

Submitter: Dick Baird  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

Honorable Members of the House Committee on Judiciary, I am writing to respectfully voice my opposition to Oregon House Bill 3075 (HB 3075) and its amended version, HB 3075-1, which modify the firearm permit provisions established by Ballot Measure 114. While I understand the intent to enhance public safety, I firmly believe this bill fails to achieve that goal and instead places undue burdens on law-abiding Oregonians. Below, I outline my concerns, grounded in evidence and principle, for your consideration.

- First, there is no credible evidence that HB 3075 will save lives, despite claims from anti-gun advocates. Extending permit processing times from 30 to 60 days, doubling fees to \$150, and adding bureaucratic hurdles lack supporting data—such as peer-reviewed studies—showing a reduction in gun violence. Public safety policies must be rooted in facts, not speculation. Without clear proof of effectiveness, this bill risks being an exercise in futility that punishes the law-abiding rather than addressing actual threats.
  - Second, HB 3075 overlooks the critical role of legal and responsible gun owners in preventing violent crime. Studies, including estimates from the National Research Council and CDC, suggest that firearms are used defensively between 500,000 and 3 million times annually across the U.S. In Oregon, responsible gun owners have undoubtedly contributed to stopping hundreds of thousands of violent acts over time. Yet, this bill imposes barriers—longer waits and higher costs—that could hinder these citizens from protecting themselves and their communities. For example, a victim of domestic violence needing immediate protection might face a 60-day delay, leaving them vulnerable when time is of the essence.
  - Third, criminals do not arm themselves through legal means, rendering HB 3075's focus on permit regulations ineffective against its stated target. Data consistently shows that firearms used in crimes are often obtained illegally—through theft, black markets, or straw purchases—not via the lawful channels this bill seeks to restrict. By targeting legal gun owners, HB 3075 misses the mark and fails to address the root causes of violence, such as socioeconomic factors or mental health crises.
- Beyond these core concerns, I share the broader opposition's view that HB 3075 infringes on Second Amendment rights. The U.S. Supreme Court's Bruen decision (2022) reaffirmed that restrictive permitting schemes must align with historical tradition, a standard this bill arguably fails to meet. Doubling fees and extending wait times turn a constitutional right into a privilege for the affluent and patient, disproportionately harming rural and lower-income Oregonians. The Bill and its Amendment place law-abiding Oregonians, especially those in the lowest income bracket at a disadvantage in obtaining permits for firearms that may be necessary for their efficient self-defense. The amendment to the Bill (HB3075-1) requires that "any

action challenging the legality, including the constitutionality, of this 2025 Act, must be commenced in the circuit court for Marion County” could create an undue burden on citizens, especially those in lower economic classes. The Amendment (HB3075-1) seems to be nothing short of tyrannical as it attempts to use the Legislative Government Branch to control the Judicial Government Branch... but these two entities are supposed to be operating separately for check and balance to prevent any branch from becoming too powerful.

Additionally, the bill’s emergency clause raises red flags. By taking effect immediately upon the Governor’s signature, it bypasses public referendum and judicial oversight, especially troubling given ongoing legal challenges to Measure 114. This maneuver undermines democratic accountability and forces citizens to restart costly legal battles to defend their rights. If this is truly an emergency, why delay key provisions until 2026 or 2028? The contradiction weakens the bill’s justific