

Submitter: Petet Brown
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

Oregon House Bill 3075, introduced in the 2025 session, claims to refine firearm permit regulations from Ballot Measure 114 (2022). However, it overreaches, undermines individual rights, and imposes impractical burdens on law-abiding citizens without clear evidence of enhancing public safety. This bill, currently in the House Committee on Judiciary with a hearing on March 17, 2025, should be rejected for its flawed approach and potential to erode constitutional protections.

Erosion of Second Amendment Rights

The bill's modifications to the permit process—extending issuance timelines to 60 days, raising fees to \$150 for initial applications, and mandating training within five years—create unnecessary hurdles for Oregonians exercising their Second Amendment rights. The U.S. Supreme Court's Bruen decision (2022) affirms that firearm regulations must align with historical traditions of public carry, not impose excessive modern barriers. HB 3075's fee hikes and delays fail this test, disproportionately affecting low-income individuals who may struggle to afford compliance. Rights should not come with a steep price tag or bureaucratic lag.

Moreover, the bill's emergency declaration, allowing immediate effect upon passage, bypasses typical legislative deliberation. This rushed implementation risks errors and public backlash, undermining trust in governance. If the goal is safety, why not allow time to assess Ballot Measure 114's existing impact before layering on more restrictions?

Lack of Evidence for Public Safety Gains

Proponents may argue HB 3075 enhances safety by refining permit rules, but where's the data? Ballot Measure 114's permit system is barely two years old as of March 16, 2025—too new to yield conclusive results. Extending permit processing from 30 to 60 days and tweaking training requirements lack backing from peer-reviewed studies showing reduced gun violence. Oregon's gun homicide rate, per the CDC, has hovered around 2.5 per 100,000 in recent years, below the national average. Without evidence that these changes address a specific, measurable problem, the bill feels like regulatory overreach dressed as reform.

The magazine provision tweak—modifying affirmative defenses for large-capacity magazines—further muddies the waters. If the intent is clarity, why not repeal or fully enforce the ban instead of this half-measure? Ambiguity invites legal challenges,

wasting taxpayer resources on court battles rather than proven safety initiatives.

Practical Burdens on Citizens and Agencies

HB 3075's operational flaws are glaring. Extending permit processing to 60 days burdens law enforcement, already stretched thin, with no guarantee of improved vetting. The bill's text (LegiScan, 2025) doesn't allocate funds for additional staff or training, risking backlogs that delay lawful purchases. For rural Oregonians, designated permit locations may be hours away, compounding costs with travel. A \$150 fee—plus potential training expenses—could total over \$200 per applicant, a regressive tax on a constitutional right.

The training mandate, while offering alternatives, assumes access to courses that may not exist in every county. Five years of validity sounds reasonable, but renewal at \$110 restarts the cycle of fees and delays.

Exceptions Highlight Inequity

The bill's exemptions—for law enforcement, military, and transfers until July 1, 2026—expose its inconsistency. If permits are critical for safety, why delay their necessity for over a year? Why exempt certain groups indefinitely? This double standard suggests the rules are less about universal safety and more about targeting civilians. Active-duty personnel, while trained, aren't immune to mental health crises or domestic violence—factors permits aim to screen. Equal application of the law should be the standard, not selective privileged few.

In short there are many clear reasons why this bill is not appropriate and places undue burden on law abiding citizens of Oregon.