



To: The Law and Order Select Committee
of the 49th Parliament of New Zealand
WELLINGTON

May 2011

Submissions of the National Shooters Association of
New Zealand in respect of the Arms (Military Style
Semi-Automatic Firearms and Import Controls)
Amendment Bill

National Shooters Association requests an appearance
before the law and order select committee.

Contact information

National Shooters Association
C/- 213 Locksley Avenue
Dallington
CHRISTCHURCH 8086

Email address: info@nsanz.org.nz

Website <http://www.nsan.org.nz>

Telephone 021 152 5527 (Richard Lincoln)

Honourable members of the law and order committee

1. National Shooters Association of New Zealand is a nation wide lobby group and private voluntary union supporting licensed civilian gun owners.
2. We access a membership of approximately 229,977 firearms license holders. These members are all of (or very near to) voting age, they all value highly their liberty to participate in their sport with firearms and are highly motivated to vote in general elections.
3. Our association was formed in 2010.
4. We support sensible arms control laws that serve the common good of New Zealand society while upholding the rights of responsible licensed civilian gun owners. We support all measures that help eliminate criminal use of weapons of any kind.
5. We oppose and resist regulations that are considered irrational and unjustly infringe on the rights and liberties of licensed civilian gun owners.
6. We oppose and resist anti-gun lobbying, anti-gun agenda pursuance by officials in public office and unlawful administration of the Arms Act.
7. National Shooters Association members include men and women, ranging from farmers to legal professionals, doctors and even police arms officers. Among our membership we have specialist High Court endorsed firearms experts, qualified range officers and an unprecedented depth and breadth of expertise in arms control policy, firearms law and arms technology.
8. We request the opportunity to appear before the select committee.

Synopsis

9. The amendments proposed in the Bill are poorly considered. The apparent proposed regulations that police favour, which are discussed in their regulatory impact statement, will obfuscate and complicate the law, and create problems if implemented.
10. The Bill and its apparent regulations run contrary to the purpose of the Arms Act to promote safe use of firearms; by restricting safety features.
11. The proposed amendments germane to military style semi-automatic firearms are not concerned with public safety or reducing gun-crime; rather they are directed at law-abiding responsible licensed civilian gun owners.
12. National Shooters Association recommends options that are discussed in the police regulatory impact statement; but therein erroneously rejected by the police author's.
13. A reasoned and evidence based approach arrives at better alternative solutions to the identified problems.
14. Police concede there is no evidence or statistics to support their preferred amendments. Police allegations seeking to justify the use of delegated regulations are disingenuous and fictitious.
15. The Bill and police recommendations concerning regulations have surfaced without consultation of effected user groups. Arms control law in New Zealand cannot succeed without support, cooperation and compliance from civilian gun owners.
16. The Bill is considered by many licensed civilian gun owners as a direct attack on their rights and liberties; both in its proposal to regulate by delegated legislation and its apparent proposed regulations.
17. On behalf of the 229,777 licensed civilian gun owners represented by National Shooters Association, we oppose the Bill in its current form and propose alternative measures which we set out in our following substantive submission.

Substantive submissions

Background

18. In 2009 the commissioner of police attempted to implement a pistol grip policy initiative. Advice was published to civilian gun owners that police were reclassifying semi-automatic sporting firearms as military style semi-automatic firearms¹. The policy was considered factually incorrect, illegal and it obfuscated the law.
19. A declaratory judgment was sought and granted by the High Court². The judgment *per* Mallon J provided for:
 - 19.1. A concise statutory interpretation of a military pattern free standing pistol grip for the purpose of section 2 of the Arms Act 1983.³
 - 19.2. Confirmation that informal police policy imposed on licensed civilian gun owners since 1992, was incorrect.
 - 19.3. Confirmation that the 2009 police pistol grip policy initiative was illegal.
20. Police now assert they have identified a problem with their recognising the statutorily defined, and now judicially defined, features of a military style semi-automatic firearm⁴.
21. Police blame the High Court and Mr Lincoln for their alleged problem⁵. Police do not consider that they themselves are the authors of their own misfortune – as a result of trying to impose an obviously erroneous policy initiative on licensed civilian gun owners.
22. It should be mentioned in passing that police tried a similar illegal policy imposition in 1990 and were similarly defeated in the High Court on that occasion⁶.

¹ New Zealand Police, *Ten One Magazine: Community Edition* (NZ Police, Wellington, 2009)

² *Lincoln v Police* [2010] HC – CIV-2009-454-473

³ *Ibid* n at [91] – [98]

⁴ New Zealand Police, *Regulatory Impact Statement: Agency disclosure statement*, Catherine Petrey, 2010

⁵ *Ibid* - n (3) at 1

⁶ *Practical Shooting Institute (NZ) Inc v Commissioner of Police* - [1992] 1 NZLR 709

Problems identified as giving rise to the Bill

23. There are two issues that the Bill seeks to address.
 - 23.1. The definition of a sporting semi-automatic firearm which is not a military style semi automatic sporting firearm.
 - 23.2. Illegal use of replica air-pistols.

Sporting Configuration vs. Military Style, semi-automatic firearms

24. It is emphasised that all semi-automatic firearms falling within the scope of the Bill are sporting firearms. None of these firearms are actual combat weapons; of the type held by the ministry of defence and the police department. Real combat weapons in New Zealand are classified as “restricted weapons” under the Arms Act 1983.
25. It is not accepted that police do not understand the law as set out by the High Court in *Lincoln v Police*. It is observed that police must know exactly what the law is because they have spelt it out themselves in their regulatory impact statement; where at page 4, paragraph 13 police have clearly and accurately identified and compared the three succinct definitions that have applied; 1992-2008, 2008-2010, and 2010 onwards.
26. It is accepted that it would be helpful to reconsider the definitions of the two types of semi-automatic firearm recognised in the principal Act; if done properly, this would assist licensed civilian gun owners, dealers and manufacturers in the face of conflicting advice from police.
27. We support the proposal to place a positive, rather than double negative interpretation on the meaning of military style semi-automatic firearm.

Firearms licensing

28. It is noted that persons in New Zealand who wish to obtain a firearm must be considered fit and proper and obtain a licence. The same applies to military style semi-automatic firearms. There is no variable or different standard of fit and

proper. Those who are fit and proper to own an “A-category” firearm are also fit and proper to own an “E-Category” military style semi-automatic sporting firearm.

29. A standard firearms licence is not a set of training wheels from which one progresses to obtain a higher level of fitness and properness.
30. We are not attracted to a mind-set that firearms licences can be handed out to anyone, because what are (erroneously) thought to be the real dangerous guns require a special endorsement. All firearms are potentially lethal and it is irresponsible mischief to classify a certain group of firearms as more dangerous, thereby relegating the remainder as less dangerous.

Sporting configuration

31. We oppose the proposal to remove the reference to “*sporting configuration*” from the principal Act. As previously mentioned, there are two distinct types of sporting semi-automatic firearm recognised in the principal Act.
32. If the “*sporting configuration*” nomenclature is removed, there will be no sensible method to refer to a semi-automatic firearm that is not a military style semiautomatic firearm.
33. If the “*sporting configuration*” nomenclature is removed,. This would steer the legislation, ‘Australian style’, in the direction of creating two overarching classes of firearm “*ordinary*” and “*military style*” – without the prerequisite of military style only applying to semi-automatic firearms. Predictably this will see various other non-semiautomatic firearms that the commissioner resents being classed as military style semi-automatic. We observe that the Bill is couched (we believe purposely) in this manner and that the regulatory impact statement makes no mention that the proposed amendments would allow any firearm to be reclassified as a military style semi-automatic sporting firearm. Although the commissioner may be attracted in this direction, we oppose it.
34. It is remarkably odd that a proposition is advanced to rid the principal Act of the “*sporting configuration*” nomenclature and retain the “*military style*” nomenclature. The phrase “*military style*” is a legal fiction for something that, outside the law, does not exist whereas “*sporting configuration*” is nomenclature that refers to firearms that do exist; both in law and in practice.

Features of a military style semi-automatic firearm

35. There are four options discussed in the police regulatory impact statement. We agree that option one and two can be immediately discounted.
36. We therefore discuss and critique options three and four.

Option three – military pattern free standing pistol grip

37. The third option discussed by police in their regulatory impact statement is to remove the feature of “military pattern free standing pistol grip” from the list of military style semi-automatic firearm features. We agree with police that this would be the simplest option.
38. Option three would best serve the purpose of the principal Act, to promote the safe use of firearms. The pistol grips of the type which police wish to restrict from sporting configuration semi-automatic firearms are safety features⁷
39. Option three supersedes a flaw drafted into the Bill. The proposed amendment to section 62 of the principal Act intends to provide for a right of appeal against a “determination by the commissioner that a firearm is a military style semi-automatic firearm”. The problem arises that the commissioner does not have any power to determine if a firearm is a military style semi-automatic firearm or not. In *Lincoln v Police* the High Court stated⁸:

“...it is important to note that Police do not have, under the Act, the ability to make a binding classification of the weapons in question. The question whether a weapon is a military style semi-automatic firearm, and if so whether it is in a sporting configuration, are questions to be determined by the application of the statutory definitions to individual weapons. That question must be determined, where necessary, by any Court which is determining some relevant issue”

⁷ *Lincoln v Police* [2010] HC – CIV-2009-454-473, n31 at [93] per Mallon J “A pistol grip of this kind may simply give the firearm user better two-handed control of the firearm (a safety feature which may be useful for sporting and other legitimate civilian purposes)”

⁸ *Lincoln v Police* [2010] HC 454 per McKenzie J at [10]

There would be no requirement for the commissioner of police to classify anything if option three is provided for in statutory legislation.

40. Option three provides clarity and certainty to police and civilian gun owners without the need to undermine the rights and liberties of civilian gun owners by subjecting them to delegated legislation in the form of regulations by order in council.
41. Police critique option three, saying that some firearms currently considered military style semi-automatic firearms and therefore held on a special endorsement, would be reclassified as being in sporting configuration. The wording of the regulatory impact statement at least infers that this is some how a negative side effect; although no explanation is given as to why or how this could be considered a negative side effect. We respond that police have overlooked the following effects:
 - 41.1. Reduction in the number of military style semi-automatic firearms within New Zealand's borders.
 - 41.2. Increased security standards; sporting configuration semi-automatic firearms being kept in "E" category security.
 - 41.3. Only a handful of firearms and their owners impacted.
42. We record the following from the police regulatory impact statement at page two:

The amendment will mean a small number of firearms reclassified as [military style semi-automatic firearms] after the Crown Law decision (which required their owners to apply for an E endorsement on their firearms licence) returning to the status of category A firearms (i.e. those in sporting configuration) if their owners choose this as an option.

What this statement illustrates is that police are currently allowing sporting configuration semi-automatic firearms to be held on a military style semi-automatic firearm endorsement and permit. We therefore observe that what police appear to criticise⁹ as a flaw in option three is the very thing they are

⁹ New Zealand Police, *Regulatory Impact Statement: Agency disclosure statement*, Catherine Petrey, 2010, n4 at 9

carrying out presently. We find it hard to reason how this can be considered a negative point to option three.

43. Unless there is some reasoned and logical argument raised against option three, we would not accept that option three is the most practical and sensible solution to the identified problem. We are convinced that removing the feature of a military pattern free standing pistol grip from the list of features that define a military style semi-automatic firearm is the best outcome.

Option four

44. Option four proposed in the police regulatory impact statement does not in practice address the problem identified. Option four is process-centric; it focuses more on how the law should be made rather than what law should be made.
45. We refute the allegation made by police that option four will provide clarity. On the contrary, option four creates a mechanism and encourages the commissioner to persuade the executive council to keep changing the definition and introducing new features and firearms that the commissioner resents. This will not create clarity; it will create ongoing volatility.
46. The volatility of delegated legislation will result in civilian gun owners being increasingly resentful and resistant to the commissioner and the government.

In 1992 there were thought to be between 12,000 to 14,000 military style semi automatic firearms in New Zealand¹⁰. Following the Arms Amendment Act of 1992 there were 6919 military style semi automatic firearm permits recorded by police according to T M Thorp¹¹. This amounts to a compliance rate of around fifty percent.

The remaining population of firearms are converted to what Thorpe calls "*grey guns*"¹² – "those not held in compliance with the firearms code, due to apathy, lack of conviction or antipathy as to the importance of firearms regulation, but not for criminal purposes." What Thorpe is really saying when he mentions

¹⁰ (22 September 1992) NZPD Arms Amendment Bill: Second Reading, Hon John Banks

¹¹ T M Thorpe, Review of firearms control in New Zealand: Report of an Independent Inquiry Commissioned by the Minister of Police, 1997, GP Print, Wellington n28.

¹² Ibid n24

“antipathy”, and how that applies to the current Bill, is that with each iteration of regulation more licensed civilian gun owners will make a conscious decision not to comply.

If the Bill is legislated in its current form, each time the commissioner manages to persuade the executive council to regulate something that he resents, there will be an increase in the population of grey guns within New Zealand’s borders, because New Zealand licensed civilian gun owners will not comply with regulations that they consider are irrational, unjustified and tyrannical.

47. We consider that the Bill hands by-proxy powers to the commissioner of police and his executive; to bring about regulatory controls without the usual checks and balances of statutory legislation; whereby citizens can have their say during the select committee and other processes. We do not believe that the commissioner and his executive should wield this kind of power because they are antigun proponents who are apathetic to the rights and liberties of licensed civilian gun owners. Inspector Joe Green of New Zealand police recognises this when he says¹³:

Despite the complexity of firearm control some advocates, including operational police staff are attracted to and promote a range of mechanisms that include the universal registration of firearms, the banning of possession of certain categories of firearms, the deactivation of firearms, buybacks, centralised armouries and the increase in penalties for the illegal possession and use of firearms. In what follows I argue that a research based approach suggests these approaches to arms control to be less than effective. I suggest that pistols, military style semi automatics and restricted weapons, often the focus of attention do not in themselves present a special risk to the wider community.

For these reasons we strongly oppose the propositions in option four, and the Bill, to impose regulations by order in council rather than having the relevant definitions spelt out in statutory legislation as they are at the moment.

48. We believe option four will create an environment that encourages litigation. In the absence of the parliamentary process of statutory legislation, judicial review

¹³ Inspector Joseph Green, New Zealand Police, ““ARMS CONTROL STRATEGIES. Debunking the myths” 2008.

is the only remaining option to address irrational regulations instigated by the commissioner and his executive. We note that the commissioner and his executive do have a historic propensity for favouring irrational and erroneous arms control policies.

49. There is a further explanatory note that says “This Bill proposes that a different approach to defining a military style semi-automatic firearm is taken to make it more easily understood and more adaptable to future changes in firearms manufacturing.” We make the immediate observation that if the amendment purports to justify future regulations on the basis of future changes in firearms manufacturing and design, then future judicial review of those regulations is inevitable. There has been no changes in firearms manufacturing germane to the functionality of semi-automatic firearms since 1903 and there is unlikely to be any further developments in the foreseeable future. Semi-automatic firearms have all but reached the limit of their evolution. This gives rise to the fact that any such future regulation must by default fall outside the stated purpose of the amendment.
50. The excuse to justify delegated legislation is greater flexibility to change regulation to head off manufacturers that change their designs to circumvent the law. This excuse is disingenuous, pathetic and if not so seriously fraudulent it would be laughable. The police cannot name, and have not named, one instance in the entire history of arms control in New Zealand where an arms manufacturer has designed any item to circumvent New Zealand arms control law. It is noted that the commissioner advanced this argument to Mallon J in *Lincoln v Police* and Her Honour raised her eyebrows and laughed under her breath at the submission; telling Mr Powell that she did not accept that international manufacturers were concerned with the New Zealand arms market. Her Honour was correct; the New Zealand arms market is so insignificant it is the last thing on the minds of arms manufacturers. There are endless designs and features of firearms on the international market; those that reach New Zealand’s shores are not those that purposely circumvent our laws; they are the those that happen to **comply** with our laws.
51. The stark truth of the proposal for delegated regulations is that that hands a by-proxy statutory power to the commissioner of police to ban anything he resents. This amounts to a de-facto police state. Delegated regulations are supposed to

be used only for housekeeping rather than, as is the case here, substantial changes in the law that effect hundreds of thousands of citizens and millions of dollars worth of private property. We rigorously oppose the use of delegated regulations.

52. If the Bill proceeds in its current form, there will need to be funding for 'buy-back' of firearms that are captured within the scope of the regulations whose owners do not wish to retain them or whom cannot, or will not obtain additional endorsements and security.
53. National Shooters Association would be unable to support option four; either the method of legislating or the apparent proposed regulations. We would be compelled to, with the support of our membership, continue resisting the regulations by whatever lawful means.

Magazine Capacities

54. The explanatory note in the Bill says "A maximum capacity of 7 rounds does not relate to international manufacturing standards, whereas magazines designed to hold 5 or 10 rounds are commonly produced."
55. We agree that there are difficulties for civilian gun owners obtaining normal capacity magazines for sporting firearms that are erroneously classified as military styled equipment by our existing legislation. We agree that amendment is required.
56. One of the significant problems faced by licensed civilian gun owners is the inextricable problem of importing magazines.

Because of the seven round restriction on magazine capacity, those firearms users who, as examples, engage in control of pest animals such as goats and wallabies, or who use firearms in harsh conditions and have to wear gloves, require an additional number of seven round magazines. It is therefore necessary to import a number of extra (ten round) magazines and convert them into seven round magazines on-shore; in order to comply with the law.

The problem arises that the customs department seize the ten round magazines at the border, on the grounds that they are military style semi-automatic firearm parts.

Additionally, police will not issue import permits to import magazines that have a ten round capacity without extorting an equivalent exchange magazine from the importer under the unlawful blanket police hand-in policy¹⁴.

The upshot is that firearms users cannot obtain even seven round magazines for their sporting configured semi-automatic firearms. This is an irksome and unintended consequence of the 1992 amendments. Often the only method by which a civilian gun owner may obtain seven round magazines is to limit her choice of semi-automatic firearm to one which has an equivalent non-semiautomatic version. She can then import magazines to convert under the guise that they are for a non-semiautomatic firearm.

Notably, the favoured police regulation of allowing magazines that will appear to hold ten cartridges, but that are actually modified to hold only seven, will not solve this problem. As police have confirmed, international arms manufacturers do not manufacture seven round capacity magazines. Magazines *that appear to hold ten rounds* will still be able to actually contain ten rounds at the time of import and therefore will still be seized by customs as they cross the border. The importer cannot modify what she does not have. The raising of the limit from seven to ten rounds, which we prefer, will solve this problem.

57. The proposed wording of the amendment introduces a cloudy subjective test that allows the use of a magazine which **appears** to hold no more than ten cartridges. These subjective tests have proven problematic in the past because the police adopt the attitude that it is their opinion alone which determines what the appearance is. We believe it is important that licensed civilian gun owners are able to determine for themselves, what the law is and how to comply with it.
58. Under the existing legislation there is an accepted methodology to determine how many cartridges a magazine appears to hold. Magazines are designed to contain a particular sized cartridge and if only seven of the specified number of cartridges fit in the magazine and there is no additional magazine length beyond

¹⁴ Assistant Commissioner I N Holyoake, Police Executive Conference: Importation of replacement MSSAs and Parts, 1996, New Zealand Police.

what is required to fit the spring, follower and floor plate (i.e. no superfluous length) , then the magazine complies with the law.

59. We agree that the legislation should be amended to reflect international manufacturing standards but we disagree that there should be uncertainty introduced by a subjective test. We believe the simplest approach is to amend the legislation to allow for ten round restricted capacity magazines in line with accepted practice in other jurisdictions; and thereby retaining a proven working methodology. This follows option two in the regulatory impact statement. The amendment (at 10) would then read:

a magazine that is capable of holding, or that, by its appearance, indicates that it is capable of holding,—

- (i) in the case of a magazine designed to hold rim-fire cartridges of 0.22 or less, more than 15 cartridges; or
- (ii) in any other case, more than 10 cartridges.

60. We do not accept the unsubstantiated police hypothesis that option two in the regulatory impact statement would give the appearance that the military style semi-automatic firearm laws are being relaxed . The proposed amendments do not address military style semi-automatic firearms; they address sporting configured semi-automatic firearms. — but even if that were the appearance, it is widely known; post Cumbria¹⁵, and post release of the Aramoana forensic reports¹⁶; that New Zealand’s military style semi-automatic firearm laws are based on inaccurate and misleading evidence. New Zealand’s current regulatory controls on military style semi-automatic firearms are in reality a placebo and do not mitigate the problem at which they are aimed.

¹⁵ Derrick Bird at Cumbria armed himself with a non-semiautomatic sawn-off shotgun and a non-semiautomatic (bolt action) .22 rifle. There were 11 victims of Bird’s shooting. Bird fired the shotgun 29 times and fired the .22 rifle 80 times. Bird shot his brother 11 times. There was one less death at Cumbria than at Aramoana.

¹⁶ ESR forensic reports detail that four deceased fell to Grey’s Norinco 86s (“AK47 lookalike”). Several other firearms were involved and it is not known which were implicated in the deaths of the other nine deceased. It is understood from internal police sources that 37 empty shell casings from Greys 86s were recovered and that 24 of these were located away from the victims; at the place where Grey made his final stand against members of the police anti-terrorist squad.

The theory of placing any limits on magazine capacity is fundamentally flawed when one can legally obtain and carry half a dozen or more loaded seven round magazines (for some rifles) and swap them into action in the blink of an eye.

There is a common law doctrine that: *where the need for a law no longer exists, so also the law itself ceases to exist*. As reported by Inspector Joe Green¹⁷, (manager of firearms and vetting, New Zealand police) there is clearly no need for the military style semi-automatic firearm laws contained in New Zealand statute.

The persons who have military style semi-automatic firearms are vetted and licensed civilian gun owners; that should be enough; for it is absurd to say that a person who is not fit and proper to have a military style semi-automatic firearm is none-the-less fit and proper to have a firearm of some other type.

We believe the compliance and support for a practical and rational amendment which heads in the proper and sensible direction of slowly repealing these draconian and unnecessary restrictions on sporting configured semi-automatic firearms would far outweigh the disproportionately loud and irrational arguments of a handful of emotional anti-gun extremists.

61. There is nothing surer that will give the “appearance that the military style semi-automatic firearm laws are being relaxed” than an increase in the population of military style semi-automatic firearms within our borders. The iterations of regulations which will inevitable accompany the proposed amendments will capture more and more sporting firearms into the scope of the military style semi-automatic firearm class; thereby increasing the population of military style semi-automatic firearms.

Airgun importation amendments

62. We observe the admission from police that there are no statistics and evidence to support the view that airguns are being used unlawfully. We submit that good law is evidenced based and that these proposed regulations concerning airguns are founded on nothing more than random supposition. We do not support these amendments.

¹⁷ Inspector Joseph Green, New Zealand Police, ““ARMS CONTROL STRATEGIES. Debunking the myths” 2008

63. We do not accept that members of the general public are able to identify any difference between an airgun that is a replica of a particular firearm and an airgun that is not – but instead just looks generally like a gun. We believe that a member of the public who has the propensity to call police because they have seen an airgun that is a replica of a particular firearm is just as likely to call police after seeing an airgun that is not a replica of a particular firearm. On this basis we argue that the proposed regulation will not provide a solution to the problem at which it is aimed.
64. Other submitters have made recommendations that we are aware of; including education campaigns and increased prosecution for offending with airguns. We support and endorse these measures and oppose the proposed import control which we see as having little merit.

Conclusion and recommendations

65. We reiterate that National Shooters Association would be unable to support the current proposed amendments cited in the Bill; particularly the move to regulate; by orders in council; sporting firearm safety features such as pistol grips. We could not endorse or accept any proposal to regulate safety features such as pistol grips; which directly undermines the first priority of all civilian gun owners and the primary purpose of the Arms Act — firearms safety .
66. If the Bill survives in its current form, we would be obliged to recommend to our members and any other civilian gun owners that in the next election, they vote against members of parliament who support this Bill and seek repeal of the amendments and any regulations promulgated under those amendments.
67. It is important for government to understand that any amendments to arms control laws in New Zealand can only succeed with the agreement, support and cooperation of civilian gun owners.
68. To summarise the sensible and proper legislative changes would be:
 - 68.1. Remove the phrase “military pattern free standing pistol grip” from the military style semi-automatic firearm feature list.
 - 68.2. Reword the definition of military style semi-automatic firearm in a positive context instead of the double negative context.

68.3. Decrease the limit on restricted capacity magazines of centre-fire semi-automatic long arms to 10 rounds.

68.4. Retain and redraft the definition of “sporting configuration”

69. Our agreement with and support of the options proposed by police would see the Bill worded in the following manner:

Military style semi-automatic firearm means any firearm excluding a pistol or restricted weapon, that after being loaded, fires, ejects, and chambers a cartridge with each pull of the trigger, and has any one or more of the following features;

- (a) a folding or telescopic butt:
- (b) a magazine that is capable of holding, or that, by its appearance, indicates that it is capable of holding;
 - (i) in the case of a magazine designed to hold .22 inch rimfire cartridges, more than 15 cartridges; or
 - (ii) in any other case, more than 10 cartridges:
- (c) bayonet lugs:
- (d) a flash suppressor

Sporting style semi-automatic firearm means any firearm that is not otherwise a military style semi-automatic firearm, a pistol or a restricted weapon, that after being loaded, fires, ejects, and chambers a cartridge with each pull of the trigger.

Per National Shooters Association Executive

May 2011