

Submitter: Gregory McGill
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

Dear Chair and Members of the Committee,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Senate Bill 243 (SB 243), which introduces several restrictive measures on firearm ownership and use in Oregon. While I appreciate the intent to promote public safety, I believe this bill infringes on the constitutional rights of law-abiding Oregonians, creates impractical barriers to exercising Second Amendment protections, and fails to address the root causes of violence. Below, I outline my concerns with specific provisions of the bill:

72-Hour Waiting Periods: The proposed 72-hour waiting period for firearm purchases creates an unnecessary burden for law-abiding citizens, particularly those who may need immediate access to a firearm for self-defense, such as individuals facing credible threats. This delay could also disrupt lawful commerce at gun shows, where transactions are often time-sensitive due to the temporary nature of these events. There is no clear evidence that mandatory waiting periods significantly reduce crime, while they do impede the rights of responsible gun owners.

Expanded Gun-Free Zones: The expansion of gun-free zones near public buildings undermines the ability of concealed carry permit holders to protect themselves and others in public spaces. These zones often create vulnerabilities, as they are known to be areas where law-abiding citizens are disarmed, potentially making them targets for criminals who do not follow such restrictions. Studies, such as those by the Crime Prevention Research Center, suggest that areas with restrictive concealed carry laws do not see reduced violent crime rates compared to areas with fewer restrictions.

Ban on "Rapid Fire" Devices: The prohibition on devices labeled as "rapid fire," such as bump stocks, appears overly broad and vague. Such language risks encompassing a range of firearm accessories that are lawfully used by sports shooters and hunters, potentially criminalizing responsible gun owners without clear justification. Any regulation must be narrowly tailored to avoid infringing on lawful uses of firearms and accessories.

Proposed Magazine Ban (Amendment from Measure 114): The last-minute amendment to include a magazine capacity restriction, similar to the previously challenged Measure 114, raises significant concerns. High-capacity magazines are standard in many firearms used for self-defense and recreational shooting. Restricting them does not address criminal behavior, as criminals are unlikely to comply with such laws. Furthermore, Measure 114 has faced legal challenges for

violating both the U.S. and Oregon Constitutions, and reintroducing it as an amendment lacks transparency and public input.

Lack of Transparency and Public Engagement: The timing of the hearings and amendments for SB 243, as noted in public discussions, suggests a lack of adequate opportunity for Oregonians to review and comment on the bill's provisions. Legislation with such significant implications for constitutional rights deserves robust public debate and scrutiny, not last-minute changes that limit citizen input.

Revenue Impact: No Revenue Impact, Statement Issued (Indeterminate Impact)
This is irresponsible at best. The impact needs to be clearly established before passing legislation of this type.

I urge the committee to consider the impact of SB 243 on law-abiding Oregonians who rely on their Second Amendment rights for self-defense, sport, and personal security. Rather than imposing additional restrictions, I encourage the legislature to focus on enforcing existing laws, addressing mental health challenges, and targeting illegal firearm use by criminals. These approaches would better serve public safety without eroding the freedoms of responsible citizens.

Thank you for considering my testimony. I respectfully request that you vote against SB 243 or, at a minimum, allow for greater public review and amendment to address these concerns.