

Submitter: Randy Wilhelm
On Behalf Of: Oregon law abiding citizens
Committee: House Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

This bill will do nothing to prevent gun violence. Criminals do not follow laws.

SB 243 TALKING POINTS!

Moms Demand Action Argument:

.

- Rapid-fire devices like bump stocks and Glock switches turn semi-automatic firearms into fully automatic weapons, making them highly lethal.
- The ATF reported a 784% increase in recovered rapid-fire devices from 2019 to 2023.
- This bill would ban the sale and possession of these devices.

Counterpoints:

? Criminals, not law-abiding gun owners, misuse these devices – The overwhelming majority of gun owners do not use bump stocks or other devices for criminal activity. Restricting their sale punishes responsible citizens rather than criminals who already ignore gun laws.

? Existing laws already prohibit machine guns and illegal modifications. Fully automatic firearms have been heavily regulated under the National Firearms Act (NFA) since 1934.

Possessing a Glock switch without proper licensing is already a felony.

? This bill criminalizes lawful ownership. The vast majority of these devices are owned legally by gun enthusiasts, collectors, and competition shooters. Rather than targeting law-abiding citizens, enforcement should focus on illegal possession and use by criminals.

.

Moms Demand Action Argument:

- Local governments should be allowed to prohibit guns on municipal property (courthouses, government buildings, etc.) if they post a sign.
- Concealed carry permit holders would not be exempt.
- Government buildings are high-risk locations for politically motivated violence.

Counterpoints:

? Gun-free zones do not stop criminals – Violent criminals and mass shooters ignore signs and laws. Disarming law-abiding citizens only creates soft targets for bad actors. 94% of mass killings happen in Gun Free Zones (GFZ).

? Concealed carry permit holders are the most law-abiding citizens – Studies show CCW holders are less likely to commit crimes than police officers. This bill only disarms responsible citizens while doing nothing to stop real threats.

? Self-defense rights shouldn't change based on location – If a person is legally allowed to carry a firearm for self-defense in public, they should not be stripped of that right simply because they enter a government building.

As a law-abiding citizen, I strongly oppose this bill. I would feel much safer with law abiding citizens surrounding me with guns than having criminals surrounding me with guns..