

Roberta DiMezza

From: Josh Adams <jadams02016@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2026 9:47 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Cranston Constituent Opposes H8073

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from jadams02016@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

I am a Cranston constituent writing regarding H8073 and to express my strong opposition to the proposed amendment expanding Rhode Island's so called assault weapons ban.

The General Assembly only recently passed the Rhode Island Assault Weapons Ban Act of 2025 (H.5436 / S.359). That legislation already imposed restrictions on the future manufacture purchase sale and transfer of certain semi automatic firearms beginning July 1 2026. Importantly the law clearly acknowledged that many Rhode Islanders already legally possess these firearms and explicitly allowed them to remain lawful if owned prior to the effective date. In other words the legislature recognized existing lawful ownership and provided a grandfather provision for citizens who had already purchased these items in compliance with the law.

Because of that clear language it is deeply concerning to now see efforts to revisit or expand the law in a way that undermines that understanding. Regardless of where one stands politically on firearms policy the General Assembly debated this issue and ultimately placed its decision in writing. Changing the rules after the fact risks undermining public confidence that laws passed by the legislature will remain stable and reliable.

Many Rhode Islanders made lawful purchasing decisions based on the language of that legislation. Altering those expectations now raises serious fairness concerns for citizens who acted in good faith under the law as it was written.

The language of H8073 itself makes the concern clear. The bill explicitly amends §11-47.2-2 to add possession to the list of prohibited activities making it illegal to manufacture sell transfer purchase or possess a prohibited firearm after July 1 2026. It then provides only a narrow window until December 31 2026 for existing lawful owners to transfer their property to a dealer or to someone outside the state. In practical terms this is not a grandfather provision. It is a forced disposal requirement that compels citizens who legally purchased property under existing law to surrender or remove that property from the state. That represents a significant departure from the assurances previously written into law and raises serious concerns about fairness reliance on existing statutes and the treatment of lawful property owners.

I would also urge the General Assembly to carefully consider the legal risks associated with legislation like H8073. By criminalizing possession and requiring existing lawful owners to dispose of property they already legally purchased the bill raises serious constitutional questions. Courts across the country are actively reviewing similar laws under the Supreme Court's decision in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* and several states are already engaged in lengthy and expensive litigation defending

comparable bans. Rhode Island taxpayers should not be placed in the position of funding costly legal battles over legislation that may ultimately be struck down.

It is also important to recognize that support for the Second Amendment is not limited to one political party or ideology. Constituents across the political spectrum support the right to keep and bear arms. Democrats, Republicans, centrists and independents alike stand to lose from this amendment. This is not purely a partisan issue but one that affects a broad cross section of Rhode Islanders who value both constitutional rights and consistency in lawmaking.

As a member of the LGBT community I am one of many people who values the ability to lawfully defend themselves and their families. Responsible firearm ownership exists in every community and among people of every political viewpoint.

It should also be stated clearly that AR 15 style rifles and other commonly owned semi automatic firearms are not the root cause of violent crime. These firearms are owned by millions of Americans for lawful purposes including recreation collection and self defense. Policies that focus primarily on specific types of firearms while overlooking the underlying causes of violence risk addressing symptoms rather than solutions.

There is also substantial evidence that firearms are used defensively by ordinary citizens to stop or deter crime. Estimates of defensive gun use in the United States range from hundreds of thousands to several million instances each year depending on the study. In many cases a firearm is never even fired. The mere ability of a lawful citizen to defend themselves often prevents a crime from escalating further.

Rhode Island's geography is also part of this conversation. While parts of the state are urban many communities are wooded suburban or semi rural with winding roads and limited access points. Law enforcement officers perform an important and difficult role but they cannot be everywhere at once and response times can vary. Responsible citizens must still retain the ability to protect their homes families and property during the critical moments before help can arrive.

This proposal would also have significant financial consequences for many lawful residents. I personally stand to lose a substantial monetary investment in my legally acquired firearm collection as a result of this amendment. These items represent thousands of dollars in lawful personal property purchased in good faith under the laws that existed at the time. Policies like this can devalue that property overnight for citizens who have done nothing wrong.

If Rhode Island continues down this path many residents will begin asking whether their rights and concerns are being adequately represented. Some may ultimately decide to relocate to states where they feel their constitutional liberties are better protected. I sincerely hope that does not become necessary.

I also want to be clear that voters across the political spectrum are paying close attention to how elected officials approach issues like this. When constituents feel that their concerns are ignored or that previously established law is being reversed they will respond at the ballot box. That is simply the reality of representative government.

I respectfully urge you to oppose H8073 and to consider the broader consequences it may have for law abiding citizens across Rhode Island.

Respectfully,

Joshua Adams
1235 Narragansett BLVD

Cranston Rhode Island 02905

4019542765