

Submitter: Michael Saindon  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Rules  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

Testimony in Opposition to Oregon Senate Bill 243

Dear Members of the Oregon State Legislature,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Senate Bill 243. While I understand the intent behind this legislation is to enhance public safety, I believe the bill does not address the root cause of public safety concerns and only punishes and burdens law abiding citizens.

**Second Amendment Rights:** SB 243 imposes significant restrictions on the Second Amendment rights of Oregonians. The mandatory 72-hour waiting period for firearm purchases and the restrictions on concealed carry in public buildings undermine the ability of law-abiding citizens to protect themselves. These measures do not address the root causes of gun violence and instead penalize responsible gun owners.

**Rural Communities:** Rural areas, where law enforcement response times can be longer that rely on firearms for protection against both human and wildlife threats will be disproportionately burdened by SB 243. SB 243's restrictions fail to consider the unique needs of these communities, potentially leaving them defenseless, firearms are often essential for protection against threats. The restrictions imposed by this bill fail to account for the unique needs of rural residents.

**Economic Implications:** The fiscal impact of SB 243 is another point of contention. The bill would place an unsustainable financial strain on state and local governments, with significant costs associated with its implementation. These funds could be better allocated to programs that address the root causes of violence and improve community safety such as addressing mental health services and community safety programs.

**Failure to Address Root Causes of Violence:** SB 243 does not address the underlying factors driving gun violence, such as mental health crises and criminal behavior. Effective solutions should focus on improving mental health resources and targeting illegal firearm use, rather than imposing blanket restrictions on law-abiding citizens. In conclusion, while the stated goal of SB 243 is reducing gun violence, it is not the solution. I urge you to consider alternative measures that respect the rights of law-abiding citizens, address the unique needs of rural communities, and do not place undue financial burdens on our state.

Thank you for your consideration.