Curt Onstott

4884 SW Roseberry St Corvallis, OR 97333 <u>curt.onstott@gmail.com</u> 3-16-2025

Oregon State Legislature 900 Court St. NE Salem, OR 97301

Subject: Opposition to HB 3075-1 – A Dangerous Precedent in Stripping Constitutional Rights From The Poor.

Dear Members of the Oregon State Legislature,

I am writing to express my absolute opposition to **House Bill 3075**, a measure that—despite whatever well-intentioned justifications its supporters may offer—**directly undermines the Second Amendment** and sets a dangerous precedent for restricting constitutional rights based on wealth, literacy, and government approval.

This is How Governments Create Second-Class Citizens

Under HB 3075, the right to keep and bear arms will no longer be a **right** for every law-abiding citizen. Instead, it becomes a **privilege**—one that can only be accessed by those who:

- ✓ Can afford \$150+ in fees just to apply.
- ✓ Have the free time and money for training courses that may cost hundreds of dollars.
- ✓ Can navigate legal paperwork in English without barriers.
- ✓ Can wait months for bureaucratic approval while their safety hangs in the balance.

By imposing these barriers, the Oregon Legislature is **not protecting anyone—it is selectively disarming the most vulnerable**. Those living in **high-crime areas**, single parents who fear for their children's safety, and working-class individuals who can't afford security systems or private protection are being told **they don't deserve self-defense** unless they **pay for the privilege**.

History Shows This is How Authoritarianism Starts

This is **not** the first time in history that a government has used **bureaucracy and financial restrictions** to undermine fundamental rights. When people think of dictatorships, they picture soldiers storming homes and imprisoning citizens in broad daylight. But that's not how most authoritarian regimes **start**. They start with **paperwork**, **fees**, **permits**, **and endless delays**—designed to make it so difficult for ordinary people to exercise their rights that most give up.

• Jim Crow Laws in the American South didn't ban Black Americans from voting outright. Instead, they used poll taxes, literacy tests, and "understanding clauses"—

- creating hurdles that made voting functionally impossible for poor and uneducated individuals.
- The Weimar Republic in pre-Nazi Germany introduced gun restrictions that required permits, fees, and bureaucratic approval. When Hitler came to power, those laws were used to disarm political enemies while ensuring that government allies remained armed.
- The Soviet Union controlled speech not by outright banning dissent, but by requiring government-issued press permits that could be revoked at any time. This ensured that only those in good standing with the government could have a voice.

Now, Oregon is playing the same game—turning the Second Amendment into a pay-to-play system where only the privileged can defend themselves.

If This Were Applied to Other Rights, It Would be Outrageous

Imagine if the **First Amendment** required:

- A \$150 fee before speaking at a protest.
- A mandatory government-approved training course before practicing religion.
- A background check and fingerprinting before publishing a newspaper article.

We would **rightfully** call these laws unconstitutional. So why is it acceptable when applied to the **Second Amendment**? The answer is simple: It isn't.

A Law That Exempts the State While Disarming the Public

One of the most telling parts of this bill is that it provides a permanent exemption for activeduty law enforcement and military personnel—but not for the average citizen. Why is it that the very people who already have state-provided weapons and protection get a pass, while a single mother in a dangerous neighborhood is told she must pay up, prove herself, and wait for approval?

This is not about **safety**—it is about **power**. A government that allows itself **unrestricted access** to weapons while disarming the people it governs is not a free government.

Conclusion: HB 3075 is a Trojan Horse for More Government Control

HB 3075 is not a public safety bill. It is a **financial and bureaucratic attack on a constitutional right**. It is a **litmus test** for how far Oregonians will allow their rights to be eroded before they push back. If this bill is allowed to pass, it will **not be the last**. The **incremental destruction of constitutional rights always begins this way**—with justifications, with fees, with "common sense" regulations that quickly morph into full-scale disarmament.

If you truly believe in justice, fairness, and equal protection under the law, then you must reject HB 3075. Rights are not privileges for the rich. They belong to every law-abiding citizen, without exception.

Sincerely,

Curt Onstott 4884 SW Roseberry St Corvallis, OR 97333 curt.onstott@gmail.com