

Submitter: Scott Acarregui
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

In regards to HB 3075, I am writing to express my concern and opposition for this bill. My concerns are three parts:

First: section 22 of this bill requires that any challenges are heard in Marion county. I can't understand why this would be in the text if the bill is not to circumvent the will of other courts. This seems disingenuous and creates a scenario in which the legislative branch is dictating how the judicial branch can operate. This section needs to be removed from this bill as it creates an unacceptable precedence, regardless of partisan leanings.

Second: section 11, subsection 2 makes it a crime to own, use, or transfer, any large capacity magazine after December 8th, 2022. Presently it is possible to purchase these magazines, but if this bill passes, it will have been a crime to have legally purchased or used these components at any point in time between December of 2022 and the present time. This is incorrect and if this bill passes, it needs forward dated to a pre-determined date after the passage of the bill.

Third: This is a more sweeping concern: gun rights are a large part of Oregon's culture. We are fortunate to not have the issues of large cities or more populous states. The vast majority of Oregon is rural and as such, guns are not just for the range, but are used to defend livestock (which I have had to do), and keep property. There is a massive difference between Central Oregon, Eastern Oregon, and the Willamette Valley. A bill such as this does the will of one geographic area while doing a disservice to the rest of the state. Per the second amendment, we can all agree that gun ownership is a right that we are blessed with in America. Bills such as this work to diminish rights and set a precedent for other rights (outside of second amendment rights) to be limited.

I humbly ask you to consider the points that I have presented and stop HB 3075.