

## Queensland Community Safety Bill 2024

**Submission No:** 203  
**Submitted by:** John Davis  
**Publication:**  
**Attachments:**  
**Submitter Comments:**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Queensland Community Safety Bill 2024  
**Date:** Friday, 10 May 2024 5:14:29 PM

---

Dear Sir,

I have had the opportunity to peruse briefly the Queensland Community Safety Bill 2024.

Sadly, it seems the deadline for commenting is designed to prevent the majority of us from reading and commenting before the deadline of 16/may 2024.

Whilst I do appreciate the attempt to toughen up on deliberate law-breakers, there are some serious concerns regarding the below sections.

Sincerely,

J. Davis

[REDACTED]

Page 2:

"Despite Australia's robust firearm regulation, significant harm from illegal gun use continues,

resulting in the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission (ACIC) reporting the trafficking and use of firearms as a serious national threat and a significant safety concern for Australia.

The ACIC has conservatively estimated there are at least 200,000 firearms in the illicit market

with an increasing number of organised crime groups, including outlaw motorcycle gangs engaging in the trafficking of illicit firearms."

If this is the case, it clearly shows our existing strict laws affect, as usual, only the law abiding.

"The rate of firearms reported as stolen has also increased by at least 21% within the last decade, with over 779 firearms reported stolen in 2023. "

Had the weapons licencing branch not made so many mistakes, it would be harder indeed

for criminal elements to know where firearms are stored. I can cite specific examples, such as me receiving details of an address in Brisbane at which a licensee held valuable firearms. Without the WLB's mistake, I would not be in a position to plan to steal from him.

Page 47

"However, for electronic service the Bill presumes service and reverses the onus of proof by requiring the person to show that they did not in fact receive the notice. The reversal

of the onus of proof is necessary because:

- police do not have the power to require the person to view the document once electronically transmitted; and
- police may not have access to information showing if and when the person accessed the document."

Whilst i can appreciate the above, the simple fact is, that electronic communications are only DEEMED reliable. My personal record is a 14 day wait for an SMS to come through to my phone, (and 3 days for something life-threatening!)

This denies the recipient procedural fairness.

You can, of course, request/require a receipt for the electronic communication (the technology exists). This would be fairer and also cover the QPS.