

Subject: Concerns Regarding Proposed NSW Firearm Reforms

Dear [Title and Name],

I am a licensed, law-abiding firearm owner writing to express serious concern about the proposed NSW firearm reform legislation.

I do not support reforms that target compliant licence holders while failing to address the real drivers of violence and extremism.

In particular:

1. Diversion From the Real Problem

Gun reform does nothing to address the national surge in antisemitism, radicalisation and extremist ideology. Lawful firearm owners must not be used as scapegoats to avoid confronting these deeper and more complex issues.

2. Capacity Limits

Proposed firearm capacity limits fundamentally misunderstand both firearm use and public safety.

Capacity limits do not stop terrorism or extremist violence. Terrorists should have no access to firearms at all. Limiting capacity assumes lawful access and lawful intent, neither of which applies to terrorists or criminals. Someone willing to commit mass violence is not deterred by arbitrary restrictions on magazine size or capacity.

Firearms in Australia are already approved based on a genuine reason framework. Different legitimate purposes require different tools. Just as no one would suggest limiting a golfer to one club regardless of distance or terrain, capacity limits ignore the reality that different shooting activities, occupational requirements and safety considerations demand different equipment.

Using the appropriate tool for the intended purpose improves safety. In some contexts, higher capacity reduces the need for repeated reloading, lowers the risk of mishandling under stress, and supports humane outcomes in pest control and animal welfare. Arbitrary limits do not improve safety and may create unintended risks.

Capacity limits also punish lawful firearm owners for the actions of deranged, radicalised terrorists who operate entirely outside the licensing system. Law-abiding shooters comply with strict storage, licensing and renewal requirements and are not the source of extremist violence.

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.

Yours sincerely,
[Full Name]
[Suburb / Electorate]