

Testimony in Opposition to S.B 554

Authorizes city, county, metropolitan service district, port operating commercial airport, school district, college or university to adopt ordinance or policy limiting or precluding affirmative defense for possession of firearms in public buildings by concealed handgun licensees.

I am opposed to S.B. 554.

State preemption of local regulation of firearms is necessary to ensure that a holder of a concealed carry license can conduct business with and on state, county and locally owned property. With differing decisions made by different entities, a concealed handgun licensee will not know until she gets to her destination what rules apply. If she has taken public transportation, what does she do with her firearm? She is precluded from conducting her business with the entity.

Allowing each government jurisdiction (and private schools!) to pass a rule that limits legal defenses of concealed carry permittees is unconscionable. These decisions MUST be made at the state level.

In addition, the bill permits regulation of firearms on real property owned by a college or university. Does this permit Oregon State University to regulate concealed carry licensees in the Elliot State Forest?

For the reasons stated above, I am opposed to S.B. 554.

Thank you for considering my testimony.