

I'm not sure I ever heard my father say the words but I grew up knowing that we have a large obligation to our family and to our country. As part of my obligation to my country I went off to a rather stupid war in Vietnam: both families and countries can get us involved in stupid stuff, can't they? And both families and countries have members that we'd be better off without, such as alcoholics, drug addicts, and some generally bad to very bad guys. So on the off chance that one of these bad guys might be out doing his bad thing and might have a gun along, I usually have one of my own available either on my person or in the car trunk. In my 76 years on the planet I have thankfully not ever had occasion to need the gun to prevent a bad guy with gun from harming some other citizen of my country, but I am usually prepared "just in case" somebody needs protecting. I believe it is not only a right but also a responsibility to bear arms for such a possibility. Both the United States Constitution and the Oregon Constitution don't outright place such a responsibility on us citizens but they do state that we have a right to exercise this bearing of arms for protection of ourselves and our fellow citizens.

The proposed legislation will place a severe restriction on my ability to bear arms for meeting my Oregon and American citizen responsibility. If this legislation were to become law in this state I would not dare to continue bearing arms as I do now because of the ease with which I could commit an inadvertent felony merely by coming into or just being adjacent to some building or other property which had become a self-protection exclusion zone without my knowledge. We all know of times when a bad guy with a gun killed many people with no opposition for many minutes. We know of other instances when the fortunate presence of a good guy with a gun stopped the bad guy with gun before he got very far. I'm sure most of us citizens would like to see the bad guys with guns more frequently be stopped sooner, which nearly always requires a good guy with a gun. And I'm sure the intent of this legislation was good, but the actual result of the legislation would be to reduce the number of "good guys with guns" in the community while not at all reducing the number of "bad guys with guns": quite the opposite of what our society needs.

Please do not move forward with this bill.

Charles McKinney