

Submitter:	Kyle Ward
On Behalf Of:	The legacy of Children and Grandchildren
Committee:	Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic:	SB698

Senate Bill 698 would allow local governments to prohibit legally carried firearms on municipal property, including government buildings and adjacent grounds. This bill targets law-abiding gun owners, undermines state preemption laws, and creates a dangerous patchwork of regulations that harm public safety.

Key Points.

1. Law-Abiding Gun Owners Are Not the Problem

* ??MDA Claim: The bill increases public safety by banning guns on municipal property.

* ??Counterpoint: Criminals do not follow gun laws — this bill only disarms law-abiding citizens while doing nothing to stop violent criminals who ignore restrictions. Concealed carry permit holders are among the most law-abiding citizens in the country, with lower crime rates than the general public.

2. State Preemption Laws Exist to Prevent Confusion and Protect Rights

* ??MDA erroneous Claim: Local governments should have the ability to regulate firearms on their own property.

* ??Counterpoint: Oregon has a state preemption law for a reason -to prevent a confusing patchwork of inconsistent local gun laws. Allowing each city, county, or town to impose different restrictions creates legal traps for law-abiding citizens and makes it impossible for gun owners to comply with constantly changing rules.

3. Concealed Carry Holders Enhance Public Safety

* ??MDA erroneous Claim: Banning guns on municipal property makes the public safer.

* ??Counterpoint: Armed citizens are proven to deter and stop violent crime. Gun-free zones have repeatedly been targeted by criminals, as seen in multiple mass shootings. Concealed carry permit holders are not the threat-criminals who ignore all laws are.

4. This Bill Disarms Vulnerable Citizens, Including Women and the Disabled

- MDA erroneous Claim: People should not be required to allow guns in public buildings.

Counterpoint: Many individuals, including domestic violence survivors, disabled individuals, and the elderly, rely on legally carried firearms for self-defense. Forcing them to disarm in government buildings makes them vulnerable to violent criminals.

5. MDA stance is merely anecdotal. There Is No Data Supporting That These Bans Reduce Crime

* ??MDA erroneous Claim: Removing firearms from municipal property prevents politically motivated violence.

* ??Counterpoint: There is no evidence that banning legally carried firearms reduces crime. Instead, these bans create "soft targets" where criminals know they will face little resistance. Armed law-abiding citizens deter crime, not create it!

Final Position Statement:

Senate Bill 698 is not about public safety— it is about government overreach and restricting the rights of law-abiding Oregonians. It creates a patchwork of confusing regulations, disarms responsible citizens, and does nothing to stop criminals. Lawmakers should reject this ineffective measure and focus on policies that target violent offenders, not law-abiding gun owners.