

Submitter: John Shelton  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Rules  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243  
Testimony Opposing SB 243  
Submitted by John Michael Shelton  
June 2025

Chair and members of the committee,

My name is John Michael Shelton, and I'm writing today as a law-abiding citizen deeply concerned about the implications of SB 243. While I respect the intent to reduce gun violence, I strongly oppose this legislation because it undermines constitutional rights, imposes unnecessary burdens on responsible gun owners, and lacks clear evidence that it would actually improve public safety.

#### It Targets the Wrong People

This bill doesn't go after criminals—it burdens the law-abiding. Criminals, by nature, do not follow laws. Adding new restrictions won't stop them, but it will interfere with the rights of citizens like me, who carry legally, responsibly, and in accordance with the law.

The waiting period, for instance, assumes that time alone is sufficient to deter violence. But what if a woman needs immediate protection from an abusive partner? This law delays her right to defend herself. And while we're tightening restrictions on concealed handgun license (CHL) holders—the most vetted group in the state—violent criminals continue to operate unchecked.

#### It Violates Constitutional Rights

SB 243 walks a fine line that dangerously infringes on our Second Amendment rights. The Supreme Court's ruling in *District of Columbia v. Heller* made it clear that the right to keep and bear arms is fundamental. Turning that right into a privilege, controlled by arbitrary delays or vague "rapid-fire" classifications, sets a dangerous precedent.

Many of the devices addressed in this bill are already subject to federal regulation. Why add unnecessary layers that only penalize citizens who follow the law?

#### It Lacks Evidence and Creates Confusion

There is no clear data that this bill will make our communities safer. In fact, 77% of Oregon's gun deaths are suicides. SB 243 does nothing to address mental health or suicide prevention. It does, however, create a patchwork of restrictions, allowing

cities and counties to define their own concealed-carry zones. That invites confusion, accidental violations, and unequal enforcement.

#### It's Costly and Unfocused

The cost of implementing and enforcing these restrictions—training officers, creating signage, managing exceptions—will fall on local agencies and taxpayers. All this for a bill that ignores the root causes of violence and instead opts for high-visibility, low-impact gestures.

#### In Closing

I urge you to consider smarter, evidence-based solutions—ones that target mental health, enforce existing laws, and focus on violent criminals rather than law-abiding gun owners. SB 243 doesn't do that. It overreaches, overburdens, and ultimately undermines the very freedoms it claims to protect.

Please vote no on SB 243.

Respectfully,  
John Michael Shelton  
Lebanon, Oregon