

Submitter: Jordan Wales  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

To the Honorable Members of the Oregon Legislature,

I am writing to express my firm opposition to HB 3075-1, a bill that threatens the constitutional rights of Oregonians, imposes undue burdens on law-abiding citizens, and fails to meaningfully address crime and public safety. The proposed legislation is legally questionable, logistically unworkable, and economically harmful, creating more problems than solutions for Oregon residents.

#### 1. HB 3075-1 Violates Constitutional Rights

The Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 27 of the Oregon Constitution explicitly protect the right to keep and bear arms. HB 3075-1 directly infringes upon these rights by imposing broad, restrictive measures on lawful gun ownership.

**Unconstitutional Restrictions:** The bill seeks to create excessive regulations that burden responsible gun owners while doing little to deter violent criminals who do not follow the law. Courts have repeatedly ruled that sweeping firearm restrictions are unconstitutional, as seen in recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions such as *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* (2022).

**Precedent for Future Erosion of Rights:** If HB 3075-1 is passed, it will set a dangerous precedent for further encroachments on individual liberties. History has shown that once rights are restricted under the guise of "public safety," further limitations often follow.

#### 2. HB 3075-1 Fails to Address Crime While Burdening Law-Abiding Citizens

This bill does nothing to stop criminals and instead places undue hardship on responsible citizens who legally own firearms for self-defense, sport, and hunting.

**Criminals Do Not Follow Gun Laws:** By definition, criminals do not adhere to legal restrictions. Stricter laws on firearm ownership only serve to disarm responsible individuals while doing nothing to deter illicit gun trafficking, gang violence, or illegal firearm possession—which are the real sources of gun-related crime.

**Self-Defense Implications:** Many Oregonians, especially in rural areas, rely on firearms for personal protection due to slow law enforcement response times. This bill creates unnecessary hurdles that delay or deny law-abiding citizens their ability to defend themselves and their families in life-threatening situations.

**Failure of Similar Policies Elsewhere:** States and cities with strict gun control laws—such as Chicago, New York, and California—continue to experience high rates of gun

violence. This demonstrates that restrictive firearm laws do not effectively prevent crime but rather hinder law-abiding citizens' ability to protect themselves.

### 3. HB 3075-1 Imposes an Unworkable and Costly System

The bill introduces new bureaucratic requirements that would strain both citizens and state agencies.

**Burden on Law Enforcement:** This legislation requires law enforcement to administer and enforce additional firearm regulations, diverting critical resources away from active crime prevention and public safety efforts. Police officers should be focused on addressing violent crime rather than processing excessive paperwork.

**Increased Costs for Taxpayers:** The implementation of HB 3075-1 would require additional funding for administrative oversight, compliance monitoring, and legal challenges, leading to higher costs for taxpayers.

**Bureaucratic Delays:** Oregon has already struggled with administrative inefficiencies in other firearm-related processes, such as background checks. This bill would only exacerbate delays, creating excessive waiting periods for law-abiding gun owners while having no impact on criminals who acquire firearms illegally.

HB 3075-1 is a misguided attempt at addressing gun violence that ultimately punishes responsible Oregonians while failing to curb actual crime. It is unconstitutional, ineffective, and economically harmful. I urge lawmakers to reject this bill and instead focus on solutions that genuinely improve public safety without infringing upon fundamental rights.