

Submitter: Dale Young
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

Argument in Opposition to Oregon HB 3075

Oregon HB 3075 represents an unjustified escalation of government overreach that undermines the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens while failing to address the root causes of gun violence. This bill, building on the controversial Ballot Measure 114, imposes burdensome regulations that disproportionately penalize responsible firearm owners rather than targeting criminal behavior. Here's why it should be opposed:

First, the enhanced background check requirements and extended 60-day waiting period infringe on the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. The U.S. Constitution guarantees this right, and delays of up to two months—coupled with doubled permit fees—create an unreasonable barrier to exercising it. For individuals in immediate need of self-defense, such as victims of domestic violence or those in rural areas with limited police protection, this delay could be life-threatening. The state assumes guilt by default, forcing citizens to wait and pay more to prove their innocence, which flips the principle of "innocent until proven guilty" on its head.

Second, the expansion of permit requirements to all firearm transfers, including private transactions, overcomplicates a fundamental right with unnecessary bureaucracy. This provision risks criminalizing innocuous actions—like a father passing a hunting rifle to his son—while doing little to deter illegal gun trafficking, which often bypasses legal channels entirely. Criminals, by definition, do not comply with permitting laws, yet HB 3075 heaps additional red tape on the law-abiding, creating a system ripe for errors, delays, and abuse.

Third, the jurisdictional restriction on legal challenges is a blatant power grab, designed to stack the deck against citizens seeking to defend their rights. By funneling lawsuits into courts likely sympathetic to the state's agenda, HB 3075 undermines judicial fairness and erodes trust in the democratic process. This move suggests a lack of confidence in the law's constitutionality—why else limit where it can be contested?

Fourth, the emergency clause is a manipulative tactic to silence public opposition. By rushing the bill into effect, lawmakers evade the standard referendum process, denying Oregonians their right to challenge this legislation through democratic means. This reeks of authoritarianism, prioritizing political expediency over accountability.

Finally, HB 3075 fails the test of efficacy. Gun violence is a complex issue tied more to socioeconomic factors, mental health, and enforcement gaps than to lawful ownership. Studies—like those from the Rand Corporation—show inconclusive evidence that permit-to-purchase laws significantly reduce violent crime. Meanwhile, Oregon's existing laws already include background checks and restrictions. Piling on more rules won't stop determined criminals but will harass responsible citizens, diverting resources from real solutions like community policing or mental health support.

In conclusion, HB 3075 is a misguided, heavy-handed measure that sacrifices liberty for the illusion of safety. It punishes the innocent, ignores the guilty, and erodes democratic principles—all under the guise of "gun violence reduction." Oregonians deserve better: policies that respect their rights and address crime's true drivers, not knee-jerk regulations that miss the mark.

Thank you for giving consideration to my remarks.

Dale Young
Salem, OR