

Submitter: Alexander Arias  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

In a pair of cases, District of Columbia v. Heller in 2008 and McDonald v. City of Chicago in 2010, the high court ruled individual Americans have a right to bear arms that must be respected under federal, state and local laws. the Oregon constitution states Section 27. Right to bear arms; military subordinate to civil power. The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence [sic] of themselves, and the State, but the Military shall be kept in strict subordination to the civil power[.] to create a Permit to Purchase (A permit to purchase is permission from the government to control what they say is illegal, and denies the right to keep and bear arms.)

is to deny the right of an individual to acquire a gun for defense of themselves. furthermore the oregon constitution states

Section 32. Taxes and duties; uniformity of taxation. No tax or duty shall be imposed without the consent of the people or their representatives in the Legislative Assembly; and all taxation shall be uniform on the same class of subjects within the territorial limits of the authority levying the tax. [Constitution of 1859; Amendment proposed by H.J.R. 16, 1917, and adopted by the people June 4, 1917] i know i do not consent to this new tax to purchase a permit that only gun owners must pay and not all the people of Oregon.

to conclude permits to purchase a gun are inherently racist, from 1791, when the Second Amendment was ratified, to 1868, when the 14th Amendment — which the Supreme Court has interpreted to apply the Bill of Rights to the states — was ratified.

During that period, permit-to-purchase laws do appear to have a historical analogue to today, but for only one group: Black Americans. In 1828, Florida passed a law requiring formerly enslaved people to obtain a license from a justice of the peace in order to use and carry a gun. Delaware followed three years later. In 1865, just as the Civil War drew to a close, Mississippi enacted a law requiring free Black people to obtain a license from “the board of police of his or her county” to keep “firearms of any kind, or any ammunition.” That same year in Louisiana, Black residents were required to seek approval from police and their employer if they wanted to own a gun.

“This is where the new methodology runs into trouble, because we have a history of racist gun laws,” said Adam Winkler, a professor at UCLA School of Law. “How do you even conceptualize those in a history-and-tradition? On one hand, you’d say to ignore them, because they’re racist,” and thus unconstitutional.