

Submitter:

Larry M. Gunter

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

Senate Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

SB696

I oppose Senate Bill 696, which seeks to ban rapid fire activators—devices like bump stocks and binary triggers—with harsh penalties of up to 10 years in prison or 364 days in jail. This bill not only missteps legally but also ignores why such accessories are vital in our advanced era. Colonial law, as applied in 2025, reveals its fatal flaws. The Supreme Court's ruling in *Bruen v. New York State Rifle & Pistol Association* (2022) mandates that Second Amendment restrictions align with our nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation, rooted in 1791 when the amendment was ratified. For SB 696, this is a breaking point: colonial America didn't regulate firearm accessories. Back then, citizens freely modified muskets—rifling barrels or tweaking locks—without a whisper of bans on tools enhancing performance. No evidence suggests rapid fire activators, which didn't exist in that flintlock age, would have been outlawed. This historical lens isn't just academic—it's a legal standard in 2025 that could strike down SB 696 unless Oregon unearths a 1791 exception, an unlikely feat given the era's limited technology and lax oversight.

*Bruen* shifted the game, rejecting vague safety arguments for hard historical proof. SB 696 fails this test. Its text inflates these devices' threat, hinting at machine-gun-like chaos, yet *Cargill v. Garland* (2024) debunked this—ruling bump stocks don't turn firearms automatic, overturning federal overreach. Oregon's bill echoes that misrepresentation, piling on penalties without colonial precedent or local justification. Why do these accessories matter now? In 2025, we live in an era of advancement—technological, tactical, and personal. Rapid fire activators empower law-abiding citizens, from sport shooters honing precision to homeowners facing modern threats requiring swift response. Colonial patriots adapted tools to their needs; today's Americans deserve the same liberty. Banning these devices doesn't just defy history—it stifles innovation and self-reliance in a world far beyond 1791's simplicity. SB 696's blanket prohibition clashes with Oregon's Article I, Section 27 and the Second Amendment's core, as *Bruen* and *Cargill* affirm. I urge you to reject it. Let's honor our constitutional roots and embrace progress, not shackle citizens with laws unmoored from tradition and blind to today's realities.

Larry M. Gunter

Wasco County