

Submitter: Patrick Aguilar

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4145

I oppose this bill. I voted for Measure 114 as written, but in the YEARS following it's become clear to me that measure was flawed to begin with. In a time when the average citizen can be gunned down with no consequence, even though multiple angles of video evidence exist to prove that government agents are escalating and murdering people, I fully oppose any legislation that would disarm the average person. I fully oppose any legislation that would put roadblocks up for citizens to acquire gun and exercise their inalienable rights to own firearms.

Measure 114 is already being considered for constitutionality. Amending an already flawed bill to add more burden on the public is a step in the wrong direction.

District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008), the Supreme Court held 5-4 that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to possess a firearm for lawful purposes.

In New York State Pistol and Rifle Association v. Bruen, the Supreme Court established that the government must demonstrate that a regulation is consistent with the nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation. The proposed doubling of time the authorities have (from 30 days increased to 60 days) affects the poor and minority populations exponentially more than it would affect the wealthy. In that same vein, increasing the fee for the already difficult license by over 100% is ridiculous. A citizen making minimum wage in a non urban county would have to work over ten and a half hours just to afford the fee under these proposed modifications. Considering the number of people who have to work multiple jobs just to make ends meet, having the time to work an extra 12 hours to have enough money after taxes just to pay for the permit, let alone travel to and then take the class for the permit, is excessive. Even at Portland's higher minimum wage rate, it would still take 9.4 hours of work to afford the new permit fees.

Essentially, everything this new bill proposes works to benefit authoritarian control rather than the service of the average citizen. It's not congruent with established rights, and I personally feel like these proposed changes are specifically designed to disarm the public.

How does one meaningfully oppose the militant fascism I read about in every fundraising e-mail when our elected representatives want us to be harmless?