

Submitter: ANDREW HALL
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

Honorable Members of the Oregon Legislature,

I strongly oppose Senate Bill 243, which criminalizes possession of rapid fire activators with up to 364 days' imprisonment or a \$6,250 fine. While aimed at public safety, this bill violates Second Amendment rights, as federal courts have ruled similar laws unconstitutional. Passing SB243 risks costly litigation, potentially costing Oregon millions, with a high chance of defeat.

In *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008) and *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* (2022), the U.S. Supreme Court protected the right to possess commonly used firearms and accessories, requiring regulations to align with historical traditions. In *Cargill v. Garland* (2024), the Court struck down a federal bump stock ban, ruling such devices don't meet the machine gun definition and are protected. SB243's restrictions on rapid fire activators are similarly unconstitutional.

Litigation costs could be substantial. California spent over \$5 million defending a similar law in *Miller v. Bonta* (2021), only to lose. Oregon's budget cannot afford such expenses for a likely unconstitutional law. Additionally, SB243's vague "rapid fire activator" definition may lead to enforcement issues and further lawsuits.

Please reject SB243 to avoid wasteful legal battles and pursue constitutional alternatives for public safety.

Sincerely, Andrew Hall, Concerned Oregon Resident

Sources:

District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008)

New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen, 597 U.S. 1 (2022)

Cargill v. Garland, 602 U.S. ____ (2024)

Miller v. Bonta, 542 F. Supp. 3d 1009 (S.D. Cal. 2021)