

POLICY AREA	ACT	NEW CONSERVATIVE	NEW ZEALAND FIRST	NEW ZEALAND LABOUR PARTY	NZ OUTDOORS PARTY	ONE PARTY	THE GREEN PARTY OF AOTEAROA / NZ	NEW ZEALAND NATIONAL PARTY	THE OPPORTUNITES PARTY (TOP)	VISION NEW ZEALAND
<b>CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY BY GOVERNMENT REQUIRES COMPENSATION</b>	Agreed. A fundamental right that is currently being ignored and abused	No confiscation, except from criminals. All compensation must be at or above market value.	Not if it's illegally held. Not if the law has been broken	Over \$100 million compensation was paid for prohibited firearms and parts, under Parliament's legislative authority.	It was an affront to all responsible legitimate license holders. We will bring in a peoples constitution to stop governments from excess of power such as the firearms confiscation bill.		Agree in principle, subject to specific situations such as confiscating illegally obtained goods.	Compensation should be paid where the previously legal item is required to be surrendered.		Yes compensation is appropriate
<b>POLICE SHOULD NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF LICENSING</b>	Support independent authority to administer all aspects of firearm law and policy writing	Administration of civilian firearms ownership & use must be removed from Police	Agree. New Zealand First has received assurances that an Independent Arms Authority will be established which will remove this responsibility from Police.	We'll consider options to establish an entity to oversee firearms licensing and administration in 2021.	Administration of Arms Act and related regulations should be undertaken by a single entity (not the Police)	Establish a separate authority to license firearm owners and engage with firearm community	Police should retain this function unless transferred to a new independent and specialised agency.	Support an independent entity responsible for administration of the Arms Act and firearms policy.		No they shouldn't. They did not manage the information on the March 15 gunmans acquisition of firearms and responsible for poor checks of obvious information on him
<b>POLICY DECISIONS SHOULD BE MADE BY PARLIAMENT, NOT DELEGATED TO POLICE</b>	Support work of the Firearms Community Advisory Forum and independent authority	Remove policy decision-making from the Police	Yes. On the recommendation of the Independent Arms Authority.	The Minister has confidence in the Commissioner of Police to enforce the law.	Agreed but also subject to stringent public scrutiny unlike the farcical scrutiny of last firearms bill.		Agree.	Yes. National will remove regulation making powers accordingly.		Agree
<b>FAIR AND EFFICIENT VETTING PROCESS</b>	Support local vetting personnel & promote face to face interviews – no square boxes into round holes	Vetting & licensing must be consistent across NZ, local, in-person and highly trained	Agreed.	Stronger vetting ensures only those who are fit and proper can own a gun.	The police are already using draconian policies to confiscate firearms from people and vetting has now become a farce with licenses being rescinded because someone in the family is taking pills for depression. They need reigning in.		Review vetting procedure to ensure it is in line with best practice.	Yes. National raised issues around proactive health notification and subjectivity around 'patterns of behaviour'.		Yes
<b>FIREARM COLLECTIONS SHOULD BE VALUED AS IMPORTANT PARTS OF OUR HISTORY</b>	Collections of historical significance should be treasured not destroyed	Repeal amendments to the Arms Act. Restore Collector endorsement.	New Zealand First agrees.	Bona fide collectors and collections, e.g. museums, are explicitly provided for in legislation	Non-sporting firearms (including vintage & collectors' firearms) should be allowed with special licence & precautions		No policy on firearm collections.	Support clear exemption for collectors.		Yes
<b>SPORT SHOOTING SHOULD BE RECOGNISED AS VALUABLE PART OF OUR SPORTING PROWESS</b>	NZ ranks highly on the world stage in sport shooting, participation should be allowed	Semi-automatics can be held under a modified "E" category endorsement, requiring additional security & vetting	Competitive Sports Shooting disciplines such as Mil Service and 3 Gun should be legal.	Parliament didn't support prohibited weapon exemptions for sports shooters. Olympic and Commonwealth Games are unaffected.	Totally support private ownership of sporting (non-military) firearms by approved persons. It is part of our parties foundation.		No policy on recognising sport shooting specifically.	Support clear exemption for sports shooting.		Yes
<b>RECOGNISE THAT A WIDE RANGE OF FIREARM USE IS REQUIRED FOR PEST CONTROL</b>	Evidence has clearly indicated that firearms are an essential pest control tool	Semi-automatics can be held under a modified "E" category endorsement, requiring additional security & vetting	New Zealand First sought pest control exemption & pushed for wider exemptions in Arms Legislation Act	Prohibited firearms exemptions are available for animal control or pest control subject to conditions.	Totally. The current license for pest control is a farce. The old system worked fine. Already we are raising a leap in criminal arms offenses. What a stupid statement from a desperate government to say it would make communities safer..		The current firearms rules for pest control strike the right balance.	Support clear exemption for pest control operations.	Support exemption but appropriate firearm should be used	Yes
<b>REQUIRING REGISTRATION OF FIREARMS WILL NOT MAKE OUR COMMUNITY ANY SAFER</b>	Agreed. It's a system that has not achieved the "community safety" goal anywhere in the world	Universal registration of firearms has failed. Remove failed E-cat PTP requirement.	New Zealand First remains to be convinced that registration will make the community safer, that is why we have delayed its introduction and brought forward the post implementation review.	Registration stops firearms falling into the wrong hands. Firearms are limited to responsible licensed owners.	We use the quote "Outlaw firearms and you will arm the outlaws". Already we are raising a leap in criminal arms offenses. What a stupid statement from a desperate government to say it would make communities safer..		Support registration of firearms, based on the Australian model, to improve firearms tracing.	National will remove the legislated register. It will not deliver the Government's stated objective.	Support full registration including some accessories such as magazines	No it won't
<b>THE TARGET OF POLICE FIREARM OPERATIONS SHOULD BE CRIMINALS NOT LICENCED FIREARM OWNERS.</b>	ACT will assist Police to target gangs rather than LFOs through law changes to CPRA	Will change Sentencing Act to provide mandatory sentences where firearm used in crime	Police should only target persons who are breaking the law.	Police intelligence indicates the firearms used by criminals are most often stolen from legitimate owners.	Sentencing Act be amended so illegal firearm use is treated as an aggravating factor	Increase penalties for breach of Arms Act	Police operational decisions should be focused on public safety.	Target illegal use of firearms. Introduce Firearm Prohibition Orders targeted at gangs.		Yes
<b>COMMUNITY SPORTING CLUBS AND RANGES SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED, AND NOT OVER-BURDENED BY UNNECESSARY REGULATION</b>	Clubs and ranges are a self policing community. They need support not burden	Protect & encourage clubs & ranges, including from urban sprawl.	New Zealand First tried to oppose those regulations but failed. We are open to a review of the cost and safety benefit of those changes.	The changes give club committees the statutory ability to enforce their own rules.	As a past Secretary of a NRA club I am appalled at the regulations now in place that are really just designed to make owning and using firearms more difficult. We have a number of various firearm club members or officials in our party.		No policy to change current regulation of community sporting clubs.	Support light regulation for clubs and ranges, not the burdensome regime legislated by the Government.	Support regulation of gun clubs	Yes
<b>SEMI-AUTOMATIC BANS (POST MARCH 15 PROHIBITION)</b>	Repeal ALA 2020, then write new Bill replacing AA1983 and all its subsequent amendments	Semi-automatics can be held under a modified "E" category endorsement, requiring additional security & vetting	We supported semi-automatic ban with exemptions for pest control and legitimate competitive Sporting Shooting.	High-risk firearms are prohibited including short (pistol-length) semi-automatic rifles	Support private ownership of sporting (non-military) firearms by approved persons. These new charges are just more restrictive measures to make firearm ownership to difficult or expensive. If it is "keeping the community safer then put the cost on the community"	Return to pre-2019 system of endorsements	Support prohibition on semi-automatics.	National supported the principle, but the definitions are flawed and exemptions should be better constructed.	Support prohibition of semi-automatics	Disagree. An Australian shot others who were immigrants, as unfortunate as that is, law-abiding Kiwis have borne the brunt of the punishment of that act with the confiscation of lawfully obtained semi-automatic firearms
<b>LICENCED FIREARM OWNERS SHOULDN'T HAVE TO PAY FOR NEW FIREARM REGULATIONS AS THEY DON'T BENEFIT THEM</b>	Only payment for services eg. permit application; not home visit security checks	Require all funding from licence holders to be applied to their administration.	The cost of licensing should reflect the cost of processing the application.	License-holders currently pay less than half the actual cost – Police and taxpayers subsidised the rest.	YES this is just more restrictive measures to make firearm ownership to difficult or expensive. These new charges are just more restrictive measures to make firearm ownership to difficult or expensive. If it is "keeping the community safer then put the cost on the community"		Any registration system should be made as accessible as possible to encourage take up.	Greater impact on costs is to ensure the only regulations imposed are sensible and effective.		No they shouldn't have to pay
<b>THERE SHOULD BE MORE TYPES OF FIREARMS BANNED.</b>	Adequately vetting the owner not the firearm is the answer. Banning hasn't worked.	Enforce vetting & licensing standard & requirements. Check & register the person, not the firearm.	New Zealand First would like to get back to a situation where rather than being banned, certain types of firearms are restricted.	The Arms Act changes are phased. The final provisions – the registry – are in three years.	NO		Should be updated as needed to include firearms that present heightened risk of dangerous use.	No. The definitions currently in use have already captured some firearms they shouldn't have.		No we do not agree that there should be more types of firearms banned

This table compares the firearms policies of each of New Zealand's registered political parties. We collected all publicly available policies and then asked each party to fill or update their part in the table. Some parties did not respond, some parties have provided online links to their policy, and some provided a quick statement.

- Of the parties that have provided alternative sources of their policy:
- Aotearoa Legalise Cannabis Party stated: "The Aotearoa Legalise Cannabis Party does not have a policy specifically on firearms for us it would be a conscience vote."
  - New Conservative provided a link to their [firearms policy](#) in addition to filling out our table.
  - National Party provided a [document with their firearms policy](#) in addition to filling out our table.
  - One Party provided a link to their [firearms policy](#).

## THE FOLLOWING PARTIES HAVE NO STATED FIREARMS POLICY AND DID NOT RESPOND TO OUR INVITATION TO FILL THE TABLE:

- HEARTLAND NEW ZEALAND PARTY
- MANA MOVEMENT
- MAORI PARTY
- NEW ZEALAND TEA PARTY
- SUSTAINABLE NEW ZEALAND PARTY
- ADVANCE NEW ZEALAND PARTY
- THE NEW ZEALAND DEMOCRATIC PARTY FOR SOCIAL CREDIT