

Legislative Analysis



LOWER FIREARM MINIMUM AGE FOR DEER, BEAR, OR ELK LICENSE

Mitchell Bean, Director
Phone: (517) 373-8080
<http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa>

House Bill 5192

Sponsor: Rep. Scott Hummel

Committee: Conservation, Forestry, and Outdoor Recreation

Complete to 11-9-05

A SUMMARY OF HOUSE BILL 5192 AS INTRODUCED 9-20-05

House Bill 5192 would amend the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act (MCL 324.43517 et al) to reduce the minimum age for a firearm deer, bear, or elk hunting license from 14 years old to 12 years old.

Currently the law allows the Department of Natural Resources to issue a hunting license to a minor child upon application of a parent, and payment of the license fee, if the young person will be accompanied by the parent or another person who is 17 years of age or older while hunting. However, a license to hunt deer, bear, or elk with a firearm cannot be issued to a person who is less than 14 years of old; and a license to hunt cannot be issued to a person who is less than 12 years old. House Bill 5192 would eliminate the restrictions to hunt deer, bear, or elk on those less than 14 years old, but retain the prohibition that a license could not be issued to a person less than 12 years old.

Currently under the law, a parent of a minor child cannot permit the young person to hunt on another person's property unless accompanied by the parent, or another person authorized by the parent who is at least 17 years old. Under House Bill 5192 this requirement would not apply if the minor child was less than 14 years of age, and the license was a license to hunt deer, bear, or elk with a firearm. Instead, House Bill 5192 specifies that a minor child younger than 14 years of age and having a license to hunt deer, bear, or elk with a firearm could hunt only on private property, and would have to be accompanied by a parent or guardian.

FISCAL IMPACT:

While this bill would encourage more young people to become hunters/sportsmen (generating more licensing revenue for the Game and Fish Protection Fund), there is nothing in this bill that would create an additional burden on the DNR or generate significant new revenue. There would be no fiscal impact on the state or on local governmental units.

Legislative Analyst: J. Hunault

Fiscal Analyst: Kirk Lindquist

■ This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.