

Submitter: Kris McManus
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243
Opposition to Oregon Senate Bill 243 (2025): An Unnecessary and Ineffective Infringement on Rights

Oregon Senate Bill 243 (2025) is a misguided attempt at gun control that burdens law-abiding citizens while doing little to curb actual violence. Though proponents frame the bill as a reasonable public safety measure, its provisions—such as a mandatory 72-hour waiting period, bans on certain firearm accessories, and expanded authority for local governments to restrict concealed carry—represent a significant overreach with questionable effectiveness.

1. The 72-Hour Waiting Period: Symbolism over Substance

SB 243 imposes a blanket three-day waiting period after a background check is initiated, even when the background check is completed instantly. This arbitrary delay penalizes responsible citizens who already comply with all legal requirements. In rural areas, where access to firearms for self-defense, pest control, or livelihood is critical, this delay can have real-life consequences. Data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other studies show mixed or inconclusive evidence that waiting periods reduce suicide or homicide rates. Public policy should be guided by measurable outcomes, not symbolic gestures.

2. The Rapid-Fire Accessory Ban: Solving a Problem That Rarely Occurs

The bill criminalizes possession and transfer of so-called “rapid-fire activators” like bump stocks and binary triggers. However, these devices are rarely used in crimes. Criminalizing possession of accessories that are already federally restricted in most contexts serves primarily to entrap unwitting owners, not deter violence. Moreover, the harsh felony penalties—up to 10 years in prison—are disproportionate, especially when applied retroactively to otherwise law-abiding gun owners.

3. Expanded Local Gun Restrictions: A Legal Patchwork of Confusion

Perhaps the most dangerous element of SB 243 is the allowance for cities and counties to ban concealed carry in public buildings. This erodes the concept of a uniform state standard for self-defense rights and creates a confusing patchwork of laws that will inevitably ensnare concealed handgun license holders acting in good faith. A person legally carrying in one county could face criminal charges by crossing a city line. This undermines trust in the legal system and opens the door to selective enforcement and discrimination.

4. Missing the Real Problem: Mental Health and Enforcement Failures

Instead of focusing on law-abiding gun owners, the legislature should prioritize proven interventions like improved mental health access, better enforcement of existing laws, and criminal justice reform. Mass shootings and gun suicides are serious problems, but SB 243 targets tools, not behaviors. Policies that stigmatize responsible ownership alienate communities and make bipartisan solutions harder to achieve.

Conclusion: Reject SB 243 in Favor of Balanced Reform

Oregon deserves firearm policy that is data-driven, narrowly tailored, and respects constitutional rights. SB 243 fails on all counts. It delays access to legal firearms, criminalizes non-violent behavior, and introduces inconsistency and confusion into existing carry laws. I urge the House of Representatives and Governor to reject SB 243 and instead pursue legislation that balances public safety with personal freedom, targets violent offenders—not law-abiding citizens—and addresses the root causes of gun violence, not its symptoms.