Daryl Kreutzer
Senate Committee On Judiciary
SB243

I am opposed to this bill for many reasons.

We have had waiting periods in the past, and they were of little to no impact on crime. It is a rare instance when a law-abiding citizen fills out an ATF form 4473 and passes a background check, with the intention of causing harm to another person. On the other hand, someone intent on harming another person will break laws to get a gun, or will use their hands, a knife, a car, or another means to cause the harm. We need to focus on the law breakers, nit the law abiding.

I have had my Oregon CHL for 30-40 years and have never been accused of a crime. The creation of more "Gun Free" zones just creates more killing fields for those intent on causing harm. This is why those individuals choose schools and malls; places that are known to be gun free. These individuals go where they can inflict the most damage, without opposition. Why would we want to expand the places THEY feel safe?

As far as age requirements, young people are deemed safe to drive a vehicle alone at 16, they are mature enough to vote for elected officials or join the armed services and die defending their country at 18, but this bill wants to limit their right to defend themselves and their families until 21. The legal age for handgun purchases is already 21, which limits their possession of those to an extent. What about the trap and skeet programs at high schools and colleges? Would these be banned? What about the Olympics, those shooters often start at a very young age. We teach our children about sex at a very young age. How about passing a bill that creates mandatory gun safety programs in the schools. Teaching our youth safe and responsible handling of what is essentially a tool would be better than "Banning" them from possession of that tool, making them ignorant in the presence of one.

We all want and end to the violence, but measures that go after criminals, not the law-abiding, are a better way to achieve this.