

Submitter: Teresita Sablan
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4145

I respectfully submit this testimony in opposition to HB4145.

HB4145 makes substantial modifications to Oregon Ballot Measure 114, a measure that remains subject to ongoing legal and constitutional challenges. Advancing significant statutory changes while litigation is unresolved creates confusion for citizens, law enforcement, and the courts. The Legislature should allow the judicial process to conclude before layering additional statutory revisions onto a measure whose legality is still being determined.

The bill extends the permit issuance timeline from 30 to 60 days and increases associated fees. These changes place additional burdens on law-abiding Oregonians seeking to exercise a constitutional right. Delays of up to two months—combined with higher costs—risk transforming a right into a privilege accessible primarily to those with greater financial means or flexible schedules. Constitutional rights should not be subject to prolonged administrative delay or escalating fees.

HB4145 also increases the maximum application and renewal fees and directs a portion of those fees to the Department of State Police for background checks. While background checks are already part of firearm transfers, raising costs during a period of economic strain will disproportionately affect lower-income residents, rural Oregonians, and first-time firearm owners seeking lawful self-defense options.

Additionally, while the bill exempts permit-holder data from public disclosure, it simultaneously expands and formalizes data collection in a centralized database. Many Oregonians have legitimate privacy concerns about the long-term storage and security of sensitive personal information related to firearm ownership. Safeguards must be clear, durable, and narrowly tailored—yet this bill expands the system before public trust has been established.

The modifications to the large-capacity magazine provisions also raise concerns. The measure adjusts affirmative defenses and enforcement timelines tied to injunctions and appellate rulings. This creates uncertainty for lawful gun owners and small businesses who must navigate shifting compliance standards depending on court actions. Public policy should provide clarity and stability—not a moving target contingent on ongoing litigation.

Finally, HB4145 declares an emergency, making it effective upon passage. Emergency clauses are traditionally reserved for urgent public necessities. In this

case, there is no demonstrated emergency requiring immediate implementation. Using an emergency clause limits referendum opportunities and reduces public oversight of consequential firearm policy.

For these reasons—ongoing litigation, increased costs and delays, privacy concerns, regulatory uncertainty, and the unnecessary emergency declaration—I urge you to oppose HB4145.

Thank you for your consideration.

Teresita Sablan