



Arms (Prohibited Firearms, Magazines, and Parts) Amendment Bill

125—1

Report of the Finance and Expenditure Committee

April 2019

Contents

Recommendation.....	2
About the bill as introduced.....	2
Timeframe of this legislation.....	4
Suggested amendments to the bill	4
Exemption for commercial wild animal or animal pest control businesses	4
Airsoft and paintball guns	5
Regulation making powers to include a transitional exemption for manufacturers and exporters	5
Exemption for firearms collectors.....	5
Conditions of endorsement for collectors of firearms	5
Exemption for people with heirloom or memento firearms	6
Proof of unlawful possession	6
Order in Council powers	7
Comments for clarification.....	8
Suppressors, silencers, and sights	8
Competitive shooting sports	8
Buy-back scheme	8
New Zealand National Party view	8
ACT New Zealand view.....	10
Appendix	14

Arms (Prohibited Firearms, Magazines, and Parts) Amendment Bill

Recommendation

The Finance and Expenditure Committee has examined the Arms (Prohibited Firearms, Magazines, and Parts) Amendment Bill. We recommend that the bill be passed, and that the House take note of the recommendations in this report.

About the bill as introduced

On 15 March 2019 an armed person carried out a mass shooting at the Al Noor and Linwood Mosques in Christchurch using legally held semi-automatic firearms. Fifty people were killed and a similar number suffered serious to moderate injuries.

We wish to acknowledge the 50 people who lost their lives, the people who were injured, and those who lost loved ones in this tragic event. The measures proposed in this bill seek to address weaknesses in New Zealand's gun laws to minimise the possibility of such an attack happening again.

The Arms (Prohibited Firearms, Magazines, and Parts) Amendment Bill would amend the Arms Act 1983. The bill would prohibit from circulation and use in New Zealand most semi-automatic firearms, parts that convert firearms into semi-automatic firearms, magazines over a certain capacity, and some shotguns.

The purpose of the bill is to reduce the risk of death or injury resulting from the misuse of semi-automatic firearms, recognising the extreme harm they can cause. At the same time, the bill seeks to preserve access to the most widespread, commonly and lawfully used lower-capacity semi-automatic firearms. This recognises the need for some use of these firearms, in particular by hunters and farmers. In this way, the bill seeks to protect public safety and the safe, responsible, and legitimate use of firearms.

The bill's proposed changes include:

- defining the following items as prohibited:
 - all military-style semi-automatic firearms (MSSAs)
 - semi-automatic firearms, other than those capable of firing only 0.22 or lower calibre rimfire cartridges from a magazine that can hold no more than 10 cartridges or semi-automatic shotguns with a non-detachable tubular magazine that can hold no more than 5 cartridges
 - pump-action shotguns that can be used with a detachable magazine
 - pump-action shotguns with a non-detachable tubular magazine that can hold more than 5 cartridges

- any magazines and parts that would enable a firearm to be converted into a prohibited firearm
- exempting limited categories of licence holders who could apply to import, sell, supply, and possess these prohibited items
- providing a strict regulatory regime for these prohibited items
- introducing new offences and penalties relating to these prohibited items
- providing for an amnesty period, until 30 September 2019, for people to surrender prohibited items
- providing for the definition of prohibited firearm, prohibited magazine, and prohibited ammunition to be amended, replaced, or declared by Order in Council.

The amendments set out in the bill would be the first in a set of reforms to the Arms Act which have been signalled by the Government.

Prohibited items

The bill would prohibit most semi-automatic firearms (other than pistols), and some shotguns, from circulation and use in New Zealand's general population. These firearms, whether they are currently classified as an A Category or E Category firearm, would no longer be generally available.

Some small-calibre rimfire semi-automatic firearms, such as those capable of firing only 0.22 or lower calibre rimfire cartridges from a magazine that can hold no more than 10 cartridges, and lesser-capacity shotguns that can hold no more than 5 cartridges, would be excluded from the prohibition. These firearms are commonly used for hunting and farming, and have a limited magazine capacity.

The bill would also prohibit:

- magazines used with shotguns that can hold more than 5 cartridges
- magazines used with any other firearm (except a pistol) that can hold more than 10 cartridges
- parts that can convert firearms into prohibited firearms.

Exemptions

The bill would provide some narrow exemptions so that certain categories of licensed gun owners could apply to import, supply, sell, or possess prohibited items. Exempt categories of people would include:

- licensed dealers
- bona fide collectors of firearms
- bona fide museum curators or directors
- approved broadcasters, bona fide theatre companies or societies, and film or television production companies
- people engaged by the Department of Conservation, or by a management agency under the Biosecurity Act 1993, to kill or hunt wild animals or animal pests

- a person authorised by the Minister of Conservation to undertake wild animal recovery operations.

Regulating possession of prohibited items

The intent of the bill is that any use of prohibited items be strictly regulated. The bill would require people in the exempt categories to apply for an endorsement on their licence to possess a prohibited item, and for a permit to possess or import prohibited firearms or magazines.

Timeframe of this legislation

Parliament required us to report back within seven days. For this reason, the changes we recommend will be contained in a Supplementary Order Paper which we expect to be tabled in the House by the sponsoring Minister.

We received and considered 13,062 submissions from interested groups and individuals. We heard oral evidence from 22 submitters at hearings in Wellington. Of the submissions we received, about 60 percent supported the bill, 26 percent were opposed to the bill, and 14 percent expressed another view.

Suggested amendments to the bill

This report covers the main amendments we recommend to the bill as introduced. We do not discuss minor, technical, or consequential amendments.

Exemption for commercial wild animal or animal pest control businesses

We recommend adding a narrow exemption to allow commercial businesses specialising in the control of wild animals or animal pests to use a prohibited item for pest-control purposes on private land or non-conservation Crown land in accordance with a specified Act.

The bill as introduced would provide an exemption for persons carrying out pest control who are employed or engaged by the Department of Conservation or a management agency in accordance with the Biosecurity Act. However, these exemptions would not cover pest control on private land, such as farms, or non-conservation Crown land.

We consider that there would be some narrow circumstances where use of a prohibited firearm was absolutely necessary to carry out pest control on private land or non-conservation Crown land for conservation, environmental, or economic reasons. Our recommendation would allow a private landowner to engage a wild animal or animal pest control business to use such firearms while still removing most semi-automatic firearms from circulation.

We believe that our recommended exemption could be kept sufficiently narrow by applying the requirements for endorsement in clause 27, section 30B(3) of the bill as introduced.

We recommend that wild animals or animal pests, under the specified Acts referred to in clause 8 of the bill as introduced, include Canada Geese. We consider that Canada Geese pose a significant problem for private land owners who would engage a commercial business for wild animal or animal pest control.

Airsoft and paintball guns

Airguns used in airsoft and paintball sports come under the definition of airgun, not firearm, in the Arms Act. This means that such airguns would not be affected by the prohibitions in the bill.

Under the Arms Act at present, a person must have a permit to import a restricted airgun. This is any airgun that looks like a restricted weapon, military-style semi-automatic firearm, or pistol. The bill would keep and extend this requirement to include any airgun that looks like a prohibited firearm as defined in clause 5, section 2A. Currently, a person does not need a permit to import any part of a restricted airgun. We believe this is appropriate. However, we note that the bill as introduced would require a permit to import any part of a restricted airgun. We believe this was inadvertent and not the intent of the bill.

We recommend deleting the reference to “restricted airgun” in clause 19, section 18(2A)(b), so that a person would not be required to have a permit to import any part of a restricted airgun.

Regulation-making powers to include a transitional exemption for manufacturers and exporters

We recommend adding regulation-making powers to include a transitional exemption for manufacturers and exporters of prohibited items. This would ensure that manufacturers and exporters currently engaged in lawful activities are not prevented from continuing their business pending further legislation.

Exemption for firearms collectors

We wish to clarify that bona fide collectors of firearms would be permitted to possess prohibited semi-automatic firearms under clause 8 of the bill, which would insert new section 4A(1)(b) into the Act.

For a person to obtain an endorsement on their licence to possess a prohibited item as a bona fide collector, they would need to fulfil the requirements in clause 31, section 33A.

Conditions of endorsement for collectors of firearms

Clause 65(2), section 74(1)(ha) of the bill as introduced would allow regulations to be made to provide for the secure storage of a vital part of a prohibited firearm possessed by a bona fide collector, to render it inoperable. The regulations would also prescribe precautions to be taken to prevent the theft or misuse of a vital part.

We consider that provisions for the secure storage of a vital part should be included in the principal Act. Therefore, we recommend inserting an additional condition of endorsement for bona fide collectors of firearms into clause 31, to require the removed vital part of a prohibited firearm to be stored at a separate address, which would be regulated by the Police.

We consider that the requirement for separate storage would mitigate the risk of a prohibited firearm being stolen and misused. We heard that an alternative solution could be to render

collectors' firearms permanently inoperable. We consider that this would be an overly harsh solution because it would significantly reduce the value of collectors' firearms.

Green Party of Aotearoa New Zealand view

We consider the exemption for collectors of firearms to be at odds with the purpose of keeping semi-automatic guns out of circulation.

We agree with the New Zealand Police Association's submission that collectors' guns should be rendered permanently inoperable, as this is an exemption that may be utilised by those with nefarious intention. In addition, we consider that the administrative burden and enforcement costs of storage of operable parts in a separate address would be notable. There is every opportunity for collectors' guns to be purchased in the Government buy-back scheme if value is the concern, to provide these weapons to a museum, or where collectors may choose to retain them for display, to render them inoperable.

Exemption for people with heirloom or memento firearms

We recommend adding a narrow exemption that would allow people to possess a prohibited firearm or prohibited magazine that clearly has special significance as an heirloom or memento.

Under section 29(2)(c) of the Arms Act at present, a person may apply for an endorsement on their licence to keep a pistol or restricted weapon if that item is an heirloom or memento. The bill as introduced does not specifically provide for people to keep prohibited firearms and prohibited magazines that are heirlooms or mementos.

We consider that the current exemption in the Arms Act for heirlooms or mementos provides an appropriate basis from which to develop a narrow exemption on the basis of an overall assessment of reasonableness. We believe that such a test should include criteria such as the type of firearm, the nature of the applicant, and the significance of the event the heirloom or memento is linked to.

We believe that, without this provision, people may continue to illegally possess prohibited heirlooms or mementos for sentimental reasons. We consider it preferable for owners of heirlooms and mementos to be subject to the stricter security standards required for an exempt person to be granted an endorsement, rather than to possess a prohibited firearm or prohibited magazine illegally.

We recommend that our suggested exemption be subject to the same conditions of endorsement that clause 31 of the bill as introduced would apply to bona fide collectors.

Proof of unlawful possession

Clause 49 of the bill would insert new sections 50A to 50C into the Act to introduce new offences for unlawful possession of prohibited firearms, magazines, or parts. These provisions would be covered by the "reverse onus of proof" provision in section 66 of the Arms Act. This means that the owner of any land, building, or vehicle where a prohibited item was found would be presumed to be in possession of it unless they could prove otherwise.

We note that this provision would raise issues with the presumption of innocence affirmed in the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act. We have taken note of advice from the Crown Law Office, and in relation to proposed sections 50A and 50B, we believe it would be appropriate to apply the reverse onus of proof. This is because the offences in these sections are comparable to other offences subject to reverse onus of proof for possession in the Arms Act.

We do not consider this approach appropriate for the offence in section 50C, relating to unlawful possession of a prohibited part. As introduced, it would create the possibility of an innocent person being wrongly convicted if they were in possession of a part that could be fitted to both a non-prohibited and prohibited firearm.

Therefore, we recommend amending clause 49, section 50C(a) to ensure that a person who had reasonable excuse to possess a prohibited part would not be criminalised for possessing it. For the same reason, we also recommend deleting “prohibited part” in clause 61, which would amend section 66 of the Act.

Order in Council powers

Power to amend definitions

The Order in Council powers in the bill as introduced (clause 66, sections 74A and 74B) would allow the Governor-General to “amend and replace the description” of prohibited items in new sections 2A and 2B. We consider this power to be broader than the existing Order in Council powers in section 74A of the Arms Act. The existing section provides for military-style semi-automatic firearms, and features of these firearms, to be defined, described, and declared by Order in Council.

We recommend amending clause 66, section 74A(a) and (b) to state “amend the description”, rather than “amend and replace the description”. Our amendment would constrain the Order in Council powers in the bill as introduced.

Transition period for future Orders in Council

We recommend inserting a provision into clause 65, section 74 to allow the Governor-General to make regulations to declare a limited amnesty period for possession offences created by future Orders in Council.

We consider that, if the definition of prohibited items was amended by Order in Council, there should be a time-limited amnesty for newly prohibited items. We believe an amnesty would be beneficial because it would provide time to educate the public about the change and encourage people to surrender newly prohibited items.

Power to declare ammunition prohibited

The bill as introduced contains two separate provisions under which ammunition could be declared prohibited by Order in Council: clause 5, section 2D, and clause 66, section 74A(e). We wish to avoid the uncertainty this could create, and accordingly recommend that section 2D clarify that such a declaration could only be made under section 74A.

We therefore recommend amending section 2D to refer to section 74A.

Comments for clarification

This section clarifies some of the issues raised by submitters during our consideration of the bill.

Suppressors, silencers, and sights

Suppressors, silencers, and sights that are fitted to, designed for, or intended to be used on an A Category firearm by a person who lawfully holds an A Category licence would not be prohibited by the bill.

As an example, a suppressor, silencer, or sight fitted to, designed for, or intended to be used on a firearm prohibited under the bill would be considered a prohibited part. However, if the prohibited firearm was surrendered and the suppressor, silencer, or sight was then intended for use on a non-prohibited firearm, it would no longer be a prohibited part.

Competitive shooting sports

We do not recommend an exemption for sporting competitors or competitions.

We consider an exemption unnecessary because the bill would not prevent people from competing in shooting disciplines at the Olympic or Commonwealth Games. In addition, we believe that people who compete in the 3-gun discipline would be able to use a 0.22 or lower calibre semi-automatic firearm, rather than a 0.223 calibre semi-automatic firearm, to continue to participate in the discipline.

The purpose of the bill is to prohibit the use of most semi-automatic firearms in New Zealand in order to reduce the risk of death or injury resulting from their misuse. We believe that providing an exemption for sporting competitors would allow more semi-automatic firearms to remain in circulation than we consider desirable for public safety.

Buy-back scheme

The Government has announced that it will set up a buy-back scheme to encourage people to give up their firearms. The buy-back scheme is not part of this bill.

The New Zealand Police and the Treasury are working on the details of the buy-back. The Government has said that the underlying principle of the buy-back will be that fair and reasonable compensation will be paid to firearms owners. It has also signalled that the buy-back will take into account the age and type of the firearm, and its market value.

New Zealand National Party view

The National Party supports the Arms (Prohibited Firearms, Magazines, and Parts) Amendment Bill. We do have some concerns about some aspects of the bill, outlined below.

Delegation of power to the Executive to change the criminal law

The bill contains a variety of clauses delegating power to the Executive through the Order in Council process. This is constitutionally inappropriate when it comes to the criminal law. For example, the bill provides a power to declare by Order in Council specific ammunition to be prohibited ammunition. The departmental report states that “the policy intent for this is to

prohibit armour piercing, incendiary, tracer, and similar types of military ammunition for non-military use". If that is the case then the bill should include that ammunition. As submitter Graeme Edgeler noted, "criminal laws, especially those carrying significant criminal penalties, should be imposed by Parliament, not delegated to regulation".¹

The bill also contains so-called Henry VIII clauses, which allow the Government to amend the Arms Act (the primary Act) itself through regulation. The Regulations Review Committee has rightly raised concern about this and although the clauses in the bill are better for the select committee's recommended amendments, the constitutional repugnance remains.

No exemption for international sporting competitions

We are sympathetic to the arguments raised by sporting bodies including Pistol New Zealand, Sport NZ, and many individual competitors that the bill should contain an exemption for target shooting competitions. Submitters suggested a new type of endorsement enabling them to use higher firing rate semi-automatic firearms under a club membership and/or in competitions.

We are disappointed that an exemption regime for international sporting shooters has not been included in the bill. The Police's argument that there are no Olympic or Commonwealth Games events that require the type of firearms that would be prohibited firearms as defined in the bill, with respect, misses the point. We believe it is possible to design an exemption regime that allows for their use under strict regulations. We encourage the Government to look at this as part of phase two of the reforms.

Amnesty and buy-back scheme

We are concerned that vital details of the amnesty and firearm buy-back scheme have not been disclosed by the Government. Parliament is legislating to criminalise the possession of a range of firearms which, until the passage of this bill, were legally held by their owners. The Government must move quickly to establish the firearm buy-back scheme. We encourage the Government to consult broadly with licensed firearm owners and interest groups to make sure the buy-back works effectively.

Compensation for each firearm given up should be at market rates. We are concerned that dealers will be excluded from the buy-back scheme. We are aware of some dealers that have taken possession of stock worth tens of thousands of dollars that they are unable to sell into the market and also unable to return to the supplier. They should not be worse off as a result of quick legislative action.

Firearm Prohibition Orders

We are disappointed that the Government has not included a Firearm Prohibition Order (FPO) regime in the bill. The introduction of FPOs was recommended by the 2017 Law and Order Committee Inquiry into issues relating to the illegal possession of firearms, and mentioned positively in the 2017 Police Briefing to the Incoming Minister.

¹ Mr Edgeler's views can be found [here](#).

FPOs would widen the powers available to the Police to search the homes and cars of serious, violent gang members for firearms. FPOs have been introduced in New South Wales and two other Australian states.

We are very concerned that contemporaneously with the bill being introduced to the House, there were news reports that gang members would refuse to give up their (soon to be illegal) firearms.

We believe this attitude demonstrates exactly why the Police need the power to issue FPOs. If law-abiding and legitimate users of firearms like hunters, farmers, and shooters can give up their weapons, then so can gangs.

Other comments

We are pleased that airsoft and paintball organisations and competitions will be unaffected by the bill and we support the amendment to section 18(2A)(b) to make this clear.

We support allowing bona fide collectors to have prohibited firearms with the appropriate endorsement on their licence. New Zealand has an active and vibrant antique arms and firearms collecting community and the intent of the law changes is not to target them.

We draw the House's attention to the submission of Rapid Advanced Manufacturing Limited in Tauranga, which manufactures via 3D printing metal suppressors for the international export market. The company requires access to semi-automatic weapons and high capacity magazines to test their suppressors before export. We understand that this issue will be addressed at the Committee of the whole House and it is important that this is included in the bill.

ACT New Zealand view

ACT opposes the way that this legislation has been rushed through the parliamentary process. We share the view of the Law Society, which submitted that such a process is likely to result in bad law. It is in that context that we submit this minority view for inclusion in the Finance and Expenditure Committee's report to the House on the Arms (Prohibited Firearms, Magazines, and Parts) Amendment Bill.

Time pressure and due process

We have been dogged by limitations on advice and information due to the shortage of time. This sentiment has frequently been expressed by officials, both in written documents and in person. We do not feel that making law without the time to acquire suitable information, let alone analyse it, is good practice for any law, let alone one seeking to legislate complex matters in the wake of a tragedy as important as this.

Far worse than time pressure, the passage of the bill has led to occurrences that we view as being highly offensive to the parliamentary process. The select committee process is a parliamentary one, meaning it is designed to hold the Government to account. In practice select committees often closely follow the position of the Government because a majority of members are from the same parties as the Government. However, even Government-aligned members usually acknowledge that select committees have an important job to do

scrutinising the law. We were shocked when officials from the Police told the committee they could not provide advice because the Minister would not let them. We were disappointed and expressed that disappointment when the chair of the committee, supported by MPs from Government parties, chose to accept this outcome. If the select committee can only receive information that the Government wants it to have, it is impossible for Parliament to properly hold the Government to account through the select committee process.

The likely success of prohibition at restricting access

The specific information sought in that instance was in regard to the likely effectiveness of an amnesty and buy-back scheme in removing weapons from the community. The intention of the legislation is to remove semi-automatic weapons from circulation in New Zealand, with limited exceptions. It became clear that many submitters believed that putting in place this legislation would achieve that. We wanted to test this assumption.

There is good reason to believe that the legislation will have very limited success. Reports from Australia suggest that as few as 20 percent of the estimated number of semi-automatic weapons were recovered through that country's buy-back programme. We asked for advice from officials as to what a likely success rate might be in New Zealand. We were told by officials that they would not provide this information because the Minister would not allow them to. We want to put on record that Ministerial interference in select committees is deeply troubling, not only to the making of this law, but to Parliament as an institution.

We heard from one submitter that the cost of the buy-back programme would be likely to be closer to three-quarters of a billion dollars rather than the \$100–200 million suggested by Ministers in the media. A second submitter agreed that the higher estimate was more likely, and expressed concern that compliance rates may be low. However, both cost estimates were based on the assumption that the buy-back would be 100 percent successful. We raised the possibility that the buy-back should offer above average value to raise compliance rates, however we were unable to get advice from officials on this question.

The inability to explore other policy options and loss of goodwill

On several occasions we asked to explore the possibilities that other solutions might be used to make us safer from gun violence. We asked, for instance, if the Pistol Club model, that officials regard as functional, could be expanded to incorporate a wider range of weapon types. We were told that there was no time for such considerations as the purpose of this bill was only to ban certain types of weapons.

More generally, this rushed legislative process has led to a loss of goodwill with many in the gun-owning community. We note that almost 16,000 people petitioned Parliament asking to be heard through a longer process. That is more than the number who submitted to the committee, and far more than the 20 who could be heard in person. The implications of this are severe. Legitimate gun owners are needed allies in the quest for gun safety. At the very time when they might have been recruited to help, many feel they have been treated with contempt. This was evident in some of the more intemperate exchanges with the committee and in media coverage of the hearings. In our view, alienating potential allies in gun law enforcement leads to a net loss in public safety.

“Henry VIII” provisions

Section 66 of the legislation, in our view, gives overbroad regulation-making powers. It appears to mean that the Executive can ban any type of weapon at any time without parliamentary scrutiny. We believe that this feature brings out two problems with the bill.

From its request for sweeping regulatory powers, the Government appears to have low confidence that it has properly defined what it would like to ban. We asked officials why this approach had been taken, and they said that it was because technological changes are likely to mean weapons that the bill does not contemplate will allow people to circumvent its intent. We heard, for instance, how the courts had interpreted the ban on a free-standing pistol grip as being circumvented if an additional screw was used to attach such a grip to the rest of the gun, meaning it was technically no longer free standing. In the context of this bill, we asked officials what exactly the definition of a semi-automatic weapon is. That is, what are we banning? No answer was forthcoming. In the interim, media reports have suggested that there are ways semi-automatic weapons might be made compliant with the law, defeating it for all practical purposes.

The second problem is that the Government’s approach, legislating under time pressure, appears to be an abandonment of parliamentary scrutiny. Instead of asking Parliament to make a law that will capture the Government’s intent, the Government appears committed to simply removing the lawmaking function from Parliament, preferring instead to make regulations through Order in Council. This is another abandonment of good lawmaking.

Interaction with future legislation

Many times throughout the select committee process, officials and committee members referred to a second tranche of legislation due to be introduced by the Government. This raised the question of whether people would observe this law, given the Government had signalled another law would shortly be passed. Officials raised the possibility that the Police would store weapons for an interim period on the basis that new laws might make them legal again. We regard this as telling of the clumsiness of this lawmaking process. It erodes respect for laws passed by Parliament when one law can be regarded as a placeholder for the next one.

Effect of current Order in Council restrictions

The Arms (Military Style Semi-automatic Firearms) Order 2019 effectively ensured that only those with the highly restricted E Category of firearms licence could legally hold semi-automatic weapons with the same exceptions proposed in this bill. The Order in Council does not expire until 30 June 2020. This condition seems at odds with the stated intention to ban semi-automatic weapons in a tight timeframe, and in our view undermines the rationale for the rushed process used to pass this bill.

Conclusion

ACT opposed the first reading of this bill that sent it to this committee. We hoped to be proven wrong, that the officials would be highly informed and be able to answer questions. In some cases they not only could not, but would not. In particular, they were unable to

reassure us that the law would actually work. Added to the erosion of parliamentary sovereignty that we saw in this bill, we see no reason why it should continue.

Appendix

Committee procedure

The Arms (Prohibited Firearms, Magazines, and Parts) Amendment Bill was referred to the committee on 2 April 2019. The closing date for submissions was 4 April 2019. We received and considered 13,062 submissions from interested groups and individuals. We heard oral evidence from 22 submitters at hearings in Wellington.

We received advice from the New Zealand Police. The Regulations Review Committee reported to us on the powers contained in clauses 4, 5, 58, 66, and Schedule 1, Part 1, Clause 1.

Committee members

Michael Wood (Chairperson)

Hon Amy Adams

Kiritapu Allan

Andrew Bayly

Rt Hon David Carter

Tamati Coffey

Hon Judith Collins

Ian McKelvie

Willow-Jean Prime

Dr Deborah Russell

David Seymour

Fletcher Tabuteau

Dr Duncan Webb

Chris Bishop, Mark Patterson, and Chlöe Swarbrick participated in our consideration of this item of business.

Advice and evidence received

The documents that we received as advice, and the written submissions we received, are available on the Parliament website, www.parliament.nz.

Petitions related to the bill

We received two petitions related to firearms during our consideration of this bill.

The first—Petition of Nicholas Green: Ban semi-automatic weapons—which was signed by 68,065 people, requests:

That the House of Representatives recommend to the Government that it ban semi-automatic weapons, and note that 68,065 people have signed an online petition calling for a ban on semi-automatic weapons.

The second—Petition of Hayden Livingstone: Kiwis request reasonable time for consultation regarding Firearms Law reform—which was signed by 15,904 people, requests:

That the House of Representatives allow for an in-depth public consultation period on changes to New Zealand firearms legislation, to ensure effective firearms legislation reform that does not unduly punish law-abiding firearms owners while maintaining assurances of public safety.

We will report back to the House on these petitions after we have reported to the House on this bill.