



Submission cover sheet

Inquiry into Legislation on proposed firearms reform

Submission number: 029

Submitter: Name Withheld

Date authorised for publication: 11 March 2026

From:
To: [LA Committee - Legal](#)
Subject: Inquiry into Firearms (Public Safety) Amendment Bill 2026 - Submission
Date: Wednesday, 4 March 2026 5:43:18 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.

Dear Committee Members

I have a number of comments and objections to the above Amendment Bill for your consideration.

1. Limit the number of firearms that can be possessed and used by individuals to 5, unless certain exceptions apply.

I do not support this. I am 70 years old and have used firearms from the age of 14. After almost a lifetime of experience with firearms, I currently own more than five firearms. Some of my firearms I have owned for more than forty years, one of my firearms is 118 years old and probably carried by an Australian soldier in WW1 - I will be very upset if these firearms are confiscated then meaninglessly destroyed on the pretext that this will make us safe from a repeat of the terror attack at Bondi - there is no such linkage.

Why are there different caps for Target shooters (10) and Hunters (5)?

Both these numbers are purely arbitrary, and dividing firearm owners in this way is unfair. This difference implies that one type of owner is a better, more trustworthy citizen - I always thought that as Australians we were all treated equally.

The arbitrary numbers of the proposed caps are not logical. In the proposed Bill a firearm owner can own 'x' number of firearms ($x = 10$ for a Class 1 Australian, $x = 5$ for a Class 2 Australian), the Bill implies that when limited to these numbers firearm owners are apparently considered responsible, trustworthy. However should 'x' increase to 'x+1', or more, a firearm owner then becomes untrustworthy, unstable - not just illogical it is silly.

The *EXPLANATORY STATEMENT and HUMAN RIGHTS COMPATIBILITY STATEMENT (Human Rights Act 2004, s 37)*, written to assist with the understanding of the proposed Bill, twists itself in knots to justify restricting the number of firearms that can be owned by individuals with statements such as: *By imposing numerical caps on the number of firearms an individual can possess or use, the Bill reduces the proliferation of firearms in the community and lowers the risk that firearms are stolen or misused by dangerous individuals - ie. security, theft issues.*

So, let's analyze the above statement, if thieves break into my house and if they are able to break into my Gun-safe they may then notice that my firearms are not fitted with critical functional components; these are secured separately. If they are then

able to break open that secure lockup and if they are terrorists/violent criminals, they may go on to commit violent crime if not apprehended beforehand by the police. There are a lot of 'ifs' in this event chain, justification based on speculation stacking is at best tenuous.

I object to the potential confiscation of my private property and would be very unhappy with an arbitrary restriction of the number of firearms I can own .

2. The bill proposes changes to the categories of the types of firearms that can be possessed and used.

One of the categories 'straight-pull bolt actions' have been around since about 1889, and some are used today for hunting and at rifle ranges. It seems that some Gun Control advocates are obsessed with the term 'rapid fire' and in experienced hands these rifles can be cycled quite quickly but not at the same rate as a self-loading rifle. Banning 'straight-pull bolt action' rifles is not going to solve any future terrorist attack as types of firearms are not the core reason behind terrorist attacks. And nor are jet airliners, bombs, large vehicles, knives etc. the core reason is crazy, violent people.

I object to banning 'straight-pull bolt actions' rifles, it will not make us safer.

(3) Proposed prohibition on belt-fed firearms.

Belt-fed firearms are military machine-guns; these have never been legal for civilian ownership in Australia. The clause is superfluous.

(4) Possession of digital blueprints for the computer-aided manufacture (CAM) of firearms and firearm parts.

I do not disagree with the illegality of the unauthorized making of CAM/3d printed guns. However I am concerned that merely possessing what is essentially just documentation that someone would be treated this way. Possession of documentation or information does not imply, and must never be misused as proof, of intent.

The term 'firearm parts', as used in the Bill, is far too broad and what parts that illegal need to be properly and sensibly defined.

At the most basic a firearm is simply a tube open at one end, closed at the other.

High pressure gas is introduced at the closed end behind a projectile, causing it to be ejected at high velocity.

It is the components that contain pressure that should be proscribed; all other parts (stocks, grips, sights, trigger, magazines, screws etc.) are simply ancillary.

Manufacture by CAM/3D of these ancillary parts should not be illegal.

Computer aided manufacture can be used to produce replacement parts for legal firearms, examples:

- a replacement rifle stock, or pistol handgrip, could be made from plastic.
- springs and screws lose tension or wear out, OEM replacements may not be available as spare parts.
- a custom gun sight to better suit failing eyesight, or a safety catch lever made for large/small hands

These are non-pressure parts and making them using CAM, or even possession of the digital manufacturing files, would be illegal under the proposed Bill.

Only firearm parts that contain pressure need to be proscribed.

(5) User registration

If I was to use a firearm belonging to another individual under existing ACT Firearm Law I must apply to be a *registered user* of that firearm. Under the proposed Bill, if I have reached my firearm cap I will not be given permission to use any other firearm. Why?

User Registration does not make sense - it is bureaucracy gone mad - it does not contribute to safety and seems rather petty. I request that the ACT Government attempt to justify this requirement with fact, not speculation. Otherwise User Registration should be removed from the legislation.

(6) Appeal

If this Bill is passed, will I, and others, have recourse to ACAT if I feel that I have been unduly affected. Or are we to lose that bit of natural justice?

(7) Final Comments

It is relatively easy for Governments to tinker with firearm laws, but is nothing but a cop-out when looking at the core reason behind the terror at Bondi so that action is taken to ensure it is never repeated.

It must be stated clearly, bluntly, that the tragedy on the evening of 14th December on Bondi Beach was because of Islamic hate.

For more than two years Albanese's Federal Government and Minn's State Government failed to reign-in Islamic hatred that boiled-over, in Australia, after the terrible 7th October massacre in Israel. What followed was assault, intimidation, fire-bombings, violent protests, display of the flags of terrorist organizations, the Albanese Government not only failed to act, but much of their actions, policies and language just poured fuel on the fire. The tragedy on Bondi Beach is the culmination of a failure to act to an obvious upsurge in cultural violence, it had nothing with firearm law.

And if our government - Federal, State and Territory - refuse to acknowledge this hate and fail to take appropriate action this terror will revisit us.

No, I do not support the passage of the bill by the Assembly.

I request that my name not be published with my submission because I have indicated that I am a firearm owner, and for home security, do not wish that this be public knowledge.

I understand that I cannot share my submission until the Committee publishes it.

Yours Sincerely,