

Submitter: Don Tunstall
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

Oregon Senate Bill 243 (2025) infringes on Second Amendment rights and imposes unnecessary restrictions on law-abiding gun owners without compelling evidence of reducing gun violence. The bill's key provisions— a 72-hour waiting period, a ban on rapid-fire devices like bump stocks, prohibiting those under 21 from purchasing semi-automatic weapons, and allowing local governments to regulate firearms in public buildings—target responsible citizens rather than criminals. For example, the waiting period delays access for individuals needing firearms for self-defense, particularly in rural Oregon where law enforcement response times can be long. The age restriction unfairly limits young adults (18-20), who are legally adults, from exercising their constitutional rights, with narrow exemptions for hunting firearms that don't cover all legitimate uses like home defense. The ban on rapid-fire devices is largely symbolic, as bump stocks are rarely used in crimes (FBI crime data, 2023), and determined attackers can find alternatives. The local government provision risks creating a confusing patchwork of regulations, undermining legal concealed carry.

Cost to Taxpayers

SB 243's fiscal impact on Oregon taxpayers is significant, though exact figures depend on implementation and litigation outcomes. Key costs include:

Background Check Study:

The bill mandates the Oregon State Police to study firearm transfer background check efficiency, reporting by September 15, 2026. The Oregon Legislative Fiscal Office estimated in 2023 (for similar gun bills) that such studies require staffing, data analysis, and reporting, potentially costing \$500,000-\$1 million in public funds, depending on scope. This draws resources from other public safety priorities.

Administrative and Enforcement Costs:

Implementing the waiting period and age restrictions requires updates to Oregon State Police systems, training for law enforcement, and oversight of compliance by gun Dealers. Similar regulations (e.g., Measure 114) were estimated to cost \$3-5 million annually for administration, including personnel and IT upgrades. Local governments enforcing new firearm rules in public buildings will incur additional costs for signage, legal reviews, and enforcement, likely in the hundreds of thousands per jurisdiction.

Litigation Expenses:

Pro-gun groups, like the Oregon Firearms Federation, have signaled intent to challenge SB 243 in court, citing Second Amendment violations. Defending such laws is costly; Oregon spent over \$2 million defending Measure 114 against lawsuits since 2022, per state budget reports. If SB 243 triggers federal lawsuits, legal fees

could exceed \$5 million, especially if cases reach appellate courts or the U.S. Supreme Court.

Indirect Economic Impact:

The bill may deter firearm-related businesses (dealers, ranges) due to added regulations, reducing tax revenue. Oregon's outdoor recreation economy, including hunting, generates \$1.4 billion annually (Oregon Outdoor Recreation Initiative, 2023). Restrictions on young adults and waiting periods could suppress gun sales and related activities, indirectly lowering sales tax revenue.

In sum, SB 243 risks costing taxpayers millions in direct costs (studies, enforcement) and legal battles, while potentially harming local economies—all for measures that pro-gun advocates argue won't effectively reduce crime and infringe on constitutional rights. Funds would be better spent on mental health programs or enforcing existing laws, which address violence without penalizing lawful gun owners.