

Submitter: Daniel Nguyen  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

I whole heartedly oppose Oregon Measure 114 and HB 3075, as these measures impose unnecessary and burdensome restrictions on law-abiding Oregonians' right to bear arms. These bills do not address the root causes of violence but instead unfairly target responsible gun owners who already comply with existing laws. By limiting access to firearms and implementing arbitrary restrictions, they infringe on the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens, and add more barriers to anyone that may want to arm/protect themselves in the future. We already have systems such as background checks in place, which many that voted in favor don't even realize that felons can't just walk into a store and buy a gun.

And the "high capacity" (factually standard capacity) further harms the law-abiding citizens' ability to more effectively defend themselves. One of the most popular handguns purchased by Americans is the Glock 19 handgun, which comes standard with 15 rounds. And the most popular rifle being the AR-15, comes standard with 30. That is not high capacity considering there are actual extended magazines that hold up to around 60. Many such cases of home invasions, robberies, and other similar crimes are commonly committed by groups of criminals, not just a single individual. What people don't realize is bullets might miss, especially in high stress situations. And people do not always go down in one shot like in the movies. What are we to do when a group of 5+ comes kicking in our doors with just 10 bullets? 10 rounds will not be enough, when and family's and my life are on the line anyone would want more than just 10. No one that's ever actually been in a real gunfight ever wished they had less ammo in their gun. That's why many American's choice of home defense is the AR-15. If 10 really was enough, why aren't police or protective details following the same restrictions? Because it is not sufficient enough to deal with the threats of today's reality. Criminals will not follow such laws while they are breaking other laws that are already in place. The vast majority shouldn't suffer because of the small minority of bad actors. Enforcing this ban won't make all 10+ magazines just magically disappear, but it will from the hands of law-abiding citizens. Limiting this will do nothing but harm the chances of responsible gun owners to successfully defend them selves, in favor of violent criminals that will use whatever magazine size they want anyway, like they already are. The police don't stop them violent criminals and protect the lives of fellow Americans with reduced magazines. And neither should we.

Instead of punishing responsible gun owners, we should focus on practical solutions that target criminal behavior and enhance public safety/mental health. The blame should not fall on guns just like any other method used by violent criminals. When they use knives, cars, etc, the blame always lies on them. When they use a gun, it's

not suddenly the gun's fault and therefore we hinder them for everyone else. It's still the fault of the perpetrator, not the tool they used, just like anything else. Even if this measure is signed into law, criminals will either just not follow them and do it anyway and/or find another way. With all that being said, I urge lawmakers to reconsider these measures and prioritize policies that protect both constitutional rights and the safety of our communities. This way everyone wins.