

Submitter: Stan Vizina
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243
To: Oregon House Rules Committee
Re: Formal Opposition to SB243

Chair Pham and Members of the Committee:

I respectfully submit this testimony in formal opposition to Senate Bill 243, which proposes expanded firearm restrictions through two primary mechanisms: (1) a prohibition on so-called "trigger activators," and (2) an expansion of designated gun-free zones.

Trigger Activator Language – Overbroad and Constitutionally Problematic

The bill's definition of "trigger activator" is unacceptably vague and overinclusive. While ostensibly aimed at devices such as bump stocks, the language extends to any modification or component that "increases the rate of fire," including sporting and competition triggers that allow for a smoother or lighter pull. These are commonly used in target shooting and lawful hunting and do not enable multiple rounds per trigger action.

As written, the bill:

- * Fails to provide adequate notice of what conduct or equipment is criminalized, violating principles of due process.
- * Risks criminal liability for individuals using factory-produced single-stage or aftermarket triggers that remain fully semi-automatic—one round per pull.
- * Invites arbitrary or inconsistent enforcement, raising equal protection concerns.

This kind of statutory overbreadth has been the subject of litigation in other jurisdictions, and courts have struck down similar laws when they are not narrowly tailored to serve a compelling government interest.

Expansion of Gun-Free Zones – Ineffective and Constitutionally Suspect

The expansion of "sensitive areas" where lawful concealed carry is prohibited raises serious Second Amendment concerns, particularly in light of *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* (2022). Under that precedent, restrictions on firearms in public places must be deeply rooted in historical tradition and not simply based on modern policy preferences.

This bill:

Criminalizes permit holders who have undergone background checks, training, and vetting by the state.

Creates an arbitrary patchwork of zones where otherwise lawful carry becomes a criminal offense, inviting accidental violations by good-faith citizens.

Does not deter criminal actors, who by nature do not obey signage or statutory prohibitions.

The net effect is to disarm only those most likely to comply with the law, while providing no corresponding public safety benefit.

Conclusion

SB243 represents a legislative overreach that is both ineffective in its policy goals and constitutionally vulnerable. I urge this committee to reconsider advancing this bill. Laws targeting lawful ownership and carry do not reduce crime; they only erode the rights of responsible Oregonians and expose the state to potential legal challenge.

Respectfully,
Stan Vizina
Portland, Oregon