

Submitter: Jacob Cosler
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4145
Opposing Testimony for Oregon House Bill 4145

Chair and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I respectfully oppose House Bill 4145 for the following reasons:

1. Overrides Voter Intent from Measure 114

HB 4145 materially alters the firearm permit and magazine restrictions that Oregon voters narrowly approved in Ballot Measure 114 in 2022. By changing key terms and expanding exemptions, it effectively lets the Legislature rewrite voter-approved law without a public vote of the people.

2. Creates Unequal Treatment Under the Law

The bill exempts active and retired law enforcement officers — as well as parole and probation officers — from the same restrictions that apply to civilians, including large-capacity magazine limitations and permit requirements. This creates a class of citizens with broader firearm rights than ordinary Oregonians and undermines the principle of equal protection under law.

3. Increased Cost and Delay for Law-Abiding Citizens

HB 4145 raises firearm permit application and renewal fees substantially — from a historic cap of \$65 to as much as \$150 or more — and doubles the time authorities have to issue or deny permits from 30 to 60 days. Higher costs and longer delays disproportionately burden lower-income residents and could deter lawful exercise of constitutional rights.

4. Expanded Discretion and Bias Risk

Extending the processing period and adding subjective judgment points increases the potential for arbitrary or discriminatory decisions. Without clearer standards, permitting could vary widely between jurisdictions or review officers. This risks unequal access to rights based on arbitrary criteria rather than objective legal standards.

5. Restricts Judicial Challenge Options

HB 4145 requires any legal challenges to the act to be filed only in Marion County. This limits access to judicial review for many Oregonians and could unduly burden plaintiffs and skew outcomes based on venue convenience rather than constitutional merit.

6. Delays Implementation of Permit Provisions

In addition to increasing fees and timelines, the bill postpones the date when permit requirements take effect until January 1, 2028, even though the current system remains blocked, meaning the Legislature is unilaterally setting a distant future date without broad consensus.