

Submitter: Zachery McLaughlin  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

Dear Chairperson and Members of the Committee,

My name is Zachery McLaughlin, and I'm an electrical engineer based in Oregon City. I want to thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony regarding Senate Bill 243, also known as the "Oregon Suicide Prevention and Community Safety Firearms Act." While I appreciate the legislature's concern for public safety, I am writing today to express strong opposition to this bill, which presents significant legal, constitutional, and practical issues that warrant reconsideration.

### 1. Unconstitutional Burden on the Second Amendment

SB 243 imposes a mandatory 72-hour waiting period for all firearm transfers—even after the buyer has passed a background check and received an approval number from the Oregon State Police. This provision unnecessarily delays the exercise of a fundamental constitutional right. The U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to possess firearms for lawful purposes such as self-defense. Imposing a multi-day delay—without any individualized suspicion or evidence of risk—amounts to a punitive barrier on law-abiding citizens.

### 2. Discriminatory Impact on Rural and Vulnerable Populations

For Oregonians in rural communities where police response times can be lengthy, the ability to quickly acquire a firearm for self-defense is critical. For survivors of domestic violence or individuals under threat, a 72-hour delay could mean the difference between life and death. SB 243 fails to provide adequate exemptions or expedited pathways in emergencies, thereby disproportionately endangering vulnerable populations.

### 3. Overcriminalization and Ambiguity in Rapid Fire Activator Provisions

While public safety concerns about certain firearm modifications are understandable, the bill's language regarding "rapid fire activators" is overly broad and ambiguous. It criminalizes possession of many devices, even those that may not substantially increase fire rate or could be possessed legally under federal law. Law-abiding gun owners could unknowingly become felons for possessing accessories they believed to be legal, with penalties reaching up to 10 years in prison. This is an excessive and

poorly defined enforcement mechanism that risks infringing on due process.

#### 4. Erosion of CHL Protections in Public Spaces

The bill allows local governments and public institutions to nullify the affirmative defense traditionally available to individuals with a valid Concealed Handgun License (CHL). This undermines Oregon's licensing system and creates a confusing patchwork of regulations across cities and counties. A CHL holder who inadvertently walks onto a restricted property—even with clear signage—could face criminal charges for an act they believed was legal. This complexity invites unintentional violations and diminishes trust in the state's permitting process.

#### 5. Bureaucratic Inefficiency and Lack of Data Justification

The bill dramatically increases administrative burdens on gun dealers and the Oregon State Police without providing evidence that such measures will reduce crime or suicide rates. Oregon already has a comprehensive background check and permitting system. Rather than adding redundant delays, lawmakers should invest in proven intervention strategies such as mental health services and firearm safety education.

In conclusion, SB 243, though well-intentioned, imposes broad and unnecessary restrictions on responsible firearm ownership, criminalizes innocuous behavior, and weakens trust in Oregon's licensing and legal systems. Public safety and constitutional rights should not be mutually exclusive. I urge the committee to oppose SB 243 and instead pursue evidence-based reforms that respect the rights of Oregonians.

Respectfully submitted,  
Zachery McLaughlin  
Electrical Engineer, Oregon City