

Submitter:

Kipp Karavanich

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

Senate Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

SB696

I strongly oppose SB 696

Oregon SB 696 represents a blatant and unacceptable infringement upon the fundamental right to keep and bear arms, a right explicitly protected by the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution. This legislation, which seeks to criminalize the possession of common firearm accessories under the guise of regulating "rapid fire activators," demonstrates a profound misunderstanding of the Second Amendment and a disregard for the rights of law-abiding Oregonians. The very notion that the state can dictate which firearm accessories citizens may own is a direct assault on the Second Amendment. The Supreme Court has affirmed that the right to bear arms extends to arms "in common use," and devices that enhance the functionality of firearms for lawful purposes, such as sport shooting, competition, and self-defense, fall squarely within this protection. SB 696 attempts to circumvent this constitutional guarantee by targeting devices based on their rate of fire enhancement, a characteristic that does not remove a firearm from Second Amendment protection.

Furthermore, recent federal court rulings have affirmed the legality of bump stocks, a device explicitly targeted by this bill. In *Garland v. Cargill* (June 2024), the United States Supreme Court struck down the federal ban on bump stocks, unequivocally stating that a semi-automatic rifle equipped with a bump stock does not meet the definition of a machine gun under federal law. This landmark decision underscores the overreach of legislative attempts to ban such accessories and sets a clear precedent against measures like Oregon SB 696.

Given this recent Supreme Court ruling, it is abundantly clear that SB 696 is on a collision course with the Second Amendment. Legal challenges to this legislation are inevitable and will undoubtedly succeed, rendering the law unconstitutional. However, this process will not be without significant cost to Oregon taxpayers, who will be forced to foot the bill for protracted legal battles defending a clearly unconstitutional law. Millions of dollars will be wasted in legal fees and court costs, resources that could be far better allocated to addressing actual drivers of crime and enhancing public safety through means that respect constitutional rights.

This bill is not about public safety; it is about the continued erosion of Second Amendment rights. It punishes law-abiding gun owners for possessing accessories that are legal under federal law and protected by the Constitution. Oregon should not waste taxpayer money on futile attempts to restrict fundamental rights that have been repeatedly affirmed by the courts. Instead of pursuing unconstitutional measures like SB 696, the legislature should focus on enforcing existing laws and addressing the underlying causes of violence, while respecting the Second Amendment rights of its citizens. This bill is a misguided and costly endeavor that will ultimately fail in the face

of constitutional scrutiny.