

Submitter: Summer White
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure: HB2006

I am writing this testimony in opposition to HB 2006 regarding changing the legal age for purchasing certain firearms to 21. This is unfair as the legal age to join the military is 17 with guardian permission. Those military age individuals will be given semi-automatic weapons. How is it that we can want these kids to sign up and serve our country, but they can't own the same weapons as the rest of us? Explain to me how this is fair or should be legal to restrict their 2nd amendment right under our constitution. At what point does the constitution trump the state laws. I am the mother of a 20 year old, 19 year old and a 17 year old. My son is 17 and is looking at joining the military/national guard. This law would make it illegal for him to use his military rifle in a capacity to protect the civilians of Oregon if he so needed to. How can that even be considered legal? Will this make his military status obsolete because he will be under 21? What about a kid who wants to be a police officer? They also use semi-automatic rifles to serve the citizens. And if they are allowed to have access to those weapons why would other adults under the age of 21 not be allowed to have the same rights? It is a RIGHT according to our constitution that we have the right to protect ourselves with the equivalent weapons as the military. Anyone that thinks the USA cant get invaded is living in a cloud. I would like my children to be able to protect themselves and their families if it was to happen. Thank you for reading my testimony.