

02/04/2026

I oppose Oregon Measure 114 and House Bill 4145.

Once again Oregonians are given short notice, and only a narrow window to reject additional laws from officials who have not enforced the statutes that already exist.

You have placed an undue burden on law abiding Oregonians without addressing the root causes of violent crime that Oregon's leaders have ignored. Public safety is a shared goal, but it must be pursued in a way that is effective, constitutional, and equitable.

Measure 114 and HB 4145 shift focus away from criminals who misuse firearms and instead impose complex requirements, delays, and uncertainty on citizens who follow the law. These measures risk creating unequal access to a constitutional right based on geography, administrative capacity, and discretionary decision-making, rather than on objective standards.

Measure 114 & HB 4145 continues to restrict standard capacity magazines that are factory standard equipment for most modern firearms and are commonly owned and lawfully used by millions of Americans, including many Oregonians. These magazines are not unusual, specialized, or inherently dangerous; they are the standard configuration designed and sold by manufacturers for reliability, safety, and lawful use.

In addition, expanding regulatory frameworks without clear evidence of effectiveness diverts limited state resources from strategies that are proven to reduce violence—such as enforcing existing laws, targeting repeat violent offenders, supporting mental health services, and investing in community based prevention.

Infringement of Constitutional Rights. This bill violates Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon Constitution and the Second Amendment by creating barriers to lawful gun ownership. Financial and administrative barriers: The bill raises permit fees by 130 % (from \$65 to \$150) and doubles the processing window from 30 to 60 days, which critics say makes rights unaffordable and inaccessible.

Lack of Due Process. I am concerned that permits can be denied on the basis of a subjective judgment even when no criminal conviction exists, violating the principle that a person is innocent until proven guilty. We've seen this in California for example.

Ineffectiveness Against Crime. I argue that Measure 114 & HB 4145 will only burden law abiding citizens while criminals will continue to obtain firearms through illegal means.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Alex Togstad