

Submitter: Cheyenne Love

On Behalf Of:

Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

Dear Members of the Senate Committee On Judiciary,

I'm writing in strong opposition to SB 243. The entirety of the bill is problematic, however I'm choosing to highlight my issues with the age restriction language, as (among other issues) it creates numerous barriers to entry for new youth and young adult hunters and sport shooters who want to participate in hunting and shooting activities. Here are some points that I think need consideration before you choose to additionally burden law-abiding gun owners:

- Restricting possession of semi-automatic rifles and shotguns fails to take into account the standard uses of both for hunting, as well as semi-automatic shotguns being a primary firearm of high school and collegiate sport shooting teams.

- 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.

- Findings on the effects of age restriction appear to be mixed at best. Have past age restrictions (21 as age of possession for handguns as an example) had a positive and significantly measurable effect on crime, overall suicide numbers, or mass shootings? If the answer is not a resounding and provable yes, why would we consider infringing on a constitutional right?

In addition to these points, please consider that in Oregon an 18 year old is considered an adult; fit to sign a contract, fit to join the military, fit to pay taxes, and fit to vote. If it's up for consideration that they may not be fit to own a semi-automatic rifle or shotgun, perhaps we need to reconsider these areas as well.

Sincerely,

Cheyenne Love