

Subject: Opposition to SB 696

I am writing to express my strong opposition to SB 696, which aims to criminalize the possession, manufacture, and transfer of rapid-fire activators, including bump stocks and trigger cranks. While I understand the intent behind this bill, it represents an unnecessary and unconstitutional restriction on law-abiding citizens, contradicts existing federal regulations, and fails to address the real causes of gun violence.

1. **Conflict with Federal and State Laws:** The federal government has already addressed the regulation of bump stocks. In 2019, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) reclassified bump stocks as machine guns under the National Firearms Act, effectively banning their possession and use nationwide. Given this existing federal prohibition, SB 696 is redundant and adds unnecessary layers of state regulation without addressing any legal gap. Additionally, Oregon's Constitution (Article I, Section 27) guarantees the right to bear arms for self-defense. By broadly defining and restricting firearm accessories that are not inherently illegal under federal law, SB 696 could invite legal challenges for violating both state and federal constitutional protections.
2. **Criminalizing Law-Abiding Citizens Without Due Process:** SB 696 turns responsible gun owners into criminals overnight simply for possessing certain firearm accessories. The bill does not differentiate between those who have lawfully acquired these items for recreational or competitive shooting and those with criminal intent. This approach punishes individuals who have followed all existing laws and regulations while doing nothing to target violent criminals. Furthermore, the bill imposes severe penalties—up to 10 years in prison and a \$250,000 fine for transferring, manufacturing, or transporting a rapid-fire activator, and up to a year in jail for mere possession. These excessive punishments do not fit the nature of the alleged offense and could disproportionately impact law-abiding citizens who may not even be aware of the new restrictions.
3. **Lack of Clear Public Safety Benefit:** There is little evidence to suggest that banning rapid-fire activators will meaningfully reduce crime or enhance public safety. The vast majority of gun-related crimes and mass shootings do not involve these devices. Instead of focusing on restricting firearm accessories, Oregon should prioritize enforcing existing laws against violent criminals, improving mental health resources, and addressing other root causes of gun violence.

4. **A Dangerous Precedent for Government Overreach:** By banning firearm accessories that are not firearms themselves, SB 696 sets a concerning precedent for further state-level restrictions on law-abiding gun owners. If this bill passes, what is to stop future legislation from targeting other commonly owned firearm components? Such incremental restrictions erode the Second Amendment rights of responsible citizens under the guise of public safety without actually making communities safer.

Conclusion: SB 696 is unnecessary, redundant, and a violation of constitutional rights. It criminalizes law-abiding gun owners, contradicts existing federal regulations, and does not offer a real solution to gun violence. Rather than passing ineffective legislation that unfairly targets responsible citizens, Oregon should focus on enforcing current laws and addressing the true factors behind violent crime. For these reasons, I strongly urge the committee to reject SB 696.