

Submitter: Jaidyn Camp
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

I strongly oppose house bill 3075.

I consider myself to be a reasonable and open minded individual and have heard arguments from both sides. I am thoroughly unconvinced that this bill will provide any benefit and is simply, strictly unconstitutional

Setting this bill as law will destroy small businesses and halt gun sales as there is currently no curriculum, license process or deadline set for law enforcement to issue a permit. Other states where permit laws have passed are shall issue states with measure in place, for Oregon this is not the case. Due to this, the bill immediately becomes unconstitutional. We will not only have to pay to use our second amendment right, but also be bottlenecked by the measure because we would be unable to purchase firearms until we have a permit, but the permit is unobtainable currently and there is no deadline for when that permit may be made available.

I oppose the magazine capacity limit. It has been shown in great magnitude that the vast majority of modern handguns have a standard capacity of 17+1, and modern sporting rifles have a standard capacity of 30+1. Furthermore, while magazines can detach from weapons and 10 round magazines may be purchased, this bill will cause historical weapons such as lever action rifles that have a built in capacity of greater than 10 rounds to become illegal with no way to work around this issue.

The following issues are cited as great concern among all reasonable, gun owning Oregonians:

1. Second Amendment Violation: The U.S.

Supreme Court's ruling in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* (2022) established that firearm regulations must be consistent with the nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation.

HB 3075's extended waiting periods, heightened fees, and discretionary permitting process-allowing law enforcement to deny permits based on subjective judgments of "dangerousness"—lack clear historical analogs. These restrictions unduly burden the right to keep and bear arms for law-abiding citizens, likely failing the Bruen test.

2. Ex Post Facto Clause: The bill retroactively criminalizes possession of large-capacity magazines legally purchased prior to its enactment. This violates Article I, Section 10 of the U.S. Constitution and Article 1, Section 21 of the Oregon Constitution, both of which prohibit ex post facto laws—laws that punish actions lawful when committed. Courts have consistently struck down similar retroactive firearm

restrictions.

3. Due Process Concerns: The vague standard for permit denial ("likely to be a danger") grants excessive discretion to law enforcement, risking arbitrary or discriminatory enforcement. The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments require clear guidelines and fair processes, which HB 3075 lacks, making it susceptible to a due process

House Bill 3075, along with measure 114 were created out of emotion and the flaws are obvious. I strongly oppose HB 3075