

Submitter:	Brian Hudspeth
On Behalf Of:	
Committee:	Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic:	SB243

While all four components of SB 243 are problematic, the age restriction language contained in the bill would negatively affect our youth and young adult hunters and sport shooters. Restricting possession of semi-automatic rifles and shotguns fails to take into account the standard uses of semi-automatic shotguns in waterfowl, upland bird, and turkey hunting, as well as being a primary firearm of high school and collegiate sport shooting teams.

Additionally, due to the language stipulating that a firearm could only be transferred to a minor from a parent or guardian, firearms training and educational courses, such as the shotgun skills courses presented by Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife, would no longer be able to provide temporary firearms to students under 21.

The age restriction language in SB 243 creates numerous barriers to entry for new youth and young adult hunters and sport shooters who want to participate in hunting and shooting activities and therefore I strongly oppose the bill.

I also STRONGLY oppose any form of additional requirements to purchase such as the proposed 72 mandatory waiting period. Recently an Injunction was just granted to a case in Main, (federal court), regarding this very issue. It's likely this case, (Beckwith v. Frey) will prevail and found that these state imposed waiting periods will be found unconstitutional giving the recent ruling by the Supreme Court in the Bruin Decision. So why should Oregonian's pay to have our legislature work on bills that arguably go against the US Constitution. Didn't you all take an Oath to "Defend and Protect" the constitution? Maybe you should take value in your oaths of office and not your wallets!