

Richard M. Husband
10 Mallard Court
Litchfield, NH 03052
(603)883-1218
RMHusband@gmail.com

January 13, 2026

VIA EMAIL

The Honorable Terry Roy, Chairman
House Criminal Justice and Public Safety Committee

RE: HB 1793-FN, *prohibiting public colleges and universities from regulating the possession or carrying of firearms and non-lethal weapons on campus*
Hearing Date: January 14, 2026; Time: 10:00 a.m.

Dear Chairman Roy and Other Honorable Committee Members:

Please consider this as my testimony in this matter.

My name is Richard Husband, I reside in Litchfield and am an attorney, practicing under New Hampshire Bar Number 6532 since 1989. For the following reasons, I **OPPOSE** HB 1793-FN as being prematurely introduced, and urge that it be tabled until such time as the necessary support discussed below is established. At that point, I may well change my position and support the bill, as I certainly agree that campus gun violence needs to be addressed. But there is too little evidence at this time to deem this bill a prudent approach to the problem: the matter is clearly more appropriate for further committee consideration.

Grounded solely in the dubious theory that granting everyone an unquestionable right to possess guns on college campuses is the best way to prevent gun tragedies, HB 1793-FN lacks anything other than meritless political arguments to support that current campus gun restrictions are not reasonable and preferable to a majority of Granite Staters, and that its approach is actually safer than the alternatives, as professed, and not just an unproven minority political ideology.

Not everyone should be entrusted with gun use equivalent to those who undergo law enforcement screening and training. The gun rights at issue are not absolute under our federal constitution. Rather, they are subject to reasonable regulations and restrictions to protect the safety of others as a “sensitive place,” *i.e.*, a campus school setting, is involved. See *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570 (2008). *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. 1 (2022) relied on in HB 1793-FN is not supportive of the bill and gun rights advocated thereunder as the decision itself recognizes that “schools” are “‘sensitive places’ where arms carrying could be prohibited consistent with the Second Amendment.” Plainly, college campuses should

be considered “schools” that are subject to reasonable gun restrictions under United States Supreme Court precedent. Additionally, all state legislation is subject to the preeminent state constitutional rights of Granite Staters to be governed only by laws that are “consented” to by “the people”—majority, not minority—and “for the general good” *See* New Hampshire Constitution, Part 1, Article 1.¹

Accordingly, HB 1793-FN should be tabled until it is supported first (1) by credible studies and other evidence, including college and law enforcement input, establishing that its approach is, indeed, safer than current restrictions, as argued by the bill, and the alternatives, and promotes the “general good”; and then, after presentation of this evidence to the public and due consideration, (2) by University of New Hampshire (“UNH”) polling or other evidence confirming majority approval. Evidence on the first issue should specifically include credible support for the bill’s claim that more guns will deter campus gun tragedies, when it appears from the reporting that I am aware of that many, if not most, of those wishing to do harm on campuses and schools seem to consider it a suicide mission²—and thus would likely only be “deterred” into targeting unarmed individuals while being free to choose them under cover of others bearing arms. Deterrence and reduction of tragedies caused by accident in an environment susceptible to alcohol, drugs, youthful pranks, emotions, broken hearts, gun inexperience, anger, volatility and just “fooling around” should also be proven. Evidence establishing that limiting the proposed gun rights to those carefully screened,

¹ Our state constitutional principles are largely grounded in the political philosophy of John Locke, primarily reflected in Part 1, the Bill of Rights, of the New Hampshire Constitution. These principles include Locke’s view that the only legitimate form of government is popular sovereignty, whereby “the people” of a sovereign body “consent” to government rule for the “general good,” but only by “the will and determination of the majority” (“majority rule”). *See* Locke’s Second Treatise, Section 95-99; New Hampshire Constitution’s Bill of Rights, and particularly Articles 1, 7, 8 and 10; *See also* <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/locke-political/>. The principle of “majority rule” was such a pillar of popular sovereignty to Locke and our founding fathers that Locke warned legitimate government would cease if it were not followed, *See* Locke’s Second Treatise, Sections 95-99, and Thomas Jefferson urged that it “is in all cases to prevail,” so long as it is reasonable and minority rights are not oppressed (“tyranny by the majority”) but equal and protected. *See* Jefferson’s First Inaugural Address. Minority rights are equal and protected under our state constitution, by equal protection provisions, other constitutionally enumerated rights, and checks and balances. The majority rule is supposed to be upheld under New Hampshire’s constitution by the majority vote of representatives, with protection for minority and individual rights. *See* State v. Lafrance, 124 N.H. 171, 177 (1983). Apparently to ensure that all legislation does adhere to the majority rule, Article 8 of our Bill of Rights tethers all representative authority, and holds all representatives accountable, to “the people.” As “the people” plainly means all individuals governed by the sovereign under Articles 1 and 7, not just the inhabitants of a representative’s district or their own opinions, the only other reasonable interpretation of Article 1 is that all lawful legislation must be grounded in the consent of *all* of “the people” of the state.

² As shown, for example, by the leaving of “manifestos” and wearing of bullet proof vests that may allow continued engagement but clearly will not prevent their inevitable demise as they do not protect the face and all body parts.

trained, licensed and easily identified by badges or other indicia of their status, and requiring that guns be safely secured beyond access when not carried, would not be a better path, should also be provided. As a taxpayer in a state with severe revenue concerns and a substantial budget deficit from last year, I would also appreciate knowing why the increased campus security, insurance costs and other expenditures resulting from HB 1793-FN would be a good use of our money. On the second issue, the need to confirm majority support is obvious as voting on the generalcourt.com web site substantially opposes the bill. This bill really appears to be just more House pursuit of the Trump administration agenda, in this case unreasonably expanding gun “rights,” that a clear majority of Granite Staters—6%, four times the amount Trump won by nationally and declared a “mandate”—turned thumbs down to in the 2024 federal election. See [December 22, 2025 online Associated Press article "The Trump administration is suing the District of Columbia over its gun laws"](#).

As a UNH graduate, husband and father of UNH graduates, and uncle of two current UNH students, I am appalled that the wholly partisan sponsorship of this bill is so *gung ho* to fundamentally alter campus character, experience and safety, while not appearing the least bit open to the slightest change on their end. In the “freest state,” legislators should not dictate what “the people” get, but be eager to discover what they really want and need—especially when the armed individual unquestionably allowed into an otherwise unarmed area full of students, staff and/or other citizens may be the one to most keep out.

When lives are at stake, we should tread slowly, carefully and be guided by far more than political agendas.

Thank you for your time and courtesy in considering this testimony.

Sincerely,

//s//Richard M. Husband