

Fred Nieman
Portland
LD 1109

This proposed bill is not only an affront to the people's of Maine's constitutional rights, but also an ineffective and negligently costly measure to try and lessen gun violence. Any way you look at it, this bill is wrong.

Firstly, limiting magazines with the capacity over 10 rounds is detrimental to the second amendment, magazines being an indispensable item to the "arms" that "shall not be infringed" upon, especially 10+ round magazines for the explicit purpose of the 2nd amendment ("the security of a free state" via an armed populace that can stand up to a tyrannical government). This right is not antiquated, is not ineffective, and is ever relevant at any point in time that there exists the potential in man's heart for tyranny (which is unfortunately an essential human attribute). Thus, to limit the people's magazine capacity for the defense of the state/principles of this country against a more powerful Federal Government is akin to standing on the side of tyranny. This is not to mention the limiting of the people's magazine capacity in the defense of themselves, which is even a more strongly rooted natural right.

Secondly, magazine capacity bans/limitations are ineffective and subsequently costly for little reward. For more than 100 years magazines with the ability to take more than 10 rounds have been available, and as time moves on are readily available and ever common. By the time of the 1994 AWB which banned newly manufactured 'high cap mags' (which I will point out, had a grandfather clause unlike LD 1109, thus depriving the people of property legally and legitimately acquired retroactively) they were so common that most gun owners were easily able to obtain them and most criminals could as well (firearms using 'high cap mags' were used in some of the most notorious crimes during the AWB 94-04 ban, notably Columbine, D.C Sniping's, Ft. Worth Church shooting, Wakefield massacre, etc).

This ability to acquire 10+ capacity magazines has been exacerbated with the advent of 3d printing technologies. One can simply print a box and buy a spring and assemble a 30+ round mag easily (and trying to regulate 3D printing such material that is even more ludicrous as files to print such items are protected by the first amendment as well as the ability to print via a 3d printer). With such an easy and cheap way to manufacture 10+ round mags, it would make the proposed ban moot for those the legislature fears will obtain them (criminals) while punishing/turning law abiding citizens into criminals themselves. Thus any measure used to enforce LD 1109 would be money going out for zero effectiveness. This doesn't mention the ability of maine residents to go over the border to NH and achieve whatever magazines they desire as magazines are not federally regulated and NH shan't be regulating them either.

Thirdly, the amount of crime in Maine that uses 10+ round mags in any meaningful negatively effective way is one of the lowest in the country, as Maine has some of the lowest violent crime/murder rates in the US. Aberrations do occur (Lewiston), but they are the exception to the rule and as previously explained would not be deterred in any way with such a law as proposed by LD 1109 (a case proving such is the Nova Scotia massacre where Wortman obtained most of his weapons illegally from Maine and exported them to the massively restrictive country of Canada. Such an act would be as easy to do after LD 1109 for someone wishing to commit such an act in Maine).

Maine should not adopt LD 1109, as it is unconstitutional (would likely be found so after exhaustive legal battle costing Maine taxpayer money, if not by the numerous other court cases across the country challenging 'high cap mag bans') but also ineffective and costly in trying to enforce with little returns.