

Firearms Amendment (Strengthening Firearm Security) Bill 2026

Firearms Amendment (Antique Firearms) Bill 2025 and the

Firearms Amendment (Miscellaneous) Bill 2026

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

This report has been prepared by the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management (DPFEM) to provide a high-level overview of feedback received during consultation on the Firearms Amendment (Antique Firearms) Bill 2025 and the Firearms Amendment (Miscellaneous) Bill 2026; now combined to be the Firearms Amendment (Strengthening Firearm Security) Bill 2026 (the Bill).

Public consultation on the Firearms Amendment (Antique Firearms) Bill 2025 was conducted from 26 February 2026 to 2 April 2026, followed by consultation on the Firearms Amendment (Miscellaneous) Bill 2026 from 3 July 2026 to 7 August 2026.

Consultation was undertaken through the Tasmania Police website, with a total of 646 submissions received across both consultation processes.

Submissions reflected a range of perspectives. While a number of respondents expressed general support for the proposed amendments, others, including key stakeholders, representative organisations, industry groups, and affected individuals provided more detailed feedback on specific provisions within the Bills. A number of submissions were not relevant to the Bills.

Given the volume and complexity of submissions received, and the need to progress the Firearms Amendment (Strengthening Firearm Security) Bill 2026 (the Bill) within the Government's legislative program, DPFEM has prepared this *provisional* summary to identify the principal themes emerging from consultation. The accompanying feedback table outlines these key themes and provides an initial departmental response to support consideration of the Bill prior to introduction to Parliament.

Stakeholder feedback indicates broad support for several proposed firearms reforms, although views differ on the scope and implementation of some measures.

Feedback was analysed and consolidated into key thematic matters rather than individual legislative provisions (clauses). While some submissions expressed clear support or opposition to the proposed amendments, many indicated general support for the reform agenda while recommending refinements to specific aspects of the Bill.

A number of submissions also proposed alternative reforms or additional legislative changes that fall outside the scope of the current Bill, including firearm ownership limits. While these matters are not proposed for inclusion as part of the present reforms, some suggestions may warrant consideration as part of future policy and legislative reviews.

Firearms Amendment (Antique Firearms) Bill 2025 - Summary of Submissions

Clause No.	PROPOSED AMENDMENT	SUBMISSION RECEIVED	DPFEM COMMENT
	Definition of antique firearms: Define an antique firearm as a firearm manufactured before 1 January 1900 and exclude firearms capable of firing cartridge ammunition or loading from the breech.	15 x submissions fully supported all the proposed amendments, 17 x submissions oppose the amendments, 11 x submissions partially supported some amendments. Some stakeholders supported further amendments to include: - Firearms rendered permanently inoperable, or for which ammunition is not commercially available, as antiques regardless of manufacture date, - Changing the cut-off date from 1900 to 1860 to exclude later cartridge firearms, and - Modern replicas manufactured to pre-1900 specifications.	Overall Assessment Mixed support. Stakeholders that supported some amendments but not all, suggested the definition should be further refined to capture other firearms, such as Boer War-era Mausers, .303 rifles and post-1900 replicas. Recommendation Retain the current proposed definition of an antique firearm. The current definition requires that a firearm was manufactured before 1 January 1900 and excludes a firearm that can fire cartridge ammunition or is loaded at the breach end of the firearm. This definition already excludes Boer War era Mausers and .303 rifles from being defined as an antique firearm and excludes replica firearms manufactured after 1 January 1900. This currently proposed definition will capture all firearms previously exempt under exemption No.4.

	Storage and display requirements: - Require antique firearms to be stored and displayed in accordance with prescribed standards. Where an antique firearm is not being displayed, general storage requirements of Section 84 of the <i>Firearms Act 1996</i> are to apply, - Owners will be required to provide contact details, information about the type of firearm and where and how it is stored, and - There will be no requirements for engraving or stamping of the antique firearm.	15 x submissions fully supported the proposed amendments, 17 x submissions oppose the amendments, and 11 x submissions partially supported some amendments. A number of submissions indicated dissatisfaction with proposed storage and display requirements for antique firearms, arguing that inoperable firearms should not be subject to storage requirements and that displaying antique firearms is often a primary reason for ownership.	Overall Assessment Mixed support. A number of stakeholder submissions indicated dissatisfaction with proposed storage and display requirements for antique firearms. Stakeholders argued that there should be no storage requirements for inoperable firearms and that the purpose of owning some of these antique firearms is to display them. Recommendation Maintain the proposed storage and display requirements subsequently refined to allow alternative storage or display arrangements where the Commissioner is satisfied the arrangements provide a level of security equivalent to or greater than the prescribed requirements. This mirrors the approach currently adopted under section 85 of the Act.
	Licensing and registration requirements: - Antique firearms manufactured prior to 1 January 1900 will only need to be registered with Tasmania Police, - Require antique firearms be registered against either an	15 x submissions fully supported the proposed amendments, 17 x submissions oppose the amendments, and 11 x submissions partially supported some amendments.	Overall assessment The requirement that there is no licensing and/or requirement to complete a firearms safety course was considered a well-balanced and sensible approach. Recommendation

	antique firearm permit or an existing firearms licence, • Provide for an antique firearm permit holder to possess, display or store antique firearms. If a person wishes to use an antique firearm, it must register it against a relevant firearms licence under the <i>Firearms Act 1996</i>, and • A provision whereby there is no requirement to complete a firearms safety course.	Some stakeholders indicated there would be opposition to any proposed licensing and firearms safety course requirements for antique firearm owners. Supportive submissions considered the proposed permit system without licensing requirements to be a balanced approach. Opposing submissions argued registration was unnecessary because antique firearms posed little public safety risk. Some submitters suggested that permanently disabling the firearm, such as through removal of the firing pin, would provide a preferable alternative.	Maintain the current policy position that there is no requirement to obtain a firearms license or to complete a firearms safety course. The recommended position maintains the requirement to apply for an antique firearms permit, and for antique firearms to be registered to the permit holder. This approach balances community safety by ensuring that an applicant who is a respondent to a family violence order, or whom has been issued with a firearms prohibition order, or is subject to the other exclusions in the proposed Section 73B will not be issued with an antique firearms permit.
--	---	---	---

Firearms Amendment (Miscellaneous) Bill 2026 - Summary of Submissions

Clause No.	PROPOSED AMENDMENT	SUBMISSION RECEIVED	DPFEM COMMENT
	Accelerate work on the development of the National Firearms Register (NFR): • Facilitate the provision of information to the NFR in near real time,	Key Stakeholders [representative or advocacy groups] and community members provided feedback with divergent positions on the NFR. There was broad endorsement for the introduction of NFR reforms, real-time licence and permit verification capabilities, improved	Overall Assessment Overall, stakeholder feedback indicates strong support for the NFR and its core objectives. Most concerns relate not to the NFR concept itself, but to the practical and regulatory

	- Require firearms dealers to sight and verify the currency and validity of a firearms licence through the licence and permit verification service prior to the sale of any firearm or ammunition to a firearms licence holder, - Ensure the Commissioner is informed of changes to a firearms licence holders address, firearms storage location and firearms licence particulars prior to these changes occurring, - Register sound suppressors in Tasmania and provide the information to the NFR, - To make amendments to terminology and definitions to facilitate national consistency, and - Any other consequential amendments that may be required for the purpose of establishing the NFR.	interstate information sharing, firearm tracing mechanisms, and stronger dealer reporting and record-keeping requirements. Within the stakeholder community some submissions supported the NFR or supported the NFR with further proposed amendment. Some stakeholders were opposed to the NFR. Stakeholder concerns were primarily centred on the practical implementation of the proposed measures, such as privacy protections and access controls as well as any potential administrative burden on lawful/responsible firearm owners.	requirements associated with implementation, compliance, administration, and specific operational requirements such as notification timeframes for changes of address or firearm storage locations. Recommendation Continued support for the implementation of the NFR, noting the strong stakeholder support. To address concerns, a targeted communication and engagement program should be included as part of implementation to provide clarity on regulatory requirements and build confidence in the proposed arrangements.
	Reclassification of straight-pull and button/lever (self-ejecting) centrefire	Key Stakeholders [representative or advocacy groups] were more strongly divided on	Overall Assessment

	and shotgun firearms to the more restrictive Category C licence: • Compensate firearm dealers for the reclassified firearms currently in stock, • Buyback for reclassified firearms, and • Voluntary buyback for any other firearm a licence holder wants to hand and in.	reclassification with community safety stakeholders strongly supportive of reclassification, or reclassification with further amendment. Key Stakeholders representing firearms owners were opposed to reclassification. General Stakeholder views on the proposed reclassification were mixed. Supporters argued that these firearms currently circumvent the intent of existing legislative restrictions and can achieve rates of fire comparable to more heavily regulated firearms. Reclassification was supported as an appropriate measure to enhance public safety and promote greater national consistency in firearm regulation. Opponents expressed concern about the impact on existing licence holders, arguing that law-abiding firearm owners would be disproportionately affected by the changes. Opponents also questioned whether sufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate meaningful public safety benefits and raised concerns about the lack of clarity regarding compensation and buyback arrangements for affected firearms.	Consultation feedback indicates mixed views on the proposed reclassification. Supporters consider the reform necessary to address those firearms that may circumvent existing legislative controls, improve public safety and for national consistency. Opponents have primarily raised concerns about the impact on existing law abiding firearm owners, questioning the evidence supporting the proposed changes, and the lack of clarity around compensation or buyback arrangements. Recommendation Recommend maintaining the proposed reclassification. While concerns have been raised about impacts on existing licence holders and the lack of clarity around compensation arrangements, these issues primarily relate to implementation rather than the policy objective itself.
	Citizenship requirement:		Overall assessment

	- Establish that Australian citizenship is the default eligibility requirement for firearms licensing, and - Introduce a provision for limited exemptions in defined circumstances, including for: - Primary producers, - Citizens from New Zealand, and - Where granted by the Commissioner of Police	Key Stakeholders [representative or advocacy groups] and community members provided feedback with divergent positions on a citizenship requirement. There were divergent opinions from within the firearm owning community with some key stakeholders supporting citizenship requirements and others opposed to citizenship requirements. From individual community members there was mixed support, however, the provision for citizenship as a default eligibility was broadly endorsed.	Stakeholder feedback indicated mixed views on the proposal; however, there was some support for establishing Australian citizenship eligibility. It could be suggested that the lack of support (without further amendment) by key stakeholders may be primarily directed at the scope and application of exemptions, rather than the principle of the citizenship eligibility itself. Recommendation The amendments provide a clear and consistent eligibility framework while maintaining flexibility through limited exemptions for defined circumstances.
	Stronger penalties for theft and possession of stolen firearms: - Increase the penalty for stealing and possessing stolen firearms, including the presumption of mandatory imprisonment for certain offences, - Providing for trafficking firearms to be dealt with summarily, - Creating a new summary offence for stealing a firearm or firearm part, and	Key stakeholders [representative or advocacy groups] and community members provided feedback with divergent positions on stronger penalties for theft and possession of stolen firearms. Stakeholders representing firearms owners were strongly in support of stronger penalties. Two of the stakeholders advocating for community safety were opposed to stronger penalties. Within the community there was no significant opposition identified to the policy	Overall Assessment Consultation findings indicate broad endorsement, with general support from law enforcement, public safety organisations, and sporting and shooting stakeholders. The primary concern raised relates to the presumption of mandatory imprisonment for certain offences, with some stakeholders arguing that sentencing should remain a matter for judicial discretion. Recommendation

	A provision for prohibition orders to also apply to firearm parts, ammunition and suppressors.	objective; however, some stakeholders opposed the mandatory sentencing provision arguing judicial discretion should be retained.	Recommend proceeding with the proposal for stronger penalties for theft and possession of stolen firearms and trafficking offences. A prudent approach to mandatory imprisonment provisions, to ensure they are proportionate, achieve the intended policy outcomes, and appropriately balance the legislative intent with judicial discretion.
	Firearm ownership limits (caps) (not included in the Bill)	The introduction of firearms caps was not a proposition in the Bill however as a theme in public discourse many contributors used the opportunity of consultation to comment on caps. Key Stakeholders [representative or advocacy groups] were divided on caps with community safety stakeholders strongly supportive of caps and stakeholders representing the firearms owning community strongly opposed to caps General stakeholder views on firearm ownership caps were mixed. Supporters argued that limiting the number of firearms an individual can own would reduce community safety risks associated with large firearm accumulations, align with harm-minimisation principles, and support national reform.	Overall Assessment Overall, feedback centred on balancing public safety objectives with the impacts on lawful firearm ownership. While not included in the Bills, firearm ownership limits emerged as a polarising issue. Support for caps came primarily from public safety advocates and Tasmania Police, who viewed them as a means of reducing community safety risks. In contrast, sporting shooters, hunting organisations, and some industry stakeholders questioned the evidence for ownership limits and argued they would unfairly affect lawful firearm owners. Recommendation

		Opponents argued that there is no evidence that licensed firearm owners pose a greater risk solely because of the size of their firearm collection. They contended that legitimate sporting, hunting, and collecting activities often require ownership of multiple firearms and that ownership caps could impose unnecessary restrictions on compliant (and law abiding) firearm owners.	Any future consideration of ownership caps should be supported by a clear evidence base demonstrating a public safety benefit. DPFEM notes that firearm ownership limits are supported by the Commissioner of Police. Accordingly, it is advised to monitor national developments and consider ownership limits as a potential future reform, while ensuring any proposal is evidence-based and developed in consultation with affected stakeholders.
--	--	--	---

Summary of Feedback

Overall, consultation demonstrated strong support for the implementation of National Firearms Register (NFR) requirements and broad acceptance of measures intended to achieve national consistency across firearms regulation. However, some stakeholders raised concerns regarding privacy, data security, and access arrangements associated with a national database containing personal information and firearm ownership records.

The principal issues identified during consultation related to the reclassification of certain firearms, the potential regulatory and compliance impacts on licensed firearm owners and the proposed firearm ownership caps (although not included in the Bill/s). Stakeholder feedback generally reflected differing views on the appropriate balance between community safety objectives and the regulatory obligations imposed on lawful firearm owners.

The proposed reclassification of firearms is supported by public safety advocates, who regard it as an important safety measure. Sporting and hunting organisations, however, question the justification for some changes and their potential impacts on responsible firearm owners.

The proposed citizenship requirement for firearms licensing was supported generally by public safety advocates, with no significant objections identified from sporting and hunting organisations.

All stakeholder groups support stronger dealer verification arrangements, with sporting and hunting organisations emphasising the need for efficient implementation and minimal regulatory burden.

Although not relevant to the Bill, the greatest divergence related to ownership caps. Public safety advocates strongly support their introduction. Sporting and hunting organisations generally oppose ownership caps, citing concerns about impacts on legitimate firearm owners.

Strong support emerged for contemporising the family/domestic violence provisions including enhanced firearms restrictions for people subject to family violence orders, improved public safety safeguards and greater scrutiny for licence suitability. Some submissions recommended extending exclusion periods after family/domestic violence orders from five years to ten years.