

Submitter:	Chase Stewmon
On Behalf Of:	Myself and my family
Committee:	House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic:	HB4145

I respectfully oppose Oregon HB 4145 due to serious concerns regarding fiscal responsibility, unintended consequences, constitutional rights, and the long-term impact on Oregon taxpayers and public services.

Oregon residents already face a high cost of living, increasing taxes, and growing pressure on core state services such as education, public safety, infrastructure, and healthcare access for citizens. HB 4145 risks further straining state resources without sufficiently addressing how these costs will be sustainably funded or how existing obligations to Oregonians will be protected.

Public policy should prioritize efficient use of taxpayer dollars and ensure that programs funded by the state deliver measurable benefits to those who are legally entitled to them. HB 4145 lacks adequate safeguards to prevent cost overruns and does not clearly demonstrate how it will avoid diverting funding from essential services that many Oregonians already struggle to access.

In addition to fiscal concerns, HB 4145 raises significant constitutional issues. The Second Amendment of the United States Constitution clearly states that the right of the people to keep and bear arms “shall not be infringed.” This language is explicit and intentional. Policies that restrict this right by placing additional limitations, reinterpretations, or administrative barriers undermine a fundamental constitutional protection and set a concerning precedent by allowing core rights to be left to subjective interpretation rather than respected as written.

The Constitution is not conditional or flexible based on political climate. Laws that erode constitutional freedoms—particularly those that impact law-abiding citizens—risk diminishing public trust and infringing upon individual liberties that the government is sworn to protect. Any legislation that restricts constitutionally protected rights must meet the highest standard of justification, clarity, and necessity, which HB 4145 fails to demonstrate.

Additionally, the bill raises concerns about accountability and fairness. Taxpayers are compelled to fund expanded state obligations, yet there is limited transparency regarding long-term fiscal impacts or mechanisms to ensure that state spending remains within responsible limits. Policies that expand government authority and spending should include clear cost controls, oversight, and assurances that they will not lead to future tax increases, service reductions, or erosion of constitutional rights.

Oregon should focus on strengthening existing systems, supporting working families, improving public safety through proven methods, and addressing affordability for residents who are already here and contributing to the state. Compassion and safety are important goals, but they must be balanced with responsible governance, constitutional fidelity, and respect for the taxpayers and citizens whose rights and livelihoods are affected.

For these reasons, I urge lawmakers to oppose HB 4145 and instead pursue solutions that are fiscally responsible, transparent, constitutionally sound, and focused on improving outcomes for Oregon residents.