

Submitter:

Misty Fox

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

Senate Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

SB696

This bill is unconstitutional on so many levels. It violates the the Second Amendment by infringing on the Peoples right to own firearms equal to our Military, it also violates the "Takings Clause" of the United States Constitution by not compensating the owners for their firearm components that are made illegal by SB696.

Government regulations that severely restrict the use of private property can also be considered a taking, even if the government doesn't physically seize the property, it is still making it illegal to own, transport, manufacture or transfer of common firearm components that this bill is labeling as "rapid fire activators". The 2nd Amendment does not have any caveats or exclusions, and an individual could legally own any arm, from a warship, a fighter jet, a tank, a machine gun or a cannon. During the War of 1812, privateers owned warships with rows of cannons, and helped repel the British, thus creatingthe United States of America. Some people believe that the language in the 2nd Amendment limits Americans to only arms that they can "bear," which would be bearable arms. However the meaning of the word "bear" in this context means to own, possess, retain or keep, not to physically carry. If the latter were true, then the arms you could constitutionally have would be different for everyone, as some people are stronger than others and can physically carry heavier weapons. That makes no sense. Today, The reason the vast majority of people do not keep military weapons is simple. They are incredibly EXPENSIVE. In many cases, owning a large weapons system, even an older obsolete one, can run into millions of dollars.