

Submitter: Richard Wisner
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB696

04 April 2025

Senate Committee on Judiciary
Senate Bill 696

Dear Chair Senator Prozanski, Vice-Chair Senator Thatcher and members of the Committee:

Why do supporters and sponsors of bills such as this focus on legal, law-abiding gun owners rather than on those that commit violence? It's a valid question when we watch criminals being ignored and law-abiding citizens being targeted with more and more onerous laws.

While I understand the intent behind this bill, it represents an unnecessary and unconstitutional infringement on law-abiding citizens and absolutely fails to address the actual causes of violence using guns.

Consider, by broadly defining and restricting firearm accessories that are not inherently illegal under federal law, SB 696 most likely will invite legal challenges for violating both state and federal constitutional protections. Just what Oregon needs at this time, eh! Bogged down with litigation. Without due process, SB 696 turns responsible gun owners into criminals simply by possessing certain firearm accessories. Exactly how does this target violent criminals?

Particularly, where is the actual, bona fide evidence SB 696 will actually provide a public safety benefit? Where is the evidence that banning rapid-fire activators will meaningfully reduce crime or enhance public safety? Where is it?

Instead of focusing on restricting firearm accessories, we would be better served by enforcing existing laws against violent criminals, improving mental health resources and addressing other root causes of gun violence. But, SB 696 sounds good doesn't it. And it seems that's about all it takes these days.

Thank you,
Richard Wisner