

Submitter: Kyle Ward
On Behalf Of: The Legacy of my Children and Grandchildren
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB696

General Overview:

Senate Bill 696 is an attempt to ban so-called "rapid-fire devices," including bump stocks, Glock switches, and other accessories. However, this bill misrepresents firearm functionality, violates Second Amendment rights, and targets law-abiding gun owners instead of criminals.

Key Points to Counter Moms Demand Action Arguments:

1. Fully Automatic Weapons Are Already Illegal Under Federal Law

MDA erroneous Claim: Manufacturers are exploiting loopholes to create near-automatic weapons.

- Counterpoint: Federal law already prohibits machine guns and has since the National Firearms Act of 1934 and the Hughes Amendment in 1986. Banning additional accessories does not change these laws - it only criminalizes legal gun owners who use these devices for lawful purposes, such as sport shooting.

2. This Bill Criminalizes Law-Abiding Citizens, Not Criminals

- * ??MDA erroneous Claim: This bill will prevent gun violence by restricting rapid-fire devices.

- *

- * ??Counterpoint: Criminals who modify firearms do not obey gun laws. Senate Bill 696 only restricts law-abiding gun owners, making no distinction between those using legally owned devices for recreational purposes and criminals misusing them.

- *

3. The ATF's "784% Increase" Is Misleading and Politically Motivated

- * ??MDA erroneous Claim: The ATF reported a massive increase in recovered rapid-fire devices.

- *

- * ??Counterpoint: The ATF expanded its definition of "rapid-fire devices," inflating the numbers. Additionally, the vast majority of crimes do not involve legally purchased firearms with these devices. Instead of banning accessories, lawmakers should target illegal gun trafficking and repeat offenders who commit violent crimes.

- *

4. The 2nd Amendment Protects the Right to Own Firearm Accessories

- MDA erroneous Claim: There is no right to own rapid-fire devices.

- Counterpoint: The Second Amendment does not limit firearm ownership to a certain rate of fire. Courts have struck down similar bans because they infringe upon law-abiding citizens' rights without evidence of public safety benefits.

5. This Bill Sets a Dangerous Precedent for Further Firearm Bans

-

MDA erroneous Claim: This bill only bans accessories, not guns.

Counterpoint: Gun control advocates incrementally push bans to restrict all semiautomatic firearms. Today, it's bump stocks and switches; tomorrow, it's magazines, AR-15s, and hunting rifles. This slippery slope endangers all gun owners' rights.

Final Position Statement:

Senate Bill 696 is unnecessary, ineffective, and unconstitutional.

Fully automatic weapons are already illegal, and banning certain accessories does nothing to prevent crime while punishing responsible gun owners. Instead of restricting lawful citizens.

Furthermore, there has been no recorded arrests, trials, nor convictions of a rapid fire device being used in the commission of a crime, in the State of Oregon.

This proposal is based on anecdotal evidence and motivated by MDA, pushing their agenda by organizers that reside outside of Oregon!

Oregon lawmakers should focus on enforcing existing laws against violent criminals. SB 696 should be rejected.