

Submitter: James Peterson
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243
To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to SB 243 as amended. As an Oregon resident, sport shooter, collector, and father, I take both firearm safety and Second Amendment rights seriously. While I originally supported the intent of SB 243 as a study bill, I am deeply disappointed to see it transformed into a sweeping omnibus bill that imposes broad restrictions without evidence-based justification or proper democratic process.

This is not transparency, it is a bait-and-switch.

Here are my primary concerns:

1. The 72-hour waiting period, even after a background check has cleared, creates an unnecessary and potentially dangerous delay. We know law enforcement can be constrained by due process and staffing when responding to restraining orders or threats. Denying individuals the right to timely self-defense during those 72 hours puts lives at risk. The government should not stand in the way of lawful citizens protecting themselves.
2. The ban on rapid-fire accessories, like bump stocks and binary triggers, is an ongoing example of legislative overreach. These are accessories, not firearms, and previous attempts to restrict them have been struck down as unconstitutional. These tools have existed for years and are used safely by many sport shooters, yet the state insists on rehashing failed bans instead of enforcing current laws.
3. The under-21 possession ban is fundamentally unfair. At 18, our sons and daughters can serve in the military, vote, pay taxes, and live independently, but this bill would deny them the right to own a firearm for home defense, sport, or hunting. Firearms education and access are part of the tradition of responsible gun ownership, and denying that to law-abiding young adults is not only inconsistent, it's unjust.
4. Expanding gun-free zones does not make communities safer. In fact, these zones often disarm only law-abiding citizens while doing nothing to deter criminals, who by definition do not follow laws. Oregon CHL holders go through rigorous vetting and training. Disarming them in more public spaces removes a critical layer of community defense and does not reflect reality.
5. The omnibus approach of SB 243 is deeply concerning. Turning what was once a

narrow study into a massive multi-topic bill avoids honest legislative scrutiny and suppresses public input. It bundles unrelated and controversial provisions together in a way that feels deeply undemocratic.

I support responsible gun ownership, appropriate enforcement of existing laws, and constructive conversation about public safety. But SB 243 in its current form is a rushed, overreaching, and unconstitutional attempt to restrict the rights of Oregon citizens.

I urge you to reject this bill and return to a transparent, evidence-based approach to public policy.