
Jeremy Burlingham

466 Moosehead Trail
Waldo, ME 04915
(207) 230-4682

March 24, 2025

Judiciary Committee

State House
Augusta, ME 04330

Dear Honorable Members of the Committee,

My name is Jeremy Burlingham, a resident of Waldo, I'm here to testify in opposition to LD 1109 "An Act to Reduce Gun Violence Casualties in Maine by Prohibiting the Possession of Large-capacity Ammunition Feeding Devices".

In the world of firearms we need to be clear about definitions, and industry standards to understand what we are talking about.

A **standard capacity magazine** generally means any detachable ammunition feeding device that is sold with and designed to operate in firearms as sold from the manufacturer. Many popular semi-automatic handguns and rifles are sold with magazines that have capacities of 15-30 rounds. Therefore, restrictions on magazine capacity create unnecessary burdens on responsible firearms owners who would then have to purchase additional equipment for their firearms to be legally operational.

A ten round magazine is a **reduced or low capacity**, these typically cost more than a standard magazine.

A **large capacity magazine** in a pistol is generally above 20 and in said rifle is 40+.

Banning magazines holding 10 or more rounds arbitrarily undermines Mainers' fundamental right to adequate self-defense, while ignoring practical realities and without meaningfully curbing crime; A study by RAND.org updated July Of 2024 shows inconclusive data on the effects of High capacity magazine bans reducing crimes, injuries or morbidities; as a result they do not support the policy as effective, esp when weighed against reducing a person's ability to defend oneself.

Expecting a person to modify an existing magazine holding more than 10 rounds to hold fewer is unreasonable, impractical, costly, and undermines the magazine's purpose. The only people who will comply are the law abiding gun owners who become disadvantaged as criminals won't bother with this as by definition they do not follow laws.

Magazine capacity restrictions arbitrarily limit how effectively a **LAWFUL** gun owning individual can defend themselves—10 rounds might not be enough especially against multiple attackers in an age of increased home invasions, and mass shootings, where seconds matter and reloading could mean the difference between life and death. Lets not forget that a 10 - 25 minute response time is more common than not, in much of Maine which is largely rural.

Banning magazines that hold sufficient ammunition meant to safely neutralize threats will penalize owners for using what's practical and widely available, by labeling them with an emotionally charged buzzword "high capacity".

I also am pointing out the inconsistency in arguing that citizens don't need the same tools that our local, county, and state police officers consider essential for their self-defense.

Police officers carry magazines with more than 10 rounds. If that capacity is necessary to ensure law enforcement's safety, why shouldn't I have the same capability for self-defense of myself and my family?

This current legislation also goes after all of the tube fed rimfire rifles many people use to teach gun safety to their children with, as they typically hold 15-20 rounds, in an attached tube, that is not easily modified without great expense or rendering the gun useless.

This legislation punishes law-abiding and responsible gun owners without addressing the **ROOT** causes of gun violence; people, mental health issues, and a weak court system.

When our police officers try to enforce laws by arresting offenders on violations, the offenders are released the same day, after posting a couple hundred dollars bail, are issued overly small sentences and have most of the charges thrown out. Our court system is a large part of the problem.

It's like slapping police officers in the face. Do you **REALLY** need to wonder **WHY** there's a shortage of officers?

Proper mental health care is grossly underfunded and could have stopped the worst of the issue that occurred here in Maine.

The Constitution's 2nd Amendment protects the right to bear arms, and while it doesn't specify magazine sizes, the principle is about allowing citizens to defend themselves effectively.

Lawmakers should prioritize focusing on enforcing existing laws against actual threats, not symbolic, ineffective restrictions that sound good but leave the vulnerable less safe in a knee jerk reaction to a tragedy.

The Second Amendment protects the individual's ability to bear arms for many reasons, among those for their own protection, a right affirmed by the Supreme Court in *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008).

While SCOTUS hasn't specifically addressed magazine capacity in handguns and rifles, I assure you it is coming in the near future, and while the few authoritarian states have enacted such bans many like Colorado have done so by leaving people with standard capacity not "10 rounds", others have grandfathered in magazines currently in ownership, like Connecticut.

I close with gratitude for your time listening and in hopes you'll do your sworn duty to protect law-abiding Maine peoples' right to protect themselves by Supporting the Maine and United States Constitutions and rejecting this legislation.

With no proven benefits, legislation arbitrarily limiting the capacity of magazines places an undue burden on law-abiding citizens. It requires responsible firearm owners to purchase additional and expensive equipment for their firearms to be operational and comply with legislation. Elected officials should vote ought not to pass, and move on with fixing some of the real issues

Sincerely,

Jeremy Burlingham

Jeremy Burlingham