

Submitter: Stan Vizina
On Behalf Of: Patriots who gave their life protecting our rights
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB696

Chairperson and Members of the Committee,

I appreciate the opportunity to testify today in opposition to proposed restrictions on forced reset triggers (FRTs). As a responsible firearm owner and advocate for constitutional rights, I am deeply concerned about the unjustified regulation of these devices, which are lawful and widely used by law-abiding Americans.

Understanding Forced Reset Triggers

Forced reset triggers are a type of semiautomatic firearm trigger designed to reset quickly after each shot, allowing for faster follow-up shots. Despite claims to the contrary, FRTs do not convert firearms into fully automatic weapons. Each pull of the trigger results in a single round being fired, in full compliance with federal law under the Gun Control Act of 1968 and the National Firearms Act of 1934. The ATF's recent reclassification of FRTs as "machine guns" is legally and factually incorrect, representing an overreach of executive authority.

Legal and Constitutional Concerns

The proposed restrictions on FRTs raise serious constitutional and legal issues:

Second Amendment Violation: The right to keep and bear arms is fundamental. Arbitrarily restricting a legally available trigger system infringes on the rights of law-abiding citizens to train, compete, and defend themselves effectively.

Lack of Legislative Authority: Congress, not regulatory agencies, is responsible for defining and regulating firearms under the law. The ATF's recent attempts to classify FRTs as machine guns contradict existing statutory definitions and set a dangerous precedent for executive overreach.

Inconsistency in Enforcement: Law-abiding gun owners who have legally purchased FRTs in good faith should not be criminalized due to shifting regulatory interpretations. Such retroactive restrictions could lead to widespread legal uncertainty and unjust prosecutions.

Public Safety and Practical Considerations

The primary justification for restricting FRTs appears to be public safety; however,

there is no credible evidence that these triggers are frequently used in crimes. Criminals seeking rapid-fire capabilities overwhelmingly obtain illegally modified firearms, not lawfully purchased FRTs. Instead of imposing new restrictions on responsible gun owners, policymakers should focus on enforcing existing laws targeting violent offenders and illegal firearm modifications.

Additionally, FRTs have legitimate uses in competition shooting, training, and recreational activities. Restrictions would disproportionately impact law-abiding citizens without addressing the root causes of firearm-related crime.

Conclusion and Call to Action

In conclusion, I urge this committee to reject any proposals that seek to ban or restrict forced reset triggers. Such measures lack a clear legal foundation, fail to enhance public safety, and infringe upon constitutionally protected rights. Lawmakers should instead focus on ensuring that enforcement efforts target actual criminal misuse of firearms rather than imposing new restrictions on responsible gun owners.

I appreciate your time and consideration and welcome any questions.

Respectfully submitted,
Stan Vizina
Portland, OR