

## Roberta DiMezza

---

**From:** Rick Gregoire <rickgregoire120@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 2, 2025 2:34 PM  
**To:** House Judiciary Committee  
**Subject:** House Bill 5436

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

I am writing to state my opposition to H5436 and H5436 sub A.

I understand the entire Second Amendment discussion is a highly emotional and volatile scenario. With that I will do my best from feeding into the emotionalism.

I will also mention the Rhode Island Constitution section 22 states "The Right Of The People to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." It is more succinct and has no implications of any interpretation of need for the citizenry to be part of a militia.

With that stated I also realize that there is need for legitimate oversight of the general welfare of a society. That oversight shouldn't be a permission slip to project undesirable or criminal intent upon any member of that society without extremely reasonable grounds.

Many portions of this bill define characteristics of rifles that are in fact cosmetic. The elimination of those cosmetic features neither diminishes nor enhances any of the actual mechanical functions and capabilities of said rifle. They do not increase or decrease the mechanical rate of fire that is inherent in the gun's design. They do not make the gun more, or less powerful. They merely alter the gun's appearance. One of the more objectionable characteristics being outlawed in this bill is the 'pistol grip'. There is no concrete proof that a pistol grip makes a rifle more deadly than a rifle that has a standard stock. It is entirely in the realm of sophistry that a pistol grip or stabilizing brace makes a gun more deadly.

What I am primarily concerned with is the use of the terminology 'assault weapon'.

Any weapon, used in an assault is a de facto assault weapon regardless of what the weapon is or any capability of firing a projectile. The assault lies solely in the intent of the assaulter.

It is erroneously believed that semi-automatic firearms originated with the military and were adopted for use in the civilian market. It is the opposite. Semi-automatic rifles were first sold to the civilian market beginning in 1906 by the Remington Arms Company. The semi-automatic Garand M1 wasn't adopted for use until World War II.

It is also a misconception that the primary opposition to this bill and others like it are being orchestrated and financed by the 'gun lobby'. The people opposed to this bill are the resident citizens of this state. We aren't being bankrolled by any activist groups who reside outside of Rhode Island. None of us are receiving any stipends from outside organizations. We are investing in opposition to this bill with our own money, time and labor. We will be living here with the effects of this. The same cannot be said of people who are receiving stipends to travel to Rhode Island and will leave here and have no personal effects from this legislation.

It is not merely a 'gun issue'. This is also a property rights issue and the right to be secure in one's property and security. The common denominator of the Federal Constitution and the Constitution of Rhode Island is the recognition that the rights of personhood are organic in nature. Said Constitutions do not grant these rights to the citizenry, they affirm the organic, natural rights of persons.

In my opinion passage of this bill will merely be wishful thinking that the societal problem of people who behave aberrantly is any closer to being solved. All this bill will accomplish in effect is to transform legitimate law-abiding citizens into 'manufactured lawbreakers by statute' under the guise of being 'tough on crime' under color of law.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.