 60 days and triples fees from \$65 to \$150—creating financial and temporal barriers that disproportionately affect lower-income Oregonians, rural residents, and those in need of self-defense tools. These changes were not approved by voters in 2022 and represent legislative overreach.

Second, the bill creates a two-tiered system of rights in violation of Oregon's Constitution (Article I, Section 20) on equality of privileges. It exempts active law enforcement, retired peace officers, parole/probation officers, and qualified retired officers (per 18 U.S.C. 926C) from the permit requirement and likely from magazine limits. If standard-capacity magazines (>10 rounds) are truly dangerous "weapons of war" as proponents claim, why do retired officers or probation officers need them while ordinary citizens face felony charges for possession? This special carve-out favors one class of citizens over others, undermining equal protection.

Third, delaying full permit requirements until January 1, 2028, while modifying magazine rules and providing limited safe harbors, does not cure the underlying problems. Measure 114 remains enjoined or under challenge; rushing implementation via legislation circumvents the courts and the will of voters who supported the measure as written—not as amended by politicians. The emergency clause further accelerates this flawed process without justification.

Finally, these restrictions do little to reduce crime but erode law-abiding citizens' ability to defend themselves and their families. Oregon's violent crime rates have risen in recent years, yet this bill focuses on burdening the responsible rather than addressing root causes.

I urge the Committee to reject HB 4145 in its entirety. Instead, respect constitutional rights, await final court rulings on Measure 114, and prioritize measures that actually enhance public safety without creating unequal classes of citizens.

Thank you for considering this testimony.