

Submitter:

Bradley Kurtz

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

House Committee On Rules

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

SB243

I am writing to express my opposition to Oregon Ballot Measure 114, which mandates a permit-to-purchase for firearms and bans magazines holding more than ten rounds. While I understand the intent to enhance public safety, this measure imposes undue burdens on law-abiding citizens and raises significant constitutional issues.

Firstly, the permit-to-purchase requirement introduces financial and procedural barriers that disproportionately affect low-income individuals. Applicants must pay for training, fingerprinting, and permit fees, creating a de facto tax on a constitutional right. The Supreme Court has consistently held that financial barriers to fundamental rights are unconstitutional, as seen in cases like *Harper v. Virginia Board of Elections* and *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*.

Secondly, Measure 114 lacks historical precedent. In *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* (2022), the Supreme Court emphasized that firearm regulations must align with the nation's historical tradition. There is no historical basis for requiring permits, training, and background checks before purchasing a firearm. Thus, Measure 114 fails the constitutional test established in *Bruen*.

Moreover, the measure's vague language and indefinite timelines for permit approval could lead to arbitrary denials and prolonged delays, effectively infringing upon the right to bear arms. Such uncertainty undermines the principle of due process and opens the door to potential abuse.

I support the goal of reducing gun violence, but Measure 114's approach infringes upon constitutional rights without clear evidence of efficacy. I urge lawmakers and voters to reconsider this measure and seek solutions that respect individual liberties while promoting public safety.