

Submitter: Chad Quickstad  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

HB3075 oversteps governmental authority, violates constitutional protections, and burdens law-abiding citizens. HB3075 is flawed because of its conflict with the Oregon State Constitution, its infringement on Second Amendment rights, its impractical measures, and its undemocratic implementation.

A primary objection to HB3075 lies in its violation of Article I, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution, which declares: “The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defense of themselves, and the State.” This provision explicitly protects an individual’s right to self-defense, a principle HB3075 undermines by extending firearm permit approval periods from 30 to 60 days and doubling permit fees. These restrictions hinder Oregonians’ ability to promptly and affordably secure arms for lawful defense, directly contradicting the state’s constitutional guarantee. Unlike narrowly tailored regulations, HB3075 imposes broad, punitive barriers that treat all gun owners as suspect, clashing with Oregon’s foundational commitment to individual liberty.

Additionally, HB3075 infringes on Second Amendment rights under the U.S. Constitution, as affirmed in *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008). The extended waiting periods and increased costs disproportionately burden law-abiding citizens—especially those with limited means—who seek firearms for self-defense or recreation. By layering excessive requirements atop an already strict permitting system, the bill effectively restricts access to a right upheld by both federal and state law. This dual violation amplifies the legislation’s overreach, penalizing responsible Oregonians rather than targeting criminal misuse of firearms.

The bill’s measures are also impractical and fail to address gun violence effectively. A 60-day waiting period leaves individuals vulnerable in urgent self-defense scenarios, while doubled fees create a financial obstacle that could exclude low-income residents from exercising their rights. Evidence from similar laws suggests these restrictions rarely deter criminals—who bypass legal channels—yet they frustrate lawful gun ownership. HB3075 offers no data linking its provisions to reduced violence, relying instead on bureaucratic hurdles that punish rather than protect.

Finally, HB3075’s emergency designation and restriction of legal challenges to specific courts erode democratic accountability. By bypassing the referendum process and limiting judicial recourse, the bill shields itself from public and legal scrutiny—likely an attempt to sidestep ongoing lawsuits against Measure 114. This undermines Oregonians’ ability to contest a law that conflicts with their state and

federal rights, fostering distrust in governance.

In conclusion, HB3075 violates the Oregon Constitution's right to bear arms, infringes on Second Amendment protections, imposes impractical burdens, and subverts democratic principles. It fails to enhance safety while disregarding the rights of law-abiding citizens. Oregonians deserve policies that uphold their constitutional freedoms and address crime without authoritarian overreach. HB3075 does neither and must be opposed.