Chair Prozanski, Vice-chair Thatcher, Members of the Committee,

SB554: Carrying restrictions patchwork laws across state, criminal penalties

I feel this ban is aimed at our constitutional rights to keep and bear arms. I do not entrust our lives to colleges and universities or other government or public buildings. Public buildings staff do not have enough people with guns to keep us safe. Will you have one gun in each classroom and a gun carrier in each hallway hallway. I do not trust our State with what it is doing because they are always short of enough police officers or enough staff. This increase innocents being murders. We are good reasonable people who want to keep our families safe.

I've always told my sons this, and never let this fall to the ground:

"The only thing the police can do is investigate their murder." Why? Because the cops will never be there to prevent it. That's why.

There are so many people who need to carry a gun when police rules do not allow a stalking order. Public buildings do not have the staff or even the knowledge of who to protect.

We continue to read about a mindless male who wanted to kill a stalked woman. It's always the good people that get murdered, and the one's who kill them get paid to eat for life and get to get out sometimes.

When all is said and done, we have the right to protect ourselves. You are harming us.

And, speaking personally to my Senator James Manning, I ask for you to uphold our constitutional rights to bear arms in all public places. Without that protection, we are unprotected. Government does not do good at protecting it's citizens. Budget problems abound. That's why people carry guns, because they alone know when they need to use them and when they don't, and no one can tell a person who is threatened to leave their gun in a locked box while the criminals use machine guns to mow down their victims.

Has anyone watched the Equalizer, the American crime drama television series, originally airing on CBS from September 18, 1985 to August 24, 1989. It starred Edward Woodward as a retired intelligence agent with a mysterious past, who uses the skills from his former career to exact justice on behalf of innocent people who find themselves in dangerous circumstances. And what was always the case? Without someone who had weapons and was physically present would result in life being preserved, but without weapons, they would have been killed.

And to all of the other members of this committee: if not even the U.S. Capitol is safe, then what of lesser public and government places who are complacent with our lives? What professor in a classroom is going to protect a student, as we have had several incidents in Oregon. And you want to take away guns from those who seek only to protect life? We've seen it happen too often in our state.

This bill violates the U.S. Constitution. Any erosion of those rights to self defense should not be abridged. Why? Because no one is going to be where we are when we are threatened. Forbid that any of your children or loved ones are killed without you having a gun to stop it, but then a law like this goes into place and you would say what? "I wish I had my gun that day, because my wife would be alive", or "my children would still be here", or "I could have shot a man who was shooting at others, if only I had my gun on me and my excellent sharpshooting skills to bring down those who would shoot dozens of students dead long before cops can ever get there.

This bill should never go forward. It should not move out of this committee.

Sincerely,

Bill Northrup, Eugene