

I oppose: House Bill 7051

The Cranston Police have had a facility predating residential development and school locations for years. The entire state does not need to be disrupted by people who move to an area and want NIMBY (not in my back yard). Whether we are taking people moving to subdivisions in Hopkinton and complaining about rooster sounds or moving adjacent to a gun range then complaining about the gun range, it is the same. The facts are RI is the most densely populated state in the country. It is unavoidable to have groups not like certain noises. We need police to be properly trained. This is their long standing facility. There is no need to transfer the agenda of certain Cranston residents to the entire state. We do not need the state to dictate zoning for local municipalities.

I oppose: 7216

This is a database law. A warrant based on probable cause will be sufficient to seize a firearm. Obviously, if the firearm was never fired in the commission of a crime that the defendant is charged with such as possession, there would not be a need for additional firing and collection of data that is immaterial to the arrest of the subject. That is what is called a fishing expedition by defense attorneys. The Fourth Amendment provides for searches and seizures based on articulable facts and the constitution favors government restraint and the protection of rights of defendants.

I oppose 7303

I do not condone such behavior as implied. However, public official as defined in the bill does not differentiate between public and private schools. It says "OR" in the case of schools. It makes no distinction after OR that it differentiates between public or private. Furthermore, it doesn't clearly explain what a 'central office official' or 'all other school employees' are. I can recall in elementary school, a janitor that was taking certain second grade girls out of class for 'projects' with the teacher's consent. Of course, it turns out that it wasn't for school related projects. Will the effect of passage essentially provide extra protection for situations in which a child or parent under threat can have the tables turned and get protection just because they are an employee of a school system? Certainly, you could have irate parents commenting to the schools when certain activities are encouraged. The misuse of the FBI for local school board political speech certainly has a tone that you are not to participate in the political process. Is the goal here the same to wipe out the political speech vs actual threats.

Oppose 7368

While noise can be annoying, automated systems to detect noise to reduce noise state-wide is not a solution with practical effect. If someone is on let's say the area of Elmwood Avenue where you can have a short drive between Providence, Cranston, and Warwick where volumes

of cars go by. How is one going to differentiate from another. The troublesome nature is that we give up security in public places in the name of technology which the private sector sells for profit with multiple variables and considerations not in place.

Oppose 7570

Good hearing is not something that should be afforded to law enforcement only. All lawful firearms owners should be afforded the same protections. In fact, if you allowed this to happen, then perhaps individuals that seek to remove ranges from their neighborhood would have less perceived noise as well.

I support House Bill No. 7098

The capitol police are LEO and should be treated as such having graduated from the academy.

I support 7450

Private property ownership is a fundamental pillar of our society. Furthermore, the constitutional requirements under the Fourth Amendment requires respect not only of criminal suspects but also private landowners.

I support 7453

Laws must keep up with the technology. The constitution requires warrants. Therefore, swooping up data on people that have no bearing or not a target of a warrant is concerning to say the least. Warrants must be based on articulated facts that justify probable cause. The Fourth Amendment must be respected. Collecting data on people that are not the targets is essentially a warrantless search. This differentiates us from a surveillance society. The Patriot Act was intentionally named as such to imply that if you did not support it, you were unpatriotic if you supported the Constitution. I encourage committee members to look back to the Inslaw Promis software case and domestic surveillance.