

Submitter: Aaron Prunty  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4145  
Honorable Representatives,

I am writing in opposition to HB 4145.

This law is costly, to the tune of \$8 million in the State's 2027-2029 biennium. That is only anticipated State costs, and does not address costs at the county and city levels. The State finds costs for local governments is indeterminate; however, there will be significant costs to the "permit agent", especially as up-front costs to implement this legislation. This is clearly an undue burden on county and city governments, unfunded by the legislators that are putting it in place. I realize the permit agent is allowed to recoup (some) costs, up to a maximum amount, but the burden and cost of putting this new legislation in place is unfunded. It is also unknown whether the "maximum" fee amount allowed is even enough to cover costs.

The fees create an undue burden on low(er)-income Oregonians. The allowed maximum fee(s) has been raised in the newest iteration of the bill from \$65 to \$150 and from \$50 to \$110 for renewals. What the legislature has done is allowed the counties and cities to recoup (some) costs, but only at the expense of those that can afford to pay for their "natural right" to bear arms (Oregon Constitution, Article 1, Section 1, 27). The State-imposed fee is only a portion of the overall cost. This legislation also requires training, with an approved trainer. Training is yet another cost that must be paid before obtaining a permit. It is not unreasonable to anticipate a cost of \$200 or more to obtain a permit to purchase a firearm. This is unreasonable and unjust.

This law is not likely to impact crime rates, nor rates of suicide or unintentional deaths. A recent RAND study, related to the effects of bans of assault weapons and high-capacity magazine finds, "There is little reason to believe that bans of assault weapons and high-capacity magazines would produce noteworthy effects on rates of suicide or unintentional injury." What this study also concludes is that anticipatory sales, sales of high-capacity magazines in this case, will likely outweigh any "benefits" this law may seek to provide. As an example, in Massachusetts, when they announced a ban on assault rifles, they had a 500-percent increase in sales (RAND, The Effects of Bans on the Sale of Assault Weapons and High-Capacity Magazines, Jan 2026). You only have to spend a few minutes at your local gun store to see the immediate increase in inventory, and sales, when legislation such as this is proposed.

Maybe the most important point, it appears the legislature has determined there is a price to pay, \$150, for what everyone knows to be a “natural right”? Is it reasonable to require payment to the State in order to exercise a natural right? No. The right to defense is inherent, and there should not be a price attached. If so, only those with the means are protected, or the State. The Oregon Constitution is meant to protect us from that. Remember your oath, and understand this legislation is contrary to that. In the State of Oregon, the Military shall be kept in strict subordination to the civil power, but not when the civil population has to pay for the power to do so.

It should be clear, this legislation is inappropriate for the constituents of Oregon.

Please vote no.

Aaron Prunty