

A ban on high capacity magazines may be easier to achieve through a compromise.

I propose that the cutoff be raised at least to 16 rounds.

For the past several decades many makes and models of guns have come with a standard 15 round magazine. Millions of people, thousands in Connecticut, bought these legally with no evil intention and no desire for a high capacity; it was just what came with the gun. Higher capacity, such as 30 were available for several models but the normal magazine that came with the gun was 15.

Raising the cutoff would create less opposition to the idea of a magazine ban by allowing a lot of honest citizens to keep what they legally own. Proposals to make magazines that hold 11 or more rounds illegal create opponents out of reasonable people who may not really have felt strongly about the issue but do not want what they paid for taken away, especially without compensation. I haven't heard any proposals about the government paying for them.

Somewhere along the line someone decided that the cutoff point should be 11 and any magazine with a capacity over 10 rounds should be banned. I have no idea how this number was decided. When the first M-16's came out, troops complained about their "low capacity" magazines. Those "low capacity" mags held 20 rounds and were soon replaced by 30 rounders.

It seems that these 30+ magazines are the ones preferred by those who would commit mass shootings. It would take 7 fifteen round magazines to fire 100 bullets.

Some people will still oppose the idea and will fight any ban. Others will want it lower. I heard a legislator call for a ban on any capacity over 1.

A magazine costs about \$ 30 and most gun owners have at least 2 per gun. A cutoff at 11 will create a windfall for gun makers and an undue expense to gun owners who will need to replace millions of magazines they would no longer be legally allowed to have.

William Erickson  
South Windsor, CT