



JAKE MCGUIGAN

Managing Director, Gov't Relations - State Affairs

jmcguigan@nssf.org | 203-426-1320 x238 | nssf.org

400 N. Capitol Street NW, Suite 475, Washington, D.C. 20001

FROM Dan Riley

March 26, 2025

Position: Opposed

Chair Anne Carney
Chair Amy Kuhn
Committee on Judiciary
State House, Room 438
Augusta, ME 04333

Re: LD 1109 An Act to Reduce Gun Violence Casualties in Maine by Prohibiting the Possession of Large-Capacity Ammunition Feeding Devices

Dear Chairs Carney and Kuhn and Members of the Judiciary Committee:

The National Shooting Sports Foundation ("NSSF") is the trade association for America's firearms, ammunition, hunting and recreational shooting sports industry. Its mission is to promote, protect and preserve hunting and the shooting sports. NSSF has a membership of more than 10,000 manufacturers, distributors, firearms retailers, shooting ranges, and sportsmen's organizations. Our manufacturer members make the firearms used by law-abiding Maine sportsmen, the U.S. military and law enforcement agencies throughout the state. This is to notify you of our strong opposition to LD 1109.

This legislation seeks to ban the retail sale, manufacture and possession of "high capacity" magazines which is defined in the bill as greater than 10 rounds. Maine legislators have decided that anything over 10 rounds is too high and thus any law-abiding citizen in possession of a larger magazine will be involved in criminal acts. What exactly is the basis for the arbitrary standard of no more than 10 round magazines? Magazines come in many different capacities and serve many different purposes, such as home defense, collecting, and participation in the shooting sports. To ask the question whether one magazine is more legitimate than another is to miss the point concerning legal vs. irrational criminal activity.

In this rising crime wave that the state is experiencing, do we really think that police departments have the resources to enforce a magazine ban? Law enforcement organizations are feeling the pressure and would much rather focus their attention on proven crime fighting efforts as opposed to whether a law-abiding citizen possesses a 10 round or 20 round magazine. Will additional personnel be required for the enforcement of 10 round magazines?

Unfortunately, the authors of this bill are not aware of the wide-ranging implications and impacts of the legislation on law-abiding gun-owners. There are many firearms, both historical and current that do not have 10 round magazines available for them. Modifying a magazine over ten rounds would decrease the value of many historical guns while there is an exemption to curio and relic firearms that only covers a very small number of firearms. This means the legislation will immediately make some very valuable firearms unable to function or worse could leave an individual unable to defend himself or herself.

The state only needs to look to other northeastern states where they were able to implement legislation that included a ridiculous registration scheme. While this bill does not offer that option you can either modify the magazine or turn it in. There are legal cases pending in other states that still do not have a definitive answer.

California is currently fighting a lawsuit challenging the taking of magazines over 10 rounds. This bill would also ban the manufacture of magazines from federally licensed companies which would of course have a detrimental effect on state taxes and jobs.

Instead of wasting state resources on legislation that will only make legislators feel like they did something, how about making sure the necessary checks and balances are in place to deal with all the warning signs present in many of these perpetrators.

The systematic failure of state and federal government to "keep us safe" continues to be the common theme in these horrific tragedies. All the warning signs are there and yet they go ignored by the officials. NSSF joins others in calling for a comprehensive approach that addresses many complex social issues, including school safety, preventing unauthorized firearms access, mental health, personal privacy, the popular media, and enforcing our existing laws while safeguarding constitutional rights.

One only needs to look as far back as the 1994 "Assault Weapons" Ban to find legislation which did little to increase public safety. One of the sections of this law was halting the production of "high capacity" magazines. This gun control strategy soon proved to be a failure. A comprehensive study by the Centers for Disease Control looked at the full panoply of gun control measures, including this proposed magazine ban, and concluded that none could be proven to reduce crime. Another study, commissioned by Congress, found that bans were not effective since "the banned weapons and magazines were never used in more than a modest fraction of all gun murders." These studies only demonstrate a ban that did not work or increase public safety.

The problem, of course, with such laws is that criminals routinely ignore them (after all, they are criminals). Law-abiding citizens who have every right to purchase and own firearms are the ones who are suffering by eliminating aspects of their activities with this type of law. Many law enforcement individuals are in agreement when questioned on the necessity of more gun control laws. Their sentiments focus on the fact that we currently have enough laws and that these laws just need to be strictly enforced.

We must all work together to help prevent those who exhibit reckless disregard for human life and values access to firearms for criminal purposes. But we must also preserve the constitutional rights of tens of millions of law-abiding Americans to safely and responsibly own, store and use firearms for personal protection, hunting and recreation.

America's firearms industry welcomes the opportunity to be a part of a respectful and constructive dialogue on this important topic and urge you to oppose LD 1109.

Sincerely,



Jake McGuigan
Managing Director State Affairs