

**From:** Wayne Turale [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 15 March 2023 5:44 PM  
**To:** Strategy Support  
**Cc:** Wayne Turale  
**Subject:** Fwd: Firearm submission Community Safety Bill Public Comment.

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** Firearms Bill 2023

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

>> FIREARMS AMENDMENT ( Community Safety ) Bill 2023

>>

>> In response to the Consultation Information Sheet ( Community Safety ) Bill 2023 I wish to submit the following on behalf of the Recreational Hunting Group I represent, compiled after discussions with our members.

>>

>> We find the the title of this Amendment and opening paragraph alarmist and this appears to indicate that lawful firearm owners are responsible for the majority of illegal actions. Tasmania has always been seen and advocated as a safe State and we weren't aware we were unsafe or exposed to "gun violence" at a scale this opening paragraph alludes too.

>>

>>

>> Also our understanding is the Government, Justice and Police Services of this State are there to enforce actual Legal Acts of Parliament and Regulations, why is there a reference to "unsafe behaviours" as how can that be defined ?

>>

>> What can be seen as unsafe by one person is perfectly legitimate and safe to another, ie rock climbing, parachuting , bungee jumping ect ..... this is purely subjective and we shouldn't live in a State where " behaviours " are dictated by the Government.... we should live in a State where it's citizens follow and obey responsible laws passed by an elected democratic Government..... isn't that the model of this Country and State? As any view of statistics will show Firearm related sports, activities are amongst the safest..... compare this with injuries and deaths attributed to football/ rugby , netball, cricket, mountain bike riding , car racing , (Targa Tas ) diving, boating/ fishing ect. The ignorant perception that Firearm related activities are un safe is unfounded.

>>

>> Comments as below.

>>

>> FIREARM RESTRICTIONS TO OMG MEMBERS:

>> We concur with reference to members of OMGs being restricted to firearm ownership but where does this stop? At what point is the line defined as to the close association ie a members father, mother , brother , sister, cousin ect.

>>

>> An individual may have a family member who is an OMG member but they have no association between themselves, is the innocent party to be subjected to punitive measures based purely on this?

>> The current definition of participant appears to be open ended in our view.

>>

>> Also why is this classification being restricted to members of OMGs? Shouldn't persons convicted of serious crimes ie of violence , firearm theft ect be prohibited persons also?

>>

>> IMITATION FIREARMS:

>> Agree that toy/imitation Firearms that actually LOOK like firearms and are used in the commission of crimes where the victim believes it to be a firearm should be subjected to the crime of aggravated assault.

>>

>> Toys/ Imitation Firearms however, that are in appearance by description , design or colour obviously NOT real firearms such as Nerf Guns ..... Gel blasters are toys and may be coloured orange/ green/ red tipped at the muzzle to indicate this.

>>

>> It is ridiculous to claim that a brightly coloured obvious toy can be construed or considered to be a firearm..... does an individual with a Mental Health disorder , drug or alcohol effected , brandishing a yellow Nerf gun to be considered and convicted as an aggravated assailant ?

>>

>> AMNESTY EXTENSION.

>> Yes, We believe the option of surrendering firearm/ parts and ammunition should be extended to allow for proper disposal or registration.

>>

>> However this amnesty should be extended to allow surrender to a Dealer anonymously also as many persons may fear dealing directly with Tas Police , also with the number of regularly unmanned police stations particularly in rural areas a Dealer alternative surrender point is a valuable option . The goal should be public safety and removal of these articles from the public who wish to be compliant with Legal requirements, this should be allowed to be completed anonymously at both venues.

>>

>>

>> RECLASSIFICATION OF LEVER ACTION SHOTGUNS

>> No, why is it necessary to do this.... it is claimed to “ make the category of this weapon more proportionate to the safety risk posed”. What safety risk is there?

>>

>> What and where is the demonstrated evidence that these shotguns have increased the safety risk ?

>>

>> None, that we can see, there is a vast between a rifle and a shotgun in its effective range regardless of its type of action. This is why they have been classified in different categories, there is no evidence we know of to support this proposal based on safety /danger between a lever action shotgun and a lever actioned rifle which has far more effective range.

>>

>> A shotgun is a shotgun not a rifle and its effective range is still restricted ... it should remain in Cat A.

>> This is emotive based on ignorance in our view and just creates more bureaucratic changes to a system that has flaws now.

>>

>> If the changes go ahead will the owners of shotguns with magazine capacity of greater than 5 be compensated for this and or given the option to exchange and reduce magazine capacity to meet new guidelines?

>>

>>

>> OFFENCES OF FIREARM DIGITAL BLUEPRINTS:

>> This as worded is far too ambiguous, does a diagram of disassembled firearm/ instructional manual classified under this ?

>> Some firearm owners may have this information recorded from previous purchases, repairs or possible future repairs... is this subject to this?

>> Several of our members have several reference books dated back 40 years that depicts firearm design drawing, parts assembly ect that may be classified in this category. Until this is defined succinctly we oppose this.

>>

>> INFRINGEMENT NOTICES

>> In theory we concur that this would help simplify enforcement of the Firearms Act however speaking from experience we believe there need to be firm guidelines established and training to officers conducting storage inspections.

>> They have many complaints of officers using their own interpretation of what is required ..ie using coins to measure gaps in doors, claiming either bolts to be removed or trigger locks need to be installed on firearms whilst

stored ( they do not) , gun bags have to be locked up also, ( they don't) safes need to be covered with blankets ( they don't) , asking for bolts to be removed from shotguns in safes ( they don't have them). ect. Also wherever possible these inspections should be done by officers in unmarked vehicles, particularly in urban areas as to not draw attention to residential addresses.

>>

>> Training need to be extended in this regard and a uniform policy enforced.

>>

>> Also how is the weight requirement enforced on storage ? ie safes over 150 kg are exempt from being secured ... how is this determined and the safe thickness construction to be determined ?

>>

>> AUDITING OBLIGATIONS

>> This to us is ambiguous and we fail to understand the significance of this amendment. More clarification is needed.

>>

>> FIREARM OFFENCES.

>> In this opening paragraph it alludes to keeping the Tasmanian community safe from gun violence..... if the Government were truly committed to doing this they should have an amendment to the Criminal Code for the Crime of Firearm Theft.

>> It is well known certain criminal elements actively target lawful firearm owners homes and go to extraordinary lengths to steal lawfully owned and stored firearms....

>>

>> Why then isn't the emphasis of responsibility for unlawful action placed squarely where it should be.. on the criminal element, not the lawful owner.

>>

>> If an offender has convictions of Firearm Theft rather than the ambiguous Burglary and Stealing ( which doesn't define the reality of the actual crime , ie theft of firearms) a re offending person can be sentenced to a crime commensurate to their actions.

>>

>> It is believed that criminals operating in illicit drug distribution actively recruit persons to target lawful firearms, there needs to be a strong deterrent of Criminal Justice penalties to deter this practice.....every storage safe in the State could have a label provided by Govt saying " Firearm Theft is a serious Crime punishable by .....".

>> Claimed ignorance of this fact would be deferred along with a PR campaign.

>>

>> If there was true commitment to public safety this proposal would be a given.

>

>> We, without hesitation, reject the possible change of moving legislative control to a public servant ie Police Commissioner from the direct line of Government, the Minister. The Government is an elected body who is answerable to the public at constituted election , a bureaucrat is not, either elected nor answerable to the general public. This hands far too much control to the Police Service and should never be considered for change

>>

>> For too long the Lawful Firearm owners of this State who are the most scrutinised group of individuals are the subject of increased legislative restrictions and public derision.

>>

>> Address the true problem, the criminal element of our Community.

>>

>> W. Turale

>> For Bronte Deer Stalkers.

>> Bronte Park

>> Tasmania.

>>

>> Sent from my iPad