

BUILDING SERVICES (REGISTRATION) BILL 2010

Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon Brian Ellis) in the chair; Hon Simon O'Brien (Minister for Commerce) in charge of the bill.

Clause 1: Short title —

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I want to bring to the attention of the house a matter that has come to me by way of correspondence from a gentleman who is working at Bencubbin. Like many other people in the building industry who have been operating in regional and maybe remote areas and do not have all the formal qualifications to be a builder but in fact have, over time, operated as builders in those communities, he is concerned about where his future lies. I want to take this opportunity to read into the Parliament the concerns he expressed in his correspondence, because that might just clarify one of the difficulties when we come to the issue about the registration categories—whether it is practitioners or contractors—and what happens to those people who have some accredited training. My correspondent, Mr Ian Sanders, earned an apprenticeship a long time ago. But, in a sense, for the past 20 years he has been operating over and above his trade qualification because he has taken on painting and has become known as the local builder. I want to put on the public record some of the concerns expressed by Mr Ian Sanders from Sanders Building Pty Ltd, 20 Hammond Street, Bencubbin. He wrote to me as shadow minister on 21 January about the Builders' Registration Act and the Painters' Registration Act. His letter reads —

I would like to express my interest in the new bill regarding the Builders Registration and Painters Registration Act. It has been brought to my attention that after building in the Mount Marshall area for the past 11 years which is 280kms north east of Perth and never having to be a registered builder or painter that this may change in the not too distant future.

I completed my apprenticeship in Carpentry and Joinery 20 years ago and have established a well reputable business in Bencubbin. I became a registered business in 2000. I have a contract with the Department of Treasury and Finance to complete any building or painting requirements for the schools and police stations in the area. I also do all of the building and maintenance requirements for the local Shire, Shire of Mt Marshall. My business has just completed building two houses from start to finish for the shire and is currently preparing to build two more for a local business.

The reality is that painting is about 25–30% of my work and jobs over \$20,000 are around 50% so as you can see that's a huge % of my working week gone.

As my reputation and business has grown, I have employed two apprentices, one a very young competent male and the other a mature age apprentice that wishes to further his career in the building industry. They are only in their first year and if they could not continue with myself would have to move from the district to finish their apprenticeships as there is no other builder in the area.

My concerns are that if I was to apply for the Builders Registration and was rejected on the grounds that I needed to seek further training, my business would suffer and two apprentices would lose their jobs. One of my apprentices has a family which also means they would have to move for employment. The local community will also suffer as anyone including local government will have to employ registered builders or painters from Perth, thus increasing the cost dramatically.

I do not understand how in the last 11 years I can be trading and doing all aspects of building and then all of a sudden need to be a registered builder and painter. I would like to know what happens now, if this new legislation comes in for the Mt Marshall Shire area what happens to my business and my employees??? Are we told we can't trade any more? Does our business have to fold? Does our community suffer?

I have been informed that this will take place in the Mt Marshall area as of the 1st July 2011, is this true? Does this give me sufficient time to obtain my license to keep my business and employees?

I put to the minister that Mr Ian Sanders is not alone. There would be all manner of people operating in the building and construction industry.

Hon Giz Watson interjected.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: In the country; absolutely! I dare say, honourable member, even in the city there would be —

Hon Giz Watson interjected.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: There probably are. That begs the question of whether somebody has been working illegally at a higher level of occupation. For example, these days we recognise prior learning as a legitimate way in which to have one's skills recognised—although there is an abuse of it under the current arrangements in terms of the Minister for Training and Workforce Development bumping up the training figures!

Hon Liz Behjat interjected.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I could not resist it!

We need to allay the concerns of all people in the community—be they in the metropolitan area or in regional areas—who have probably gotten away with operating at a higher level over and above their trade qualifications. I do not say that about the ones operating in regional areas because I understand they were allowed to operate there without those qualifications. What processes will be put in place to make sure there is not a sudden drop in the number of people who can perform these functions? If they cannot perform them in small communities, it will obviously result in a skills shortage; and there will also be a shortage in the metropolitan area if they cannot perform them during a high level of demand for skilled labour. Consequently we need assurances about some of the issues that have been raised by Mr Ian Sanders from Sanders Building Pty Ltd.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The member is right. We expect there will be a substantial number of people—an indeterminate number in fact—in that position wanting answers to those questions. I point out for the member's benefit that the Builders' Registration Act currently does not cover all areas of the state. Generally it covers Perth and the south west land division as well as most major towns throughout the remainder of the state.

I will deal with the builders aspect first. This bill will extend coverage to the whole of the state—in some places for the first time. Therefore, builders and painters in all areas of the state will be required to be registered for the first time unless they are exempt. Because there is a need to examine the issues raised by the member and by Mr Sanders in his correspondence, the Building Commission will be going about this slowly and in a genuinely transitional way. It is not intended that everyone be registered from day one.

In other words, from the commencement date we are looking to phase in the various areas of the state gradually, having regard to particular circumstances. I note for example the real-life world out there, which is that Sanders Building might be the only one around and it has been doing a good job. We are here to facilitate things, not to unnecessarily restrict them. Therefore, builders in regional areas will not be required to be registered if the work they carry out does not require a building permit. Although requirements to take out a building permit vary across local government areas, some broad requirements apply in all areas. For example, the current \$20 000 threshold on the value of building work before the building work must be carried out by a registered builder will be one of the key requirements before a building permit is required across all areas of the state. There is likely to be a significant number of currently unregistered builders operating in regional areas who will be required to obtain registration under the building registration legislation. A number of those builders are not likely to have the qualification or experience to meet the registration requirements applying in other areas of the state. Therefore, to accommodate that, because I agree with the member that it is desirable that we do, upon commencement of the act it is proposed that registration requirements will not apply in those regional areas where they did not apply under the former act for a period of at least 12 months or more. That is the first thing. During that period, the Building Commission will research and consult on the best means to transition unregistered builders in these areas into the registration system, including the option of developing a new registration class or classes. With that in mind, what is actively being contemplated by the Building Commission is a sort of tier system so that we do not impose some sort of one-size-fits-all centralised regime onto the various systems that have grown up all over rural and regional Western Australia. As minister, I put on the record that I understand and agree with the spirit of what the honourable member raised, and I will ensure that what I have said is going to happen will happen. The member can hold me accountable to it, but I know that the Building Commission officers also get it; they understand the real world as well.

Painters will not be required to be registered for any painting work carried out that is valued at \$1 000 or less, which is an increase on the current \$200 threshold. Again, there is likely to be a significant number of currently unregistered painters operating in regional areas who will be required to obtain registration under the building registration legislation. A number of those painters are not likely to have the qualification or experience to meet the registration requirements applicable in other areas of the state. To accommodate that, the Building Commission is also contemplating a similar transitional period and processes to those I have just outlined for builders.

I notice that Hon Giz Watson is listening very intently. I suspect she is probably the only registered builder in this place. Hon Giz Watson has no idea what a comfort it is to see her nodding occasionally as I am saying these words—not nodding off, she is listening closely and nodding in agreement, I think. That is encouraging because, as I said during my second reading reply, we want a system that does a range of things; protects the interests of consumers, reinforces and retains appropriate standards, but not in such a way that it gets in the way of people

going about their business and providing those services to all our constituents. Those things needed to be balanced. Sure, the house realises, I think, that we need regulation but it has to be implemented in a way that recognises the real world and addresses the concerns that the member has brought to my attention through Mr Sanders. I hope the member is satisfied with what I have said.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I am very unsatisfied because, for a start, Mr Sanders is not a qualified builder or a qualified painter; he has an apprenticeship in carpentry and joinery that he got 20 years ago. The minister is saying that this requirement will not apply to jobs in regional areas that do not require a building permit. I would say that most councils, irrespective of how small they are, probably require a building permit for a house. Councils may not require a building permit for a pig shed or something, but I think in this day and age even for a pig shed or something, they probably will, so there is an issue.

The second point made by the minister was that the provisions would not apply to painting jobs valued at less than \$1 000. Quite frankly, they would have to be very small jobs to be valued at less than \$1 000. I am concerned because, from what the minister has told me, this man's livelihood—I do not even know Mr Sanders—is far from certain. It looks as if he will be picking up scrappy jobs around the place trying to make ends meet, because councils require building permits and \$1 000 jobs are not particularly good jobs. I am a bit surprised that regional members have not jacked up about this issue; I am very concerned about it. Either the minister has missed something or I have missed something, but the issue is very concerning.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Let me have another go because I would hate to have an unsatisfied customer! I will not give up while we are on clause 1! The categories of registration contemplated in this bill are for a building service practitioner and a building service contractor. Just previously I used the terms in the example of the transition for builders because that is who we currently have registered. I have also used painters as an example, because they are the other people affected by these bills. But a whole range of other building service contractors—they might be a chippie or something else—will be registered to provide building services so that life goes on and does so with the reassurance for consumers that they are dealing with someone who has achieved a certain level of registration as a building service practitioner. That registration process will be extremely flexible and have regard for the established disciplines or experience exhibited by the person applying for, or bound by, the registration. The member is probably looking for a problem where we are not trying to create one. I am certainly not looking for a fight about this with Mr Sanders or anybody else. The fact of the matter is that qualified or semi-qualified people who are unregistered and working will neatly fold over and continue what they are doing under the new regime. As the process matures and develops, they will do so in a way that is steadily transitional and has regard for the specific circumstances of the Mr Sanders of the world. I do not see what further guarantee I can give. I think what I have said goes a long way and if the member is not satisfied by it, I am very sorry.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I have a question regarding the workforce planning that was done. Did the minister think about how many jobs might be created through this process of registration? This question may be more relevant to the Building Bill when we talk about the fact that we have private surveyors, but it also relates to the question raised regarding the transition between the old system and the new system. The minister has said that he is looking at professionalising the current workforce. My advice has been that the educational opportunities for registered builders have been limited. Does the minister have any idea of how many jobs might be created through this system, and is the technical and further education system gearing up to provide that training, or to provide assessments for recognition of prior learning, so that people are able to acquire these professional qualifications that we are talking about?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The changes that we are seeking to make here are not about creating jobs per se; however, they will create a stronger sector and provide more meaningful jobs. It is the wide experience of those involved in the building sector that the end goal of registration does work in encouraging apprentices and trainees to stick to their program and to reach that goal, and I think that is very positive. It will also strengthen the standing and self-worth of the participants in the industry if they know that they will have the security of registration. One thing I did not know previously, which I have learned in this role, is that a lot of trades in this state are not registered. That includes roof tilers, floor tilers and roof carpenters—all sorts of people. When people in those trades come here from other states where they need to be registered or licensed and say, "Where can I get registered so that I can work here?", they are appalled to find that they do not need to be registered here, because they see registration as a reinforcement of their standing and their qualifications, and as their guarantee that they will be able to provide their services at a higher technical standard to an appreciative consumer body. Therefore, from the sector's point of view, that is the positive reinforcement that we will get out of registration. Also, from the consumers' point of view, I am sure that all those attributes and strengths will be appreciated and will increase consumer confidence. As part of the process, some moneys have been allocated by the Building Commission to Central TAFE to assist with some of its education programs, I think for building surveyors. As I have said, strictly speaking, no jobs are targeted to be created through these bills. However, as

our economy grows, more jobs will be created in this sector, which through this legislation will become healthier and better structured than it might otherwise have been.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: When we look at a sustainable future and the transition to energy-efficient buildings, one of the jobs that will be very important is the assessment of whether energy efficiency standards have been met. This is what we would see as a new green job in the new green economy. Will there be any opportunity under this new building registration regime to encourage job creation in those industries in which people are learning new skills about the thermal properties of building materials and the ways in which we can improve the energy efficiency of buildings?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I thank the member for that; I will take the comments on board. By way of brief response, as the member points out, it is a sign of the times and a sign of our need to develop and adapt new systems that there are new occupations such as sustainability assessors. Whether those or other classes of newish occupations are actually captured under this system is something for which we have built-in flexibility so that we can. We can do that by regulation. Whether it is sustainability assessors, tilers, cabinet-makers or something else, there is the prospect for this system to grow and serve it. Again, to get into any further discussion on job creation is probably going a little bit beyond registration and clause 1 of the bill.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Claims as to registration —

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I notice that clause 5(1) and (2) and clause 6(1) state —

A person must not advertise, or otherwise hold out or imply, that the person is registered ...

Why was that included and how can that be proven in a court of law? Who will make that determination? We know whether someone has advertised or not, but how would we know that they have held out or implied?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: My advice is that the term “hold out or imply”, as opposed to advertising, which is clearly understood, indicates a first-person representation, either face to face or over the phone or by letter. The commission would in this case, as it would in having to prove any offence, have to rely on taking the matter to a court and the court determining whether or not that element was proven.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I am only asking because I have never seen this in legislation in the 14 years that I have been in this place, and I do not know, firstly, how the commission could determine that somebody has held out or that somebody has implied something to another party. Let me give an example: there is a debate in another place about good faith and the provisions of good faith in terms of, let us say, lease agreements or franchises. There is huge debate around whether courts will be able to understand what we mean by “good faith”. If the courts do not understand what is meant by good faith as a legal principle, how on earth are they going to understand the legal principle of holding out and implying between two parties in relation to a claim of registration?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Yes, I am well aware that the expression “good faith” has been kicked about in other quarters, but that is not what we are dealing with now.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: It was just a comparison.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: It is my advice that the terms used are fairly common in consumer protection-type laws; for example, we might find them in matters dealing with real estate transactions. My advice is that it is not perceived that there will be any common problems with these matters being understood by a court, and a court, of course, is obviously the place that will have to determine whether these matters exist or not.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I do not want to make a big deal of this, but can the minister advise the chamber whether a determination has ever been made by a court about this holding out or implying; and, if so, can we have a look at that? I do not mean now.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The matter would have to be researched; there is no information immediately to hand.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: It can't be too common then!

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: No, no; the provision, as a statutory provision, is not uncommon. Not being a practitioner, I do not know how common it is for the matter to be tested in courts. I would be guessing, but I would imagine it would be more a case of false advertising that would probably be tested in a court. I cannot advise the member whether this has been tested in a court. We can see whether there is case law and refer it to the member, but I will have to take it outside these proceedings if the member wishes me to follow it up.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Yes, I do; that would be very kind.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I undertake to do that. My advisers appreciate being given the work!

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Well, it should not be hard because you have told me that there are lots of them!

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: No, we are here to help; we are from the government, remember!

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 15 put and passed.

Clause 16: Application for registration by a person whose registration has been cancelled —

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Clause 16(2) states that a disqualified person cannot apply for registration for a period of three months after the cancellation of the person's registration. Firstly, why is it only three months? It seems almost pointless to deregister somebody if, after three months, they can re-register again. Secondly, do they have to go through the whole process of re-registration—that is, pay the fees and do the whole thing again?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I will deal with the second matter first: they have to go through the process and pay their registration application fee and what have you for all of those processes. Parliamentary counsel has contemplated, through this clause, a minimum period of three months, which does seem rather short, even though they would have to go through the process of re-registering. This will leave it open to the State Administrative Tribunal to order that someone be deregistered. I think SAT would specify a period before which one cannot reapply, which might be one year, two years or five years, so the option of three months is the bare minimum to take into account any circumstances that might justify that. It gives us that flexibility. I point out that once a person has been disqualified, the board cannot grant an application for registration or re-register a disqualified person without SAT's approval. The process for doing that, if such approval is required, is that it will be sought by the Building Commission on behalf of the board. In other words, it will go off to SAT and ask whether it is all right if it considers re-registering this person. There are some checks and balances there.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 17 to 25 put and passed.

Clause 26: When Board may amend, suspend or cancel registration —

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Division 4, and this clause specifically, deals with amendment, suspension and cancellation of registration. I notice that the board can do each of those three things. Were these provisions in place prior to this legislation, and under what circumstances would the board amend, suspend or cancel, or has that not been worked out and is subject to regulation?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: These provisions are not presently contained in law, so this is probably an improvement that we now have them. In the case of the board amending, suspending or cancelling a registration, I am advised that this is not contemplated as a disciplinary measure but will be at the building service provider's request. For example, an amendment because of a clerical error or something; a suspension of the registration perhaps because the principal might be going overseas for an extended period and they do not want to have to comply with various requirements; or they are going out of business or whatever.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: As the minister knows, I am a reasonable person and that sounds pretty reasonable to me.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The member's reasonableness knows no bounds.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 27 to 31 put and passed.

Clause 32: Notification of change of address —

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Division 6 deals with offences relating to registration. Clauses 32 to 37 deal with a series of offences and charges. The penalties for a breach seem to be quite high. For example, clause 32(1) states —

A registered building service provider must give the Board written notice of any change to any of the addresses that are recorded in the register in relation to the provider.

The penalty for not notifying the board is \$5 000. Clause 33(1) states —

A registered building service provider must give the Board written notice of any change to the circumstances of the provider that affect the eligibility of the provider to remain registered.

The penalty is \$10 000; and so on and so forth. I made the comment during my speech on the second reading that this looks like a licence to print money. I am alarmed at the fairly punitive nature of parts of this legislation. I

want to know whether these offences are new offences, whether they existed before and whether these penalties are new penalties that are now being applied for the first time.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I am advised that the provisions before us and the nature of the offences reflect modern current practice, obviously more closely than the 1939 provisions. There are some pre-existing offences, such as notification of change of address, whereas I think notification of change in eligibility is a new one. Some of the provisions are pre-existing and some are new to reflect the changed program but all are relevant. My attention was also drawn to the quantum of the fines.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich interjected.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: No. Whilst reading the bill, I thought they sounded pretty stiff. The penalty for non-notification of change of address was \$10 000, not \$5 000 as set out in the bill. I think the initial amounts contemplated in clauses 35 and 36 was also \$10 000 rather than the current \$5 000. That was talked through with the industry during discussions and consultation over a period. I understand that industry is generally happy with the changes that have been made, bearing in mind that any on-the-spot infringement penalty would be one-tenth of that. In talking to builders—I have been talking to a lot of them in the context of these bills—they have said that anything less than \$500 is a waste of their time.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Do they want to have more?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I had to say, “No, that’s enough.” Seriously, though, if there was going to be a consequence —

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: How much did they want to pay really?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The point is that anything less than that would be meaningless in the context of a one-size-fits-all penalty. That was the spirit of what was being explained. I am pretty confident with that. I looked at the penalties as they stand now, just as the member did, and thought they looked pretty stiff. I sat down with builders’ representatives and apparently everyone is prepared to accept these new penalties.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I also note that fine because when I undertook consultation, that is exactly what the building surveyor advised me. He said that a penalty of \$10 000 for not notifying the commission of a change of address was a bit steep but that half that amount would not be as bad. I was delighted to see that between the time this bill was introduced in the Assembly and the Council the amount of the fine had been reduced, which is good.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I am glad that the surveyor said that the penalty of \$5 000 was not as bad as a penalty of \$10 000.

Hon Simon O'Brien: That would be the maximum penalty imposed by the court.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That does not mean that the builders are happy; the surveyor just said that the penalty of \$5 000 was not as bad as a penalty of \$10 000. The minister said that some of these penalties are new and that others have been used in other provisions. The minister will not be able to do it now, but perhaps he can provide us with a schedule showing which penalties existed previously and which are new, and also how much they were and how much they are now. I do not mean the change in the penalty from \$10 000 to \$5 000; I want to know how much were they in the other regulations or acts.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Yes, we can do that. We could have provided that information earlier if the member had sought it earlier. We are making good progress and I am inferring from the member’s indications so far that this is not a point upon which the support of the bill relies. I will have to come back another day to provide the member with that information. Perhaps we could provide it at the third reading stage.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: That would be great.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I undertake to do that.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 33 to 39 put and passed.

Clause 40: When owner–builder approval is required —

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I move —

Page 25, lines 22 to 27 — To delete the lines and insert —

40. When owner-builder approval may be applied for

- (1) An owner may apply for approval under this Part (*owner-builder approval*) before obtaining a building permit to carry out owner-builder work on the owner's land if the owner proposes to be named as the builder on the building permit.

This amendment removes the requirement for an owner to seek owner-builder approval in all circumstances before obtaining a building permit. It removes the unintended restrictions on registered building service contractors from being owner-builders, if they wish, and the unintended requirement to get owner-builder approval when a registered building contractor would not be required for the work.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 41 to 44 put and passed.

Clause 45: Decision on application for approval —

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I move —

Page 28, lines 13 to 16 — To delete the lines and insert —

- (e) the applicant has complied with each other requirement prescribed by the regulations for the grant of an owner-builder approval.

The intent of the amendment is to remove the requirement for an approved owner-builder to reside on the land on which the building work is carried out. This amendment is required because some types of owner-builder works are carried out on commercial or industrial properties where it is not appropriate for the owner to reside on the land. We just want to correct that.

Hon KATE DOUST: I have an interest in this; I have a neighbour who has been working as an owner-builder on her property for more than three years and has had no end of trouble. If an owner-builder is no longer required to live on a property while building or while renovations are occurring, what impact will that have on their insurance? I understand that at the moment, for insurance purposes, they are required to remain on the property.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I do not think this will offer any comfort, unfortunately —

Hon Kate Doust: No, I'm just curious.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: In the vast majority of owner-builder cases, it is a residential property and the requirement, for insurance purposes, might well remain. This amendment is not intended to address that; it is about land that is commercial or industrial and, for zoning reasons—for example, it is in a heavy industry area—it is actually illegal to reside there, so it would be impossible for an owner-builder to do that work. We are just trying to address that anomaly.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 46 to 155 put and passed.

Clause 156: *Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1960* amended —

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I have two related amendments standing at 3/156 and 4/156 on the supplementary notice paper. With the Deputy Chairman's permission I will move them both, if I may, because they are complementary. I move —

Page 84, lines 5 and 6 — To delete —

with a value of \$20 000 or more

Page 84, after line 16 — To insert —

- (2A) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of a building licence for building work —
- (a) with a value of less than \$20 000; or
- (b) that is to be carried out in an area of the State prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this section.

I think members will be glad to support this amendment in view of an earlier discussion that revolved around some correspondence from Mr Sanders.

The proposed amendment to clause 156 sets out the circumstances in which local governments are not to issue building licences—in other words, when a building licence is not required. Those circumstances are when the value of the building work is less than \$20 000 and when the work is carried out in an area of the state prescribed by the regulations. Clause 156 ensures that the requirements for registration as a builder or owner-builder remain as close as possible to those under the current regime. This will have a couple of impacts. Firstly, we have to hold this legislation until the Building Bill is enacted. The other thing that members have probably picked up on is that this is the device whereby we can manage the length of transition in the sorts of circumstances debated earlier. This actually gives substance to the undertakings I gave earlier. I hope the amendment will find favour with members.

Amendments put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 157 to 159 put and passed.

Title put and passed.