

3/25/25 Written testimony in opposition of the following bills:

There is no rational basis to restrict owners rights to use their property when not assaulting or battering another person. If traffic accidents were a real concern then no one would pass a law that says vehicles can be designed to go up to 300 mph when the speed limits are 65 or less but only those that are red and have two doors and a spoiler should be turned into the local police station as a response. What if the actual data revealed that more crashes occurred between speeds of 35 to 35 mph and more often it was a white, black, or gray 4 cylinder sedan involved and the most fatal accidents were at 85 mph and in silver SUVs. Why would anyone in their right mind think that the ban on red coupes with spoilers was going to have any measurable impact on accidents? All it would do is be a set up for them coming back the next year claiming we found that this legislation is not expansive enough and now we need to add blue and green cars in there. That cycle would repeat until there would be no cars.

Regarding the assault weapons bill, banning, restricting, placing infringements, and otherwise making ownership onerous does nothing for safety or crime prevention. One of the most violent and death producing events in the history of the United States occurred on September 11, 2001 where boxcutters and airplanes were used by malevolent and evil perpetrators. Clearly, no one called for cosmetic redesign of airplanes or boxcutters as a result. Rather, security was changed to make sure that the cockpits weren't able to be breached and that bad people can't get on the planes with bad stuff.

The definition of assault is generally an intentional act that puts another person in reasonable apprehension of imminent harmful or offensive contact. While no injury is required, the actor must have intended to create an offensive contact. Battery is the actual contact. So, basically, the idea of creating an assault weapons ban is to ban firearms that have features that somehow make people feel less apprehensive than other firearms. We know the Lt. Governor even stated that she wants all firearms removed from the state. Not only is registration unconstitutional, the state and federal constitutions say the right to bear arms shall not be infringed. Anyone that is against the constitution violates the oath to

support and defend the constitution.

Rhode Island law also has a litany of assault related crimes including banning assault with items that appear to look like a firearm and assault with bodily fluid. To be an assault, the person has to intend to cause a response in the victim. Obviously, if one is actually assaulted and contact is made, there is the crime and tort of battery. Any object can be used to commit assault and battery including the hands, feet, elbows, knees, etc. Passing more restrictions will not stop someone who intends to commit homicide. This is why there are lesser included offenses in the criminal justice system.

This does nothing but criminalize individuals for minding their own business. Given that home prices are high, the job market lags neighbors, and the state has long failed to keep its fiscal house in order, and has suffered for making financially due to administrations making sweetheart deals with special interests, the state is already increasingly unliveable. Passing any of these laws will just encourage leaving. In today's economy, jobs are not necessarily filled in the state when people leave. When people leave a company, that job can be performed in different states and when a replacement is made from out of state, that taxable income is lost. When outdoorsmen leave the state, the DEM loses money as those individuals aren't buying the goods and licenses that FWS gives to the state as far as Pittman money. I don't think the state can afford to lose a penny given the many self inflicted fiscal disasters of this administration like failing to maintain bridges. Given the federal deficits, don't expect Santa Claus, the Tooth Fairy, or the feds to come to the rescue either. In fact, more litigation is something the state can't afford either.

