



Submission cover sheet

Inquiry into Legislation on proposed firearms reform

Submission number: 044

Submitter: Name Withheld

Date authorised for publication: 1 April 2026

From:
To: [LA Committee - Legal](#)
Subject: Inquiry into Firearms (Public Safety) Amendment Bill 2026 - Submission
Date: Wednesday, 11 March 2026 8:11:52 PM

Caution: This email originated from outside of the ACT Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Request for Anonymity or Confidentiality - I request that my name, and email address be withheld from the publication of this submission. The publication of firearms license holder details present a risk for security/theft

Please find below my submission into the Inquiry into Firearms (Public Safety) Amendment Bill 2026

Q: The Firearms (Public Safety) Amendment Bill 2026 proposes to limit the number of firearms that can be possessed and used by individuals to 5, unless certain exceptions apply. Do you support this?

A: No. License holders must already prove genuine reason/genuine need for each firearm. There is no rationale or evidence to suggest these caps would accomplish any public benefit. And it would be a waste of tax payer money to direct it to this cause.

Q: The Firearms (Public Safety) Amendment Bill 2026 proposes changes to the categories of the types of firearms that can be possessed and used. Do you have any views on this?

A: I disagree with all re-categorizations, but in particular these points must be raised:

STRAIGHT PULL RIFLES

- Straight pull repeating action rifles should not be moved to higher categories. This is technology from the 1800's and does not pose any greater threat to public safety than any other action type. I am not aware of any Western country that restricts this action type. It defies common sense.
- Straight pull rimfire rifles are required for Olympic Biathlon shooting, please see the statement from Biathlon Australia here - <https://www.biathlonaustralia.com.au/news/urgent-save-biathlon-from-gun-law-changes>
- Straight pull centrefire rifles are common hunting and sporting firearms that have been legally owned in Australia for as long as firearms have been in the country. Many of these firearms are very expensive European made hunting rifles, the cost to buy them back at market value would be significant.

MAGAZINE CAPACITY RESTRICTIONS

- The proposed law makes no distinction between fixed tubular magazine fed and detachable magazine fed rifles. Nor does it make any distinction between centrefire and rimfire (low powered) ammunition in this regard.
- To my knowledge, every model of pump, lever, and bolt action rimfire rifle with a fixed tubular magazine has a capacity greater than 10 rounds (typically 12-15). Centrefire tubular magazine rifles are typically between 5 and 13 rounds.
- These firearms have been widespread in Australia since before federation and would cost a significant sum to buy back owing to the sheer volume owned and some of their collectable value.
- Tubular magazines are very slow and cumbersome to reload. Banning these firearms would affect a very large number of the shooting sports, including all “cowboy” and “lever action” events contested at National and World levels. These firearms are of the least “threatening” or “capable” category in terms of their capacity to cause harm in the wrong hands. Technology has eclipsed them over the hundreds of years since their invention.
- Perversely, if you choose to ban tubular fed rifles on the basis of capacity, it will encourage shooters to purchase detachable magazine fed rifles of the same action types, which allow for a higher sustained length of fire. I am not advocating for a restriction on either of these things (tubular versus detachable) but am merely pointing out this absurdity in the law as it stands.

Q: Do you support the Firearms (Public Safety) Amendment Bill 2026's creation of an offence of possessing digital blueprints for the computer-aided manufacture of firearms and firearm parts?

A: There should be allowances for licensed sports shooters to access these materials to maintain and modify their firearms where already allowed by law.

Q: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the Firearms (Public Safety) Amendment Bill?

I do not believe the bill is required. It will not accomplish any measurable public safety benefit, and will only serve to waste taxpayer money and punish law abiding citizens.

Q: Do you support the passage of the Firearms (Public Safety) Amendment Bill 2026 by the Assembly?

A: No