

Submitter: Brandon Howard  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4145

Testimony in Opposition to House Bill 4145  
House Committee on Judiciary  
Submitted by: Brandon Howard, Grants Pass, Oregon  
Date: February 27, 2026

Dear Chair and Members of the Committee,

I strongly oppose HB 4145, which modifies Ballot Measure 114 by implementing a permit-to-purchase system for firearms, delaying but ultimately enforcing requirements like extended background checks, higher fees, mandatory training, and restrictions tied to large-capacity magazines. While the bill delays some aspects until 2028, it expands government oversight, increases costs, and creates unequal treatment under the law—all while failing to address real public safety threats.

First, this bill treats a fundamental constitutional right—the right to keep and bear arms under the Second Amendment and Article I, Section 27 of the Oregon Constitution—as a privilege requiring government permission. As the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* (2022), laws burdening core Second Amendment conduct must be consistent with historical tradition. Requiring permits, fingerprints, fees up to \$150 (more than double the original), and up to 60 days for approval has no such historical analogue for law-abiding citizens. It converts a right into a bureaucratic hurdle.

Second, HB 4145 disproportionately burdens law-abiding Oregonians, especially in rural areas like southern Oregon. Many residents rely on firearms for self-defense, hunting, and protection from wildlife. Delaying permits to 60 days could leave people vulnerable during waits. The fee increases—from \$65 to \$150 for initial permits and \$50 to \$110 for renewals—create financial barriers, hitting low-income families hardest. Rural residents already face limited access to training courses and sheriff's offices for processing. This does nothing to stop criminals, who ignore laws by definition.

Third, the bill carves out exemptions for active and retired law enforcement from magazine restrictions and potentially other requirements, creating two classes of citizens. If high-capacity magazines are supposedly too dangerous for civilians, why are they safe for off-duty or retired officers? This unequal treatment undermines fairness and suggests the restrictions target the general public, not threats.

Fourth, evidence shows these measures won't reduce crime. Criminals don't submit to background checks or permits. Oregon's violent crime rates, including homicides, have risen in recent years despite existing laws. Focus should be on enforcing current statutes against illegal possession, prosecuting violent offenders, and addressing root causes like mental health and drug issues—not piling more restrictions on responsible gun owners.

Finally, as legal challenges to Measure 114 continue in state and federal courts, rushing implementation via HB 4145 risks wasting resources on a law that may ultimately be struck down as unconstitutional. The public overwhelmingly opposed similar expansions in testimony, yet the bill advances.

I urge you to vote NO on HB 4145. Protect the rights of law-abiding Oregonians, reject ineffective gun control that only burdens the compliant, and prioritize real solutions to violence.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Brandon Howard

Grants Pass, Oregon