

Roberta DiMezza

From: Cole Morgan <cmorgan5292@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2024 9:53 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Written Testimony for Hearings on 5/23/24

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Esteemed Members of the House Judiciary Committee,

My name is Cole Morgan and am writing this email as testimony in opposition to the proposed bills scheduled for hearing, Thursday, May 23rd.

HB 7098 - would exempt full-time members of the Capitol Police, state and municipal police, state marshals and correctional officers and persons licensed under 11-47-11 from the seven (7) day waiting period and other requirements for purchasing concealable firearms or rifles and shotguns. I am a supporter of our police but I also recognize that police are ordinary citizens with ordinary lives and problems when not in uniform and must obey the same laws that other ordinary citizens must follow daily who don't wear a badge when they go to work. A class of people who are employed by a government entity/body should not be given exemptions when it comes to private ownership of firearms because of a chosen profession. The entity that employs police provides a service weapon, sidearm or long gun or both, to carry out their duties while on the job and the burden of purchasing all necessary tools falls on the employing entity as it does for any other employing entity, non-law enforcement, for their employees to perform their duties (i.e. a laptop, hand tools, pens and pencils). If this bill passes, it will be another example in the list of many that clearly identifies that government believes there are two classes of people, those who are exempt from law and those who are not as it relates to firearm ownership. Either do away with the 7 day waiting period for all or no one at all.

HB 7216 - "Crime Gun". A new definition to describe a firearm used in the commission of a crime. I personally do not see the need to add a new definition to describe a "gun" that was used in a crime. A crime is a crime. What is used in the commission of a crime gets documented as such, whether it be a gun or a knife or other instrument. By the logic of the bill, there needs to be an added definition for "Crime Knife" and for "Crime Car" and for "Crime Bat" etc, etc.. This is more frivolous legislation to redefine a firearm of any kind used in a crime. The crime is an act and whatever was used in the crime is accessory to the act. This is an unnecessary definition seeking only to further the talking point and narrative of anti-gun advocates to make firearms sound even scarier. Please do not pass this bill as it logically makes no sense and from a literary perspective, it makes no sense.

HB 7373 and SB 2202 (as amended) - Safe Storage Act. Requires safe storage of all firearms not being carried, requires all firearms sold to have a trigger lock device included, requires all firearm shops to post signage of the law regarding safe storage. As I put in my written testimony a couple months ago regarding this bill, I do not support legislative measures with associated penalties to force people how to act within their home. Do I support and practice storing of firearms safely, absolutely but yet there is no legislation to help people who may not be able to afford a safe and I find it unfair to force the burden upon retailers to provide a trigger lock device as that incurred cost will be passed on to the consumer, further raising the cost for people who would like to partake in their 2nd Amendment right to defend themselves and others from those who wish to do them harm. I talk about about safe storage with friends and colleagues and my wife. Any reasonable gun owner, partakes in safe storage for many reasons like they don't want their child to gain access and potentially harm themselves or others. They don't want prohibited persons gaining access. They also don't want their firearms to be stolen, the same reason being why people lock their cars and the doors and windows to their homes. This bill would also disproportionately affect people, negatively, who don't have children or who live by themselves. If such people need to use their firearm in the event of a home intrusion, they will be restricted because they were safely

storing their firearm while asleep and didn't have enough time to release the trigger lock after fumbling around with the key in the dark, or trying to punch in the code on their safe or while trying to use a key to unlock their safe. As a responsible firearms owner, a husband, and a father, I believe in safely storing my firearms that are not in use but I do not believe it is the position of the government to mandate it. As a father, if my child were harm themself or others, I would have to live with that for the rest of my life. That's a greater burden than any fine or potential prison time the state could issue. This legislation also opens firearms owners to years of civil lawsuit cases. This is aiming to penalize firearms owners, who I trust safely store firearms, in an unfair way. The state should promote responsible firearm ownership, should host people (gun advocates) to talk about ways to safely store firearms if one cannot afford a safe, and the state should provide assistance for those seeking to partake in their 2nd Amendment Right to acquire an affordable safe or accessible means as we accommodate many of our other constitutional rights such as voting.

HB 7570 - Would allow law enforcement to utilize mufflers, silencers, or other devices for deadening/muffling the natural report of a firearm while acting within the scope of their official duties. I will defer to the basis of my opposition of HB 7098. I am not as strongly opposed to this bill as the prior but again, everyone who doesn't wear a badge should have equal access to the mentioned devices in this bill. Reasoning for general ownership is primarily safety. Tinnitus is a constant ringing in the ears caused from long exposures to loud noises over time. Silencers/mufflers/suppressors ownership should be allowed for all, within the rules of the NFA (\$200 tax stamp needed), especially at indoor ranges where hearing protection helps but with multiple people on the firing line at any given time in an enclosed space, it gets loud. These devices would serve as a net benefit for law enforcement operating in official capacity but also for non-law enforcement who shoot primarily at indoor ranges. If its not allowed for general population, then it shouldn't be allowed for just law enforcement.

Kind Regards,

Cole Morgan
83 Bateman Ave
Cranston RI 02920