

Date: March 26, 2025

To: Honorable Members of the Judiciary Committee Members,

From: Jonathan Martell

My Name is Jonathan Martell, from Sanford.

I am a currently serving Sanford City Councilor, Lifetime member of the Gun Owners of Maine, Legislative Officer for the Sanford- Springvale Fish and Game Club, NRA Range Safety Officer, and lifelong firearms enthusiast.

Members of the committee, I would like to express my **Support** of:

LD 424 - An Act Concerning the Concealed Carrying of a Handgun by an Individual Who Is 18 Years of Age but Under 21 Years of Age

LD 829 - An Act to Standardize the Laws Regarding the Carrying of Concealed Handguns in State Parks

LD 998 - An Act Regarding an Employer's Authority to Prohibit an Employee from Storing a Firearm in the Employee's Vehicle

LD 1049 - An Act to Eliminate the Duty to Inform a Law Enforcement Officer When Carrying a Concealed Handgun Without a Permit

This update to the law would simply align it to the Maine Constitution in that anyone 18 or older is able to exercise their rights under Constitutional Carry which was enacted in 2015. If someone is considered legally an adult at 18, can vote and fight for their country, they should also have the right to defend themselves.

The remainder of these changes update the antiquated laws that referred to a now unnecessary Concealed Carry Permit. Constitutional Carry has been working well for the last decade, and it's time these were updated.

Please vote Ought to Pass, and thank you for your time.

Members of the committee, I would like to express my **Opposition** to:

LD 677 - An Act to Update the Statutory Definition of "Machine Gun" and Prohibit Possession of a Rapid-fire Device

LD 953 - An Act to Change the Definition of "Machine Gun" in the Maine Criminal Code

This bill is another round of the same bills introduced over the last few years that failed.

LD 976 An Act To Amend the Definition of Machine Gun To Include Bump Stock Devices-2021

LD 1340 An Act to Prohibit the Sale or Possession of Rapid-fire Modification Devices-2023

Machine Gun and Rapid Fire:

None of these devices make a firearm fire faster, nor do they make it fire fully automatic. Fully automatic firearms are already controlled under the National Firearms Act, and have been illegal to make for individuals ownership since 1986, pursuant to 18 U.S. Code §922 (o).

Anything firing 2 or more rounds with a single trigger pull is already defined as a machine gun under 26 U.S. Code §5845 (b), with imports illegal since 1968 and domestic production halted in 1986.

The devices mentioned still only fire one round with one activation of the trigger. Bump firing is nothing more than rapid activation of the trigger and can be done with only a trigger finger. No other devices are necessary. Binary Triggers and crank devices have been approved by the ATF and per ATF, only fire with one shot with each action of the trigger.

Rapid-fire modification device attempts to lump multiple items together. This is wrong as the cyclic rate of fire is determined by physics of the firing mechanism, gas system, bolt design, cartridge pressure and other factors. It is explicitly how fast the action can cycle, and does not reflect how fast someone can pull a trigger. Simply replacing a factory spring with another factory spring can affect the cyclic rate.

Machine Gun Definition:

The current definition of a "Machine Gun" closely aligns with the federal definition and for good reason.

The phrases "designed to shoot" or "readily restored" is not clearly defined, and a fully equipped machine shop could manufacture a fully automatic firearm in some amount of time. So could a home shop given enough time and tooling. Regardless, the end result still meets the federal definition of a Machine Gun.

A. The definition of receiver is incorrect as it identifies the internal mechanism as the receiver. A frame and receiver are typically used interchangeably.

B and C. Conversion devices are federally illegal already. Some examples would be Drop-In Auto Sears or Glock Switches.

This bill appears to be an attempt to call semiautomatic firearms machine guns, and as well as any parts that could potentially be used with or without modification.

Let's stick with actual definitions as codified in federal law. These attempts at bans merely serve to provide inconsistencies in the law, which can lead leads to loopholes. This issue has been resolved at the federal level since 1986 when the quantity of legal machine guns was capped, there is no value to change the rules at this point.

Please see previously submitted longer testimony for these bills as the 2-3 minute limit is difficult to meet without severely limiting the information discussed.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Martell

Sanford, ME