

Submitter: Teresita Sablan
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

Chair, Vice Chair, and Honorable Members of the Oregon State Senate,

My name is Teresita Sablan, and I come before you today as an Indigenous and Latina woman, a mother, a worker, and an Oregon resident. I speak not just from theory or ideology but from lived experience in communities struggling with poverty, addiction, and the daily threat of violence.

I strongly oppose the proposed Act that includes a 72-hour waiting period for lawful firearm transfers, criminalizes certain firearm accessories, and imposes new restrictions on concealed handgun license holders in public spaces. Though this bill is being presented as a step toward safety, I believe it will have serious consequences for the very communities that most need protection.

Let me begin with the mandatory 72-hour delay on transferring a firearm or unfinished frame or receiver even after a background check has been submitted and approval granted. This is not a minor administrative inconvenience; for many law-abiding Oregonians, particularly women of color facing real, immediate threats, this delay could be fatal. In situations where a restraining order isn't enough and law enforcement response is unreliable, 72 hours is a deadly gap.

Moreover, this provision does nothing to deter those who obtain firearms illegally who are not subject to these background checks in the first place. This measure burdens only law-abiding citizens who follow the law, while criminals continue to operate outside of it.

The Act also creates new crimes surrounding "rapid fire activators," with penalties as high as 10 years in prison or a \$250,000 fine. While I support responsible firearm use, we must be cautious not to criminalize ownership of parts or accessories without clear evidence that they pose a public danger. Overbroad criminalization can disproportionately impact working-class gun owners and hobbyists without reducing violent crime. Aside from the 2017 Las Vegas shooting, there's very little statistical evidence showing widespread criminal use of these devices. Most users are law-abiding hobbyists or sportsmen. Therefore, banning them punishes the majority for the actions of the few.

Another deeply concerning provision is the authorization granted to local governments—including cities, counties, and even metropolitan zoo districts to strip away protections for CHL holders in public buildings. This puts responsible, vetted

individuals at risk of Class A misdemeanors, fines, and up to a year in jail simply for legally carrying in spaces they previously had a lawful right to enter. This undermines statewide concealed carry laws and creates confusion, inconsistency, and potential entrapment for permit holders acting in good faith.

Instead of focusing on limiting access to firearms for law-abiding citizens, our energy and resources should be aimed at:

Funding mental health services, which remain inaccessible to many

Addressing the drug addiction crisis devastating families statewide

Improving public education and youth intervention programs

Expanding violence prevention programs rooted in community-based solutions

We don't need more bureaucratic restrictions. We need real investments in public health and safety. This legislation, while perhaps well-intentioned, will leave many of us especially women, people of color, and rural residents less safe and more vulnerable.

I am not a threat. I am not a criminal. I am a woman, a mother, and a citizen who values life, liberty, and the right to defend my family. I urge this body to oppose this Act and focus instead on real solutions that address the root causes of violence in our state.

Thank you for your time