

Submitter: Jacob Cosler  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Rules  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243  
To: Senate Judiciary Committee  
From: Jacob Cosler, Avid hunter, competition shooter and overall enthusiast.  
Re: Opposition to SB?243 ("Efficiency of firearm transfer background checks")  
Date: 6/11/2025

This is another attack on gun rights and law abiding citizens while once again doing nothing to stop actual criminals. Here are a few examples of why that is.

#### 1. Misleading Title & Hidden Agenda

- The title frames SB?243 as a study on "efficiency," but recent amendments indicate it includes broad regulatory restrictions on firearm transfers ?.
- This "bait-and-switch" approach undermines transparency and deprives the public of meaningful input ?.

?

#### 2. Insufficient Transparency & Public Notice

- The core language appeared late, reducing public scrutiny. Rushed amendments in work sessions hinder proper legislative review .
- Legislators and citizens deserve a transparent process, not hidden provisions.

?

#### 3. Pre-emptive Lawmaking (Sunset Clause Doesn't Justify)

- The bill's sunset on January?2,?2027, doesn't lower the stakes. It's a short window to impose potentially sweeping changes.
- Regulatory creep is real: these temporary measures can easily return in a new form.

?

#### 4. Enactment Risks

- Restricting lawful transfers without demonstrated need can burden law-abiding citizens.
- There's no public data showing inefficiency in current background checks. Any new regulations should be evidence-based.

?

#### 5. Unnecessary Duplication

- Background check systems are already in place. Calling for a review of “efficiency” is redundant unless major flaws are demonstrated—none have been.
- The legislature should focus on actual issues, not speculative burdens.