


Fighting Antisemitism and Keeping Guns out of the Hands of Terrorists and Criminals Amendment Bill 2026

Submission No: 269
Submission By: 
Publication: Making the submission public but withholding your name

Gun Reform Queensland

I am a commercial lawyer in Brisbane's CBD, I own rural hobby farms in Queensland and NSW (in the New England). I am also a law-abiding firearms owner that may be affected adversely by the reforms both federally and in NSW and any reforms in Queensland that go beyond the current bill.

Summary

I support the reforms in the current Queensland Bill so far as they relate to the tightening of weapons control to target criminals.

I would not support any further amendments beyond those announced by the joint statement on 9 February of the Premier and Police Minister (and in the current bill).

My reasons for not supporting gun reforms legislated in Federal Parliament, NSW, and WA are set out below and my 2 separate submission documents.

Overview of Concerns with Reforms Federally and in NSW and WA (and possibly other States)

In particular in relation to NSW and the Federal legislation (and this is relevant to what is being proposed in Queensland): I do not support any proposed reforms that fail to address the real drivers of violence and extremism and reforms that will impact in a most serious way on gun owners and others without achieving the desired aims.

Extracted below are some details of issues surrounding the proposed reforms. These come from a retail gun business in the industry in NSW. I endorse these views and add that these reforms will impact not just NSW but possibly Qld and all of Australia in a way that is counterproductive and very damaging to the economy.

Also **attached** are submissions I made when Western Australia sought to introduce similar changes (and did so. Those submissions are very pertinent to the reforms to NSW laws foreshadowed.

Issues include:

1. **Diversion From the Real Problem**

Gun reform does nothing to address the national surge in antisemitism, radicalisation and extremist ideology.

2. **Capacity Limits**

Proposed firearm capacity limits fundamentally misunderstand both firearm use and public safety. [I refer to my NSW detailed submissions.]

If the objective is public safety, the focus must be on preventing terrorists and criminals from accessing firearms at all, not on restricting the lawful tools of compliant citizens.

3. **Compensation and Buy-Back Costs**

Any reform that renders lawfully owned firearms unlawful will require fair and lawful compensation. This obligation does not stop at the firearm itself.

A mandatory buy-back would also require compensation for:

- *Firearms*
- *Magazines and other regulated ancillaries*
- *Optics and sighting systems*
- *Ammunition rendered unusable or unlawful*
- *Dealer stock held in good faith under existing law*

Beyond compensation to owners and businesses, there are significant administrative and enforcement costs. These include valuation, processing, storage, transport, destruction, compliance oversight and additional policing resources required to implement the scheme.

Past buy-back programs demonstrate that these costs escalate rapidly and run into the billions of dollars once fully accounted for. At a time of significant cost-of-living pressure and strained public finances, it is reasonable to ask who will pay for this.

Will taxpayers fund another multi-billion-dollar program that targets compliant citizens, or will lawful firearm owners and small businesses be expected to absorb the losses?

If existing laws were not properly enforced, shifting the financial burden onto law-abiding Australians is neither fair nor responsible. Public money should be directed toward addressing extremism, radicalisation and community safety, not compensating for rushed and avoidable legislative overreach.

Australia already has some of the toughest firearm laws in the world. If existing systems failed, they should be properly reviewed and fixed. Rushed legislation will not deliver safer outcomes.

I urge you to oppose reforms that punish lawful citizens and instead focus on evidence-based solutions that genuinely improve public safety.

Hate Speech Reforms

I do not address the other reforms (hate speech etc) other than to say I do have concerns that there may be an erosion of free speech by what is proposed. I have not had time to review those proposed reforms. I will leave it to others to comment – other than to say my Fed Subs touch on this issue.

Submissions to Representatives in Parliament.

The light of liberty is dimming and flickering. We are entering a very unsettled period in human history, and Australia is not immune. Our freedoms are slowly diminishing and being threatened on a daily basis, not only on a global level, but national and state levels. The shadow of evil is reaching out.

Now, you might think that that is somewhat alarmist, but in my lifetime, which is nearly 60 years, I have seen an erosion of freedoms in this country, and recently the rate of erosion has become alarming.

An example of this in the bill is the retrospective application. This is unacceptable.

Good government and good laws for the people.

Our Constitution specifically states in clause 51 that:

"The Parliament shall, subject to this constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth, with respect to:"
and then the clause sets out a number of heads of power.

The federal government has no power to legislate in relation to firearms and a compulsory buyback. That is clear not only from the Constitution, but also from the National Firearms Agreement between it and the states (copy attached). I say more about this shortly.

It seems that both state and federal governments have forgotten what "good government" means.

The Federal government

According to The Ombudsman for the Commonwealth government, good governance has 8 major characteristic principles:

It is participatory, consensus orientated, accountable, transparent, responsive, Effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and follows the rule of law.

So why are these new laws being:

1. Rushed now that a Royal Commission (RC) is to be conducted?
2. Introduced when we don't have the outcomes and recommendations of a RC?
3. Introduced as what is in essence a cognate bill when it should be two or more bills?
4. Introduced without proper consultation with the public and key stakeholders ?(and this is a big one especially for the firearm industries and gun owners whose expectations for nearly 3 decades have been set by the NFA until recently).In essence WA, NSW and now the Federal government have "broken the NFA deal".
5. Referred to a Parliamentary committee with submissions allowed for just 2 days?
6. Introduced without empirical evidence the changes are needed, and
7. Introduced without detail and without working through the potential consequences.

The perceived urgency is simply not there.

Importantly, the words "*power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government*" have been interpreted by at least some of the courts as imposing a general limitation on the legislature's power to enact legislation, which interferes with fundamental democratic rights. Legislation, which is manifestly arbitrary and unjust, would be limited by such words. For example, laws imposing arbitrary restrictions or penalties on persons because of their membership of certain groups, would fall within this scope of restriction.

in relation to the West Australian government and its legislation changes to the gun regime in that state and separately the recent cognate bill introduced just before Christmas last year by the New South Wales government.

The States and Territories Governments

The legislatures in each of the different states and territories in Australia have their own constitutional and legislative sources for their powers. I only deal with New South Wales, Western Australia, and Queensland at this stage. Those states have similar constitutions so far as that they each have a power to make laws for the peace welfare and good government of the state.

Therefore, they are all subject to similar considerations, as for the federal government in terms of good government.

The subject of firearms laws for each state is therefore a residuary power of each of those state legislatures.

In 1996 all of the governments entered, as mentioned above, into a national firearms agreement (**NFA**).

Given the shortness of time, I have had the balance of this submission only deals with the changes to the gun laws and only in a generic way. I also hold grave concerns about the hate laws component of the bill but have not had time to form any views yet. I hope to soon.

The NFA

The latest version of the NFA dates from 2017.

Clause 2 of the NFA.

The NFA sets out minimum requirements in relation to the regulation of firearms such that other restrictions could also be imposed by states or territories on a state or territory basis.

There is no requirement for any state or territory to comply with anything other than the minimum requirements if it chooses to do so. In other words, there is no requirement for example, on Queensland to follow suit with the further restrictions imposed by New South Wales or Western Australia.

Clause 4 of the NFA.

Clause 4 then sets out how the NFA is to be updated and how that would take place. It also states what the fundamental aspects were (in 1996) and those that needed to be regarded moving forward when considering any changes. And I quote:

"... issues for consideration will be those which ensure, that the agreement remains, true to its fundamental aspects, being:

- the requirement for a genuine reason for possessing or using a firearm,
- the appropriate categorisation of firearms,
- the registration of firearms,
- Firearms licensing, including fit and proper person requirements,
- the requirements for a permit to require each firearm,
- the safe and secure storage of firearms,
- the recording of firearms, sales, and suitable firearms,... transactions,... practises, "

Nowhere in there or elsewhere in the NFA was it ever envisaged that there would be a limit on the number of firearms an individual could hold and acquire. And for good reason – an arbitrary limit is devoid of reality and practicality and shows no understanding of

And the above are very important because the NFA has set the expectations of everyone who is affected by the NFA for nearly 30 years. Now the Federal government and recently NSW and WA have decided to make changes without real consultation and without empirical evidence to show why the changes are necessary and will have the desired impact.

The NFA has been developed and implemented and fine-tuned over 3 decades. Industry has been built around the framework in the NFA, livelihoods have been shaped by what is in the NFA, as has the vast majority ports and pastimes involving firearms in this country. For the governments, particularly WA, NSW, and now the Federal government to ignore those stakeholders and not properly consult is a breach of trust by those governments. And as some commentators have said, it's a betrayal of the lawful firearm owners in this country.

Recently on the news (example Channel 7) , gun store owners in NSW are saying their sales have "fallen off a cliff" ,they've been left with large amount of stock and many cancellations, and they may not survive (as a direct result of the Minn's legislation introduced just before Christmas). 500 businesses in NSW are now at risk.

And there has been no empirical evidence given as to why that framework (NFA) is inadequate or requires the changes that have been made both in Western Australia and New South Wales. And I'll say more about this shortly.

IT'S NOT ABOUT THE GUNS

A number of prominent speakers in recent times have come out and made it very clear that their own view is it's not about the guns.

Those Speakers include David Littleproud, Dawn Fraser, John Howard, Pauline Hansen, Mark Latham, and a number of speakers in the Parliament in New South Wales.

And yes while there are more guns in the community since the 1996 buy back here has also been a substantial increase in the population (18.5 m to 27.6m) and the rate of private gun ownership per capita remains lower than before the Port Arthur massacre in 1996.

COST OF COMPENSATION

It is likely that the cost of what the federal government has termed a buyback, (which is in effect, a compulsory acquisition by the government), will have a huge cost for little tangible benefit.

It is the legitimate owners and the industries that will bear the cost.

It is also likely, given the WA experience, that compensation will not be adequate. There is at least one example of a firearms owner in WA who has been offered \$250 for an air gun that's worth \$10,000. And this is just the tip of the iceberg.

Compensation certainly won't be adequate unless it is in these terms:

For the individual,

Recompense for the individual needs to extend these things (and I very much doubt the governments will do this):

- gun and costs and time and effort of acquisition (including PTA cost, freight, taxes, customs if applicable),
- scope (if applicable),
- accessories,
- ammunition,
- storage containers,
- sighting in costs ,
- repair and modification costs when previously made,
- loss of heirlooms, and pieces that have emotional attachment to people. One example I saw on facebook was a man in his 50s was given a gun by his dad when he was a 13 year old and he is very concerned about the loss of that weapon, even though he doesn't use it, as has a lot of emotional attachment for him, and
- other unknown costs.

For business owners.

In New South Wales, there is already a real prospect of upwards of 500 gun shop owners, going to the wall. How will they be compensated??

There is clearly going to be a flooding of the market and a depression of the value of not only firearms, but all the other things that were associated with those.

There'll be big decreases in sales of all sorts of things. A loss of volume of sales of items also means a loss of range of goods and services in the future, for law abiding firearm owners.

Other Consequences

For some, there will also be the loss of the ability to do their sport, their pastime and for others, unnecessary restrictions on activities, including business.

For government agencies,

There will be a large increase in resources needed in terms of costs and man, power, to administer the scheme and the aftermath.

This comes at a time when departments currently are not coping with their current workloads for the laws and regulations relating to firearms. And this is borne out by the slow pace of putting in place national firearms registry information.

It will direct government agencies attention away from their current progress of the national register and resources.

It will divert attention from the real issues.

Agencies will also be saddled with resentment and distrust from lawful gun owners.

LFOs and mental health issues.

What hasn't been widely discussed in the press is the impact this will have on lawful firearms owners (**LFOs**)(including farmers) is mental health issues. Australia has some of the toughest gun laws in the world.

For many LFOs, 4 , 5 or 10 is not enough

In fact, any number is arbitrary, and it comes down to each and every person, and their activities. This is something that seems to have been completely ignored and discounted in WA but especially in NSW.

Please see attached submissions I made to WA when they foreshadowed their gun law changes (as to why an arbitrary limit is not fair etc).

The W.A. Example ("Cook government")

From what I have seen, in terms of speeches in the W.A. Legislative Assembly and Parliament, and from press, is that the laws there were introduced :

- with little proper consultation,
- poor communication,
- rushed drafting, and
- widespread confusion.

In addition, the mental health of licensed firearm owners has become an issue.

According to at least one WA MP "there seems to be a conflation of public safety and lawful firearm gun ownership, which is unjustified, and for which there's been no evidence, no real hard evidence.

Politicians in WA, particularly the nationals, have indicated not only all of the above, but that it has resulted in a sacrificing of the goodwill of the community. And there has been a disregard for those most affected.

The NSW ("Minn's Government")

I implore you to obtain and read the Hansard for the 2 sitting days before Christmas in the NSW Parliament. I sat through most of it, and there were some excellent speeches. <https://api.parliament.nsw.gov.au/api/hansard/search/daily/pdf/HANSARD-1323879322-160910> and <https://api.parliament.nsw.gov.au/api/hansard/search/daily/pdf/HANSARD-1820781676-102599>

And It appeared to me, in summary, that this cognate bill that was introduced was a result of a knee jerk reaction, political grandstanding, , no consultation with the affected gun industries and firearms owners and others, no evidence of any correlation between the new laws and their impact.

I emailed all the NSW parliamentary representatives on 18 December 2025. Below is an extract from that email:

Dear Sirs/Mesdames,

I am a lawyer with nearly 36 years in practice, a farm owner in NSW, and a licensed, law-abiding firearm owner.

I express my most serious concern about the proposed NSW firearm reform legislation.

I do not support any proposed reforms that fail to address the real drivers of violence and extremism and reforms that will impact in a most serious way on gun owners and others without achieving the desired aims.

Extracted below are some details of issues surrounding the proposed reforms. These come from a retail gun business in the industry in NSW. I endorse these views and add that these reforms will impact not just NSW but Qld and all of Australia in a way that is counter productive and very damaging to the economy.

Attached are submissions I made when Western Australia sought to introduce similar changes. Those submissions are very pertinent to the reforms to NSW laws foreshadowed.

Issues include:

1. Diversion From the Real Problem

Gun reform does nothing to address the national surge in antisemitism, radicalisation and extremist ideology.

2. Capacity Limits

Proposed firearm capacity limits fundamentally misunderstand both firearm use and public safety.[I refer to my attached detailed submissions.]

If the objective is public safety, the focus must be on preventing terrorists and criminals from accessing firearms at all, not on restricting the lawful tools of compliant citizens.

3. Compensation and Buy-Back Costs

Any reform that renders lawfully owned firearms unlawful will require fair and lawful compensation. This obligation does not stop at the firearm itself.

A mandatory buy-back would also require compensation for:

- *Firearms*
- *Magazines and other regulated ancillaries*
- *Optics and sighting systems*
- *Ammunition rendered unusable or unlawful*
- *Dealer stock held in good faith under existing law*

Beyond compensation to owners and businesses, there are significant administrative and enforcement costs. These include valuation, processing, storage, transport, destruction, compliance oversight and additional policing resources required to implement the scheme.

Past buy-back programs demonstrate that these costs escalate rapidly and run into the billions of dollars once fully accounted for. At a time of significant cost-of-living pressure and strained public finances, it is reasonable to ask who will pay for this.

Will taxpayers fund another multi-billion-dollar program that targets compliant citizens, or will lawful firearm owners and small businesses be expected to absorb the losses?

If existing laws were not properly enforced, shifting the financial burden onto law-abiding Australians is neither fair nor responsible. Public money should be directed toward addressing extremism, radicalisation and community safety, not compensating for rushed and avoidable legislative overreach. Australia already has some of the toughest firearm laws in the world. If existing systems failed, they should be properly reviewed and fixed. Rushed legislation will not deliver safer outcomes.

I urge you to oppose reforms that punish lawful citizens and instead focus on evidence-based solutions that genuinely improve public safety.

In essence the NSW laws are bad laws for many reasons.

My Situation

I give a personal example showing that for me, 10 firearms will not be enough. Hopefully this will give you greater insight into things as there seems to be a lack of understanding in the broader community. And I will have to give up part of my sports and pastimes.

Pest Management

I own 2 rural properties (hobby farms), one in Queensland and one in New South Wales.

For pest management on those properties (where I have rabbits, foxes, cats, dogs, pigs and the occasional deer) I need a variety of rifles:

- For rabbits I use these calibres : .17, .204,.22, and .22 WMR. I also like utilising air guns, to reduce noise where possible.
- For cats and foxes, I use a .22/250, .222 or .223.
- For dogs, same as for foxes and cats,
- for pigs, different types of .243, and a shotgun where it's close quarters

Game Hunting

For game hunting, for deer, I use 7 x57 or .308 calibres. For goats .243.

Target Shooting,

I use a number of different guns. And these are not the same as those used for pest management and hunting because of the differences in setup and weights for the rifles and the way the rifles perform.

For target hunting, I have a .22, .243, a Creedmore 6.5, and also guns for shooting in Clays (Shotgun) and separately the military club.

For clays and shotgun, these rifles are again different to the shotguns used for pest management and game hunting. They have to be.

I also have military weapons, including 7 mm Mauser with open sights and a Martini cadet, both guns having military history and significance.

Heirloom guns from my father, and his father- these are rifles with emotional and heritage significance, including a shotgun and a . 22.

Finally I have collector pieces, including boat tail Ruger rifles, which are also used as part of my other activities (mainly pest management). I also have a British .303 from the Second World War.

In essence, if you count up the number of guns, that's well in excess of 10. But they all have different uses and significance to me.

A good analogy as to why someone might need so many guns, is not only as I've demonstrated above, but golf clubs - do you play golf with 4 clubs? No.

The same goes with many things we do in life - tennis rackets, Cricket bats, fishing rods, and on the list goes.

Many people have many more than just a few of these objects. To impose arbitrary numbers on people means that you will be restricting their ability to carry out activities that they've been carried out, often for generations like myself. Both my father and his father and his father, all had guns and all carried out different activities with those.

Problems with proposals and changes to the gun laws in Australia.

Similarly, no studies that I am aware of provide empirical evidence that reducing the number of firearms that a person can hold, has any effect on the perpetration of crime, particularly hate crime. They have been bald claims from a number of commentators, but I've not seen any substance or evidence.

The new laws don't pass the pub test. Even if you banned all guns, you are not going to stop the illegal use or supply of rifles. And in fact, many of the "baddies" are producing 3D printed guns and rifles.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject: Submissions on Proposed Gun Laws in Western Australia

I am writing to submit my concerns regarding the proposed new gun laws in Western Australia.

I am a dedicated shooter who engages in hunting and target shooting.

I want to talk about the dedicated shooter who requires a variety of calibre rifles for these activities and seeks to demonstrate that imposing a cap of 5 guns is not justifiable and would unduly restrict his/her lawful and responsible practices.

- **1. Necessity for Different Calibres and Firearm Configurations:**

Any shooter who is deeply engaged in shooting activities will encompass a wide range of disciplines.

Each of these disciplines demands the use of specific calibre rifles and firearm configurations, depending on the terrain and nature of the hunt. The same applies to the competitive shooter.

A limitation to just five firearms would unduly hinder the shooter's ability to participate effectively.

- **a. Hunting Practices:**

- **· Game Size and Behaviour:**

- i. The size and behaviour of the game also play a pivotal role. A larger, slower-moving animal will require a different rifle and scope configuration compared to a smaller, more elusive target. Owning firearms of the same calibre but with varying characteristics allows for precise adaptation to the game at hand.
 - ii. The choice of rifle and scope is highly influenced by the terrain and the nature of the hunt. For instance, in open plains or long-range hunting scenarios, a hunter may need a

rifle equipped with a high-powered scope and a flatter-shooting calibre to take accurate shots at extended distances. Conversely, when hunting in dense forests or for animals requiring quick follow-up shots, a different rifle-scope combination may be needed. Using a single rifle-scope combination for all scenarios can compromise the hunt's success and ethical considerations.

- iii. By acknowledging the critical role of terrain and the nature of the hunt or competition in the choice of firearm, it becomes evident that owning multiple rifles and scopes in the same calibre is not a matter of indulgence but a practical necessity. Each combination serves a specific purpose and optimizes performance based on the unique demands of the shooting scenario. Limiting the number of firearms available could adversely affect the safety, ethical standards, and success of hunting and shooting practices.

- · **Deer Hunting:**

- · When hunting larger game such as deer, it is essential to use calibres like .30-06 Springfield or .308 Winchester to ensure a humane kill. These calibres provide the necessary power and accuracy to take down game of this size.
- · However, sighting in a rifle for each of these specific calibres can be a time-consuming and meticulous process. Achieving pinpoint accuracy demands considerable effort and multiple rounds of ammunition, which can vary significantly in grain weight. Each adjustment and bullet type requires dedicated time and effort to achieve optimal accuracy.

- · The choice of rifle and scope for deer hunting can vary greatly depending on whether the hunt takes place in open fields, dense woods, or mountainous terrain. Open fields may require a bolt-action rifle with a powerful scope for long-range shots, while dense woods may necessitate a lever-action rifle with a lower magnification scope for quick target acquisition. The specific rifle and scope combination can significantly impact the success and safety of the hunt.

- · **Small Game Hunting:**

- · For smaller game such as rabbits or foxes, smaller calibres like .22 Long Rifle or .17 HMR (Hornady Magnum Rimfire) are preferred. These calibres minimize damage to the animal and are more suitable for precision shots.
- · For smaller game such as rabbits or foxes, smaller calibres like .22 Long Rifle or .17 HMR are preferred. Sighting in a scope and rifle for these calibres is a different challenge altogether, as precision and accuracy at shorter ranges are paramount. Switching between these small game calibres and larger game calibres necessitates recalibration, further highlighting the need for multiple firearms.
- · Similar variations apply to small game hunting. When hunting in confined spaces or areas with thick vegetation, a lightweight, manoeuvrable rifle with a low-power scope may be preferred. In contrast, open expanses may demand a more substantial rifle with a higher magnification scope for precision shots.

- · **Vermin Control:**

- · Vermin control can take place in a variety of locations, from agricultural fields to urban areas.

The choice of rifle and scope configuration depends on the specific environment and the need for accurate, humane dispatching of pests.

- b. **Competitive Target Shooting:**

Competition rifles are often very different to those used in hunting.

- · **Range and Competition Rules:**

Different shooting competitions may take place at varying distances and under specific rules that dictate the firearm's configuration. For instance, a precision rifle competition at long ranges might require a specific calibre and scope setup, while an IPSC event might necessitate a different configuration to meet time-sensitive engagement requirements.

- · **Long-Range Precision Shooting:**

- · Long-range precision shooting competitions require specialized calibres such as 6.5mm Creedmoor or .300 Winchester Magnum, as they offer superior ballistic performance and accuracy at extended distances.
- · In long-range precision shooting competitions, the choice of calibre may change depending on the competition's rules and the characteristics of the range. Sighting in a scope and rifle for various calibres can be a labour-intensive task, as minute differences in bullet grain weights affect ballistics. Achieving consistent accuracy across a range of calibres is an intricate process that demands time and effort.
- · Competing in different terrains, from flat ranges to mountainous settings, requires the selection of a rifle and scope combination that can adapt to varying shooting distances and environmental conditions. A single firearm configuration will not suffice for all situations.

- · **IPSC and Action Shooting:**

-
- · In dynamic disciplines like IPSC, calibres like 9mm and .45 ACP are common choices due to their manageable recoil and magazine capacity, which align with the rapid-fire and accuracy requirements of these events.
 - · IPSC and action shooting competitions often involve a variety of calibres. Each calibre requires precise sight adjustments to ensure rapid and accurate target engagement, and considerable time is invested in perfecting the setup for each firearm.
 - · IPSC and action shooting competitions often feature diverse stages with different obstacles and target arrangements. Shooters require different firearm configurations, including variations in scope magnification and firearm ergonomics, to excel in these competitions.
 - · **Precision Rifle Competitions:**
 - · Precision rifle competitions often involve calibres like 6mm Dasher or 6.5x47 Lapua, chosen for their precision, flat trajectory, and consistent performance.
 - · Precision rifle competitions demand meticulous tuning of the rifle-scope combination to match the ballistic characteristics of specific calibres. This process can be intricate and time-consuming, with considerable effort required for each setup.
 - · The nature of precision rifle competitions can vary widely, from shooting at known distances to engaging targets at unknown ranges. Shooters need flexibility in their rifle and scope choices to adapt to the competition's specific characteristics.
 - · **Shotgun**

- · The sport of shotgun is similarly diverse and requires a number of different rifles and configurations for competition and separately hunting.

In recognizing the necessity for different rifles and scope configurations within the same calibres based on the terrain and nature of the hunt or competition, it becomes evident that responsible shooters require a diverse arsenal to meet these varying demands. Limiting firearms to just five would severely hinder their ability to ensure safety, accuracy, and success in the field or on the range.

By understanding the substantial time and effort needed to sight in a scope and rifle for each different grain bullet, it becomes evident that owning multiple firearms is a practical necessity for a shooter involved in various disciplines and hunting scenarios. These efforts are essential to achieve the precision, accuracy, and humane practices that responsible shooters uphold.

- 2. **Safety and Skill Development:** Owning and practicing with multiple firearms is crucial for safety and skill development. This ensures my client's competence and proficiency in the responsible use of firearms.
- 3. **Legitimate Use:** Shooters who are law-abiding citizen and use firearms exclusively for lawful purposes contribute to wildlife conservation through hunting and promote sporting integrity through competitive target shooting. They also contribute significantly to the economy.
- 4. **Existing Regulations:** Western Australia's existing regulations, such as background checks, waiting periods, and licensing requirements, already serve as robust safeguards for responsible gun ownership.
- 5. **Comparable Jurisdictions:** Many regions with similar demographics and traditions do not impose arbitrary caps on the number of firearms. These jurisdictions rely on individual assessment and robust licensing procedures.

- 6. **Individual Assessment:** I suggest considering each applicant's history, training, and intended use when granting licenses for additional firearms, rather than imposing a blanket cap.

4 / 4

- 7. **Risk Mitigation:** Dedicated shooters are already committed to following stringent safety protocols and responsible storage practices, reducing the risk associated with firearm ownership.
- 8. **Public Support:** Research indicates that there is substantial public support for responsible gun ownership among the shooting community in Western Australia.
- 9. **Collaboration:** I also think you will find shooters are very willing to collaborate with relevant authorities and organizations to promote safety education and responsible firearm ownership within the community.
- 10. **Economic Contribution:** Shooting sports and related industries contribute significantly to the local economy. Imposing arbitrary caps on firearm ownership will negatively impact these economic contributions.
- 11. **Unfair to Shooters.** Finally, any such cap is to be honest an unfair burden and imposition on lawful shooters many of whom have spent a lot of time and effort acquiring their rifles and guns, scopes, ammunition and accessories over a long period of time.
- 12. **Golf with a putter?** Ultimately any cap (and I would suggest a cap should not be under 30 weapons if at all) is like asking a person to play golf with a putter. It shows a lack of understanding of the many disciplines and requirements of the sport of shooting

In light of the above, I respectfully request that you reconsider the proposed cap of 5 guns and consider a more individualized, fair, and safety-focused approach to firearm regulation.