

A Personal Appeal: Why SB 243 Misses the Mark

Dear Fellow Oregonians,

I understand the desire to make our communities safer. We all want to protect our children, reduce gun violence, and prevent tragedies. But I ask you to take a closer look at Senate Bill 243, not through the lens of fear or partisanship--but through logic, fairness, and effectiveness.

This bill doesn't stop criminals--it restricts the law-abiding.

Criminals, by definition, do not follow the law. They don't submit to background checks. They don't wait 72 hours. They don't care if they're under 21 or if a part is banned. Meanwhile, responsible citizens--people who pass background checks, store their firearms safely, and follow every rule--are the ones burdened by delays, denials, and new restrictions.

A 72-hour waiting period may sound reasonable, but imagine you're someone facing an urgent threat--like domestic abuse or stalking. Three days can be a very long time when you're trying to defend yourself. That delay doesn't save lives; in some cases, it could cost them.

The bill also bans certain accessories that make firearms easier or more comfortable to use--not just for those with malicious intent, but for hunters, sport shooters, and even disabled gun owners who benefit from those tools.

We must ask: Are we actually making anyone safer? Or are we creating a false sense of security while slowly chipping away at the rights of citizens who haven't done anything wrong?

I'm not writing this out of anger or division. I'm writing it because I believe deeply in liberty, fairness, and real solutions. We can all agree that we want guns out of the hands of violent criminals. But Senate Bill 243 does not do that.

Let's work together on legislation that targets the illegal use of firearms, improves mental health access, and enforces existing laws--instead of layering more restrictions on the good people who already follow the rules.

Respectfully,

Dennis McMillan

Concerned Oregonian & Supporter of Responsible Liberty