



Speech By  
**Mark Furner**


**MEMBER FOR FERNY GROVE**

---

Record of Proceedings, 2 November 2016

**WEAPONS REGULATION**

**Disallowance of Statutory Instrument**

 **Mr FURNER** (Ferry Grove—ALP) (7.49 pm): I rise to speak against the disallowance motion moved by the member for Everton. I will start by explaining the particular regulation. In 2016 the Weapons Regulation 1996 expired and was required to be renewed. As we know, subordinate regulation needs to be renewed on a 10-yearly basis. In the 10 years of this weapons regulation's existence, there have been no policy changes made between the Weapons Regulation 1996 and the Weapons Regulation 2016, which became effective on 1 September 2016. The 2016 regulation was modernised, which involved renumbering and minor wording changes to reflect modern drafting standards. That is typically what happens when you renew subordinate legislation that has been working. For example, in clause 13(1) the word 'or' has been removed and replaced with a comma between 'suspended' and 'revoked'. That is a small demonstration of what has changed between the 2006 and 2016 regulations. That specific provision was enacted as section 13 of the Weapons Regulation 1996 by the Borbidge coalition government. The provision has remained in existence without amendment since that date.

The system for the changeover of representatives has operated successfully since its enactment in the Weapons Regulation 2006, which was superseded by the regulation of 2016. Regardless of section 16 of the Weapons Regulation 2016, upon the death of a licensee, section 20(6)(b) is applicable and any licence previously issued is cancelled. Currently, a licence held by a body is held in the name of the representative who has the ability to nominate associates to the licence who can carry out the duties of the representative, such as dealers or employees. Should the licensee be subject to criminal charges due to the loss of firearms or a failure to carry out their duties correctly, the representative is the person who is criminally responsible. Police have advised that any new representative would be required to seek an entirely new licence with supporting information, resulting in firearms being surrendered for safekeeping for long periods of time and further information being sought over the ownership of the firearms. Essentially, if this section is removed it will create an issue for dealers. As the process stands, the removal of this particular section would impact dealers significantly, particularly in terms of the time taken for the new applicant to go through the process to become the dealer.

Ultimately, the LNP is showing that it is soft on guns and soft on crime. Maybe they are following in the footsteps of their brothers and sisters in the New South Wales parliament and also what we have seen in the Commonwealth parliament lately, where an attempt is being made to water down the national gun laws. Those gun laws were put in place following the tragedy of the Port Arthur massacre. I well remember being in Brisbane on a cold winter's afternoon in 1996 when I heard the breaking news about that terrible massacre, yet tonight we are debating this regulation.

Last month, the police minister met with his state and territory counterparts. A key issue on the agenda was the reclassification of lever-action shotguns, specifically, the controversial Adler A110. It has been widely reported that all but one jurisdiction was prepared to re-categorise lever-action shotguns from category A, which is easy to acquire, to category B for a magazine of five rounds or less and to category D for a magazine greater than five rounds. At that meeting, Queensland presented its case that as a short-range rapid-fire weapon, the Adler was potentially dangerous and categories B and D were the minimum that should be considered. The seven-shot Adler shotgun is banned from Australia until the states and territories can agree on how to classify the gun and the permit that a gun holder would require to use the weapon.

Lately, there has been some media interest in firearms, which is what we are discussing in the disallowance motion before the House tonight. Today I did a bit of research. No doubt rural members such as the member for Gregory—I remember him as Lachie—would know farmers who are very concerned about the importation and use of Adler guns, and the meaning of this proposed change to the regulation. Peter Lucas from Wyandra said—

We don't use a shotgun out here. We can't get close enough to use a shotgun to shoot any of those feral pests. We just use a normal large calibre rifle, a .22-250—

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Miss Barton): One moment, member for Ferny Grove.

**Mr RICKUSS:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This is totally irrelevant to the disallowance motion that we are talking about. This is not about Adler shotguns.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** With respect, member for Lockyer, given that we are talking about gun regulations, a discussion around some weapons has to be allowed.

**Mr RICKUSS:** If I want to talk about popguns, I should be right.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Lockyer, during the discussion on a disallowance motion with respect to weapons regulations, I do not think it is unreasonable that there be discussion about particular types of weapons. I am listening very closely to what the member for Ferny Grove is saying.

**Mr FURNER:** Thank you for your protection, Madam Deputy Speaker. Mr Lucas went on to indicate—

We do have shooters come from time to time—

No doubt those shooters use firearms that are regulated by the weapons regulation—

but none of them use a shotgun to my knowledge.

Mr Lucas went on to suggest that he is unimpressed with the issue being politicised. One cannot blame a farmer for being unhappy that something he uses to regulate his land is being politicised. That is not a good thing for rural landholders.

In my opinion, the only knowledge that the member for Everton and the member for Lockyer have about firearms would come from holding a water pistol. I have had some experience of firearms. Listen up, member for Everton. I was a member of the Virginia shooting range. I held a concealable weapons licence, which I handed in as that is a requirement under the regulation if you are no longer a member. I have never held a concealable weapon. I had no wish to go down that path. However, many years ago I had a .22 magnum rifle. At Al Minhad military weapons range in Dubai I was privileged to fire a Steyr. I have fired a 12.7 millimetre deck-mounted machine gun on the Armidale patrol boat, HMAS *Bathurst*. In fact, Peter Dutton was with me on that particular day, attending a defence program. I had to show him how to use it, because he was pretty clueless. Once again referring to firearms, when I was employed by Armaguard I carried on my right hip a .357 Smith & Wesson and, in many cases, a .38 Smith & Wesson.

To be honest, when it comes to this issue half the people opposite are hypocrites. On the one hand, they come in here and talk tough on crime and talk tough on the use of firearms. Tonight, by disallowing this particular regulation they want to make it more difficult for dealers. They want to go down the path of making shotguns such as the Adler more accessible, putting people in our communities at risk. On that basis, I oppose the disallowance motion before the House this evening.