



**New Zealand House of Representatives**  
Te Whare Māngai o Aotearoa

**Economic Development, Science and Innovation Committee**  
Komiti Whiriwhiri Take Whanaketanga Ōhanga, Take Pūtaiao,  
Take Atamaitanga

54th Parliament  
August 2025

---

## **Consumer Guarantees (Right to Repair) Amendment Bill**

39—1

---

Presented to the House of Representatives  
by Dr Parmjeet Parmar, Chairperson

## Contents

Recommendation.....	3
Introduction .....	3
Legislative scrutiny.....	3
Submissions received on the bill .....	3
Our consideration.....	4
Appendix.....	6
Committee procedure.....	6
Committee members.....	6
Related resources.....	6

# Consumer Guarantees (Right to Repair) Amendment Bill

## Recommendation

The Economic Development, Science and Innovation Committee has examined the Consumer Guarantees (Right to Repair) Amendment Bill and recommends by majority that the bill not be passed.

## Introduction

The Consumer Guarantees (Right to Repair) Amendment Bill is a Member's bill in the name of Hon Marama Davidson. The bill would amend the Consumer Guarantees Act 1993 to increase consumers' rights in regard to the repair of consumer goods. It aims to extend the lifetime of consumer products, thereby reducing waste. To achieve this, it would:

- retain requirements for manufacturers to make repair facilities, parts, software, tools, and information available to consumers
- allow consumers to request that goods be repaired, rather than replaced
- prevent the use of unauthorised repairers and parts from voiding manufacturers' guarantees.

## Legislative scrutiny

As part of our consideration of the bill, we have examined its consistency with principles of legislative quality. We have no issues regarding the legislation's design to bring to the attention of the House.

## Submissions received on the bill

We received 1,250 submissions and heard oral evidence from 42 submitters. More than 95 percent of submitters supported the bill and its general aims. We thank submitters for taking the time to share their opinions on the bill. A full summary of submissions, along with comments and advice from the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, is available in the departmental report on the bill, which is published on the Parliament website.

Of those that supported the bill, nearly two-thirds supported the bill as introduced, while others recommended changes. Many submitters considered that the bill would reduce waste and costs, remove barriers to repairs, strengthen the repair sector, increase consumer control and safety, and help New Zealand stay aligned with international jurisdictions with similar legislation. Submitters recommended a range of changes to the bill, including widening or narrowing the range of products and sectors affected by the bill, and changes or clarifications to how consumer guarantees would work in practice.

Less than 2 percent of submitters opposed the bill, while a few did not clearly state whether they opposed or supported it. Submitters opposed to the bill voiced concerns about negative

commercial effects, unintended consequences, health and safety, and the complexity of implementing the bill. Some agreed with the bill's general objectives, but disagreed with the bill's approach.

## **Our consideration**

During our consideration of the bill, we explored possible amendments and instructed the Parliamentary Counsel Office to draft a revision-tracked version of the bill. We were unable to agree on whether to recommend amendments to the bill. We therefore report the bill to the House without amendments.

## **Differing view of the New Zealand Labour Party and the Green Party of Aotearoa New Zealand**

This bill is about reducing the cost of living for ordinary New Zealanders who want to repair their appliances, tools, bikes, and other everyday items instead of having to buy new. It would also enable important amendments proposed by Labour at the next stage to ensure that independent mechanics can repair cars, farm machinery, and tractors at a fair price, rather than leaving these repairs in the hands of manufacturers and their preferred service networks. The right to repair is both a consumer right and an economic policy that supports families, small businesses, and communities.

The opposition members support the Right to Repair Bill. We believe that strengthening consumers' ability to repair goods, and ensuring repair services and information are accessible, will deliver enduring benefits for households, reduce waste, and support local businesses. We also support amendments that make such legislation cross-partisan so that it endures beyond the term of any single Government, and to improve the effectiveness of the legislation for manufacturers, retailers, and consumers. This is the best way to ensure that the right to repair becomes a settled feature of our consumer protection law.

However, opposition members must record serious concerns about the way this committee has conducted its work on this bill. Standing Orders and the commentary in *Parliamentary Practice* (Wilson)<sup>1</sup> are clear: select committees exist to scrutinise legislation in a manner that promotes collegiality and allows members of all parties to contribute constructively. The differing view provisions in SO 249 and section 33.4 of *Parliamentary Practice* were created to protect minority and divergent views, but also sit within a wider expectation that committee processes are conducted in good faith, with open exchange and mutual respect between Government and opposition members.

In this case, members of all parties engaged extensively with potential amendments, including options that were not initiated by the member in charge of the bill and were not supported by all Government members. Opposition members participated in this work in the reasonable expectation that such engagement was aimed at building genuine cross-party agreement.

The result was otherwise. The committee spent significant time, and drew on the resources of Parliamentary Counsel and departmental advisors, to explore and draft changes to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*, Fifth Edition, David Wilson.

resolve the concerns of Government members that they then ultimately chose not to support. That decision is of course within their rights. But when extensive collaborative work is undertaken with the tacit implication that it might secure support, only for that support to be withheld, the effect is to undermine trust between members. It also risks the perception that the process was used to keep the committee occupied rather than to improve the bill, at a cost to the public purse.

We believe that there should be concern that members were required to prepare differing views before members' voting intentions were made known. This meant that, at a point when there was still apparent consensus, opposition members were directed to prepare for a dissent that on the information available was not required. We believe this is not consistent with the spirit of good faith engagement that Standing Orders seek to promote, nor with the committee responsibility under *Parliamentary Practice* to "ensure that the legitimate expectations of Government and non-Government members are accommodated" (Wilson).

To demonstrate the extent of the committee's work, and to acknowledge the significant areas where cross-partisan consensus was achieved in principle if not in the final vote, opposition members believe that the amended version of the bill prepared by Parliamentary Counsel for the committee's consideration should be appended to this report. That was voted down by majority. Including this text here is the only way to provide transparency for the public and the House, and will show that there were substantive, workable proposals that commanded broad support during the committee's deliberations, even if those agreements were ultimately not reflected in the Government members' votes.

The Green member in charge of the bill intends to move the changes made in the amended version as Amendment Papers should the bill advance to later stages, to ensure that a strong right to repair framework that is workable for manufacturers, retailers, and consumers can pass into law. Opposition members reaffirm that the right to repair deserves careful, good faith, cross-party development so that it endures. We urge all members to treat the select committee process as an opportunity to work together, not merely as a stage in the numbers game of parliamentary politics.

## Appendix

### Committee procedure

The Consumer Guarantees (Right to Repair) Amendment Bill was referred to the committee on 19 February 2025. The closing date for submissions was 3 April 2025. We received and considered submissions from 1,250 interested groups and individuals. We heard oral evidence from 42 submitters.

We received advice on the bill from the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. The Office of the Clerk provided advice on the bill's legislative quality. The Parliamentary Counsel Office assisted with legal drafting.

### Committee members

Dr Parmjeet Parmar (Chairperson)  
Dr Hamish Campbell  
Reuben Davidson  
Hon Peeni Henare (from 12 March 2025)  
Hon Willie Jackson (until 12 March 2025)  
Cushla Tangaere-Manuel (from 12 March 2025)  
Tanya Unkovich (until 26 June 2025)  
Dr Vanessa Weenink  
Helen White (until 12 March 2025)  
Arena Williams (from 14 May 2025)  
Scott Willis  
Dr David Wilson (from 16 July 2025)

Hon Marama Davidson and Ricardo Menéndez-March replaced Scott Willis for parts of our consideration.

### Related resources

The documents that we received as advice and evidence are available on the [Parliament website](#).