

Submitter: Drew Samson
On Behalf Of: WE THE PEOPLE
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3076

Defending Standard Firearm Practices and Constitutional Rights

Article I, Section 27 of the Oregon Constitution clearly states:

“The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defense of themselves, and the State, but the Military shall be kept in strict subordination to the civil power.”

This provision affirms two key points that are critical in opposing HB 3076:

- The right to bear arms for defense is explicitly protected.
- The military must remain subordinate to civilian authority, ensuring no armed force gains unchecked power over the people.

The Constitutional Right to Bear Arms Extends to Standard Equipment

The Oregon Constitution’s wording places no arbitrary limit on what constitutes acceptable defensive tools. Article I, Section 27 affirms the right to bear arms broadly, and there is no historical or legal basis for separating firearms from their commonly used components — such as standard-capacity magazines. Attempting to redefine standard equipment as excessive directly conflicts with this principle.

Military Subordination and Civilian Empowerment

The Constitution’s demand that the military remain in strict subordination to civil power reinforces the belief that the public must retain reasonable means to defend itself. By restricting standard firearm equipment, HB 3076 risks tilting the balance of power away from civilians — the very people the Constitution aims to protect.

HB 3076 seeks to limit access to what are, in fact, standard magazines, unfairly restricting the rights of law-abiding citizens. By doing so, the bill undermines the core intent of Article I, Section 27 — to ensure Oregonians have the means to protect themselves and their communities. Rather than imposing arbitrary capacity limits, the focus should remain on enforcing existing laws that address criminal misuse while respecting responsible firearm ownership.