

Submitter: Darin Kundert
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3076

SOME TALKING POINTS!

Talking Points for Lawmakers: Opposing HB 3075 – Permit-to-Purchase (Ballot Measure 114)

Honorable Members of the Oregon Legislature,

As you consider HB 3075, which seeks to implement Measure 114's permit-to-purchase requirements, it is crucial to recognize the constitutional, legal, and practical flaws in this legislation.

1. Measure 114 Was Not a Clear Mandate from Oregonians

Measure 114 barely passed (50.7% to 49.3%), showing Oregon is deeply divided on this issue. Such a significant restriction on constitutional rights should not be enacted on a near 50/50 vote.

The measure faced immediate legal challenges, proving that many Oregonians—including law enforcement and legal experts—believe it violates the Second Amendment.

Courts in other states have struck down similar laws in light of the Supreme Court's Bruen decision, making Measure 114 legally vulnerable.

2. Permit-to-Purchase Creates Unnecessary Bureaucracy and Burdens Law Enforcement

Oregon law enforcement agencies lack the resources to process firearm permits efficiently. Adding another layer of bureaucracy will divert resources away from crime prevention and response.

The backlog from concealed handgun license (CHL) processing already delays law-abiding citizens from exercising their rights—Measure 114 will only make this worse. Police and sheriff's offices across Oregon have openly opposed this measure due to feasibility concerns.

3. This Law Will Not Reduce Crime or Enhance Public Safety

Criminals do not obtain firearms through legal channels and will not apply for a permit-to-purchase. Instead, this measure only hinders law-abiding Oregonians. Studies linking permit-to-purchase laws to reduced homicides fail to account for broader crime trends. Oregon already has a low gun homicide rate compared to other states with stricter gun laws.

If the goal is to reduce violent crime, resources should be directed toward enforcing existing gun laws, increasing penalties for violent offenders, and addressing mental health crises.

4. Large-Capacity Magazine Bans Do Not Prevent Mass Shootings

Standard-capacity magazines (over 10 rounds) are commonly used for self-defense, sport shooting, and lawful carry. Criminals will not abide by this ban, and restricting

magazine size will not stop mass shootings.

States like California and New York have had magazine bans for years but continue to experience high-profile mass shootings.

Restricting magazine capacity disproportionately affects women and vulnerable citizens, who may need more rounds to defend themselves effectively against multiple attackers.

5. The “Charleston Loophole” Talking Point is Misleading

Federal law allows firearm transfers if a background check is not completed within three business days, preventing indefinite delays that could amount to a de facto gun ban.

Delays primarily impact law-abiding gun buyers, not criminals, who overwhelmingly obtain firearms illegally.

If background checks take longer, the solution is to improve the efficiency of the system—not to indefinitely delay constitutional rights.

6. Oregon’s Gun Laws Must Align with the Supreme Court’s Bruen Decision

The Bruen ruling reinforced that gun regulations must align with historical tradition—modern permit-to-purchase laws have no historical precedent in U.S. law.

States like New York, New Jersey, and California have seen their restrictive gun laws overturned due to Bruen. Oregon will likely face costly legal challenges if it moves forward with implementing Measure 114.

7. Please oppose measure HB3076 as a law abiding citizen I oppose measure HB3076