

Roberta DiMezza

From: Danny Bunte <danbunte@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 7:08 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee; Senate Judiciary Committee
Subject: Written testimony for hearings 3/12 and 3/13

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To RI House and Senate members

I am writing in support of the following proposed House and Senate bills and have provided my reasoning below for your consideration.

HB7374 and SB2107. We live in the United States of America. A citizen's rights should not end at the border of another state.

HB7752 Stun guns are considered arms under SCOTUS decision in Heller and determined to be in common use in *Caetano vs Massachusetts*.

SB2108. I strongly support this bill. If a person is not prohibited to possess a firearm, it stands to reason that the same person has a Constitutional right to "bear" said arm without government permission under the 2nd Amendment. Permit less or "Constitutional" carry is now allowed in 30 states across our country. Recent studies from Ohio have shown that after this law was passed there, violent crime decreased. That cannot go unstated. Those states that have urban cities which are "gun free zones" are often targeted by violent criminals and are responsible for the majority of firearm related and other forms of violent crime.

Regarding proficiency requirements, I am very much in favor of suggesting a person get training and become proficient prior to carrying concealed, however, there lies a question of constitutionality of having to prove said proficiency. This is another type of testing requirement prior to exercising a right but this is much less burdensome than the current permitting process. This could be something along the lines of "common sense" that most may support provided that the instructors and testing facilities are readily available and not cost prohibitive.

SB2111 I agree that if a property owner decides that they do not want to allow persons with firearms on their premises then they assume all liability for the guarantee of safety.

SB2201, SB 2216, SB2199 (regarding the sale and ownership of suppressors) I do not agree with the current permitting scheme which requires notarized character references (does anyone think that they would ask someone that doesn't like them to do this?) and a "valid" reason which is purely subjective to police chiefs or the AG. But, most of these changes are better than it is now. It should be on the state's onus to prove that an individual is a prohibited person, not the latter.

In regard to suppressors, if necessary, these bills should all include additional language to define use at bonafide shooting ranges as well as hunting. In most cases, suppressors only reduce the decibels of the audible report to roughly 125db which is still very loud and requires hearing protection to prevent damage/loss of hearing. These devices are not like they are depicted in Hollywood films. In England of all places, it is thought of as gentlemanly and courteous to other shooters nearby and are widely required.

SB2231 Finally a piece of legislation that goes after known gang associates...Thank you. This may actually "Do Something". Similar to SB2201 this also standardizes licensing authority applications. Nice changes to the process overall.

SB2451 This prevents unfriendly 2A jurisdictions from monetarily discouraging the permit process.

SB2676 Stiffer penalties for law breakers. Cannot argue about that.

Thank you,
Danny Bunte
8 Midway Ave
Westerly RI 02891