

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- [Sheep Following Sheep](#)
- [Our View](#)
- [Will Politicians Pay?](#)

**IN OTHER NEWS**

**Classes of Registration**

Last week we told you the Federation had sent a letter to the Mr Bickers, the Chairman of the Plumbers Gasfitters and Drainlayers Board requesting consultation on the Classes of Registration.

We would like to thank Mr Bickers for his prompt response which follows:

*Dear Mr Gordon*

***Classes of Registration***

*Thank you for your letter of 22 November 2013 proposing changes to the registration classes.*

*I am aware that this is a matter that has been discussed in the course of the qualifications review and that your Federation had been participating in that.*

*I will arrange for your letter to go before the Board at a future meeting, with the suggestion that a small deputation from the Federation be invited to attend the meeting and speak to your proposal.*

*I will ask the Chief Executive to contact you*

**Sheep Following Sheep**



It looks like the National Party dominated Regulation Review Committee is going to continue to drag the chain and not pursue the Federation's complaint regarding Continuing Professional Development (CPD).

Chairperson Maryan Street (Labour Party), Deputy-Chairperson Katrina Shanks (National Party), Member Andrew Little (Labour Party), Member Ian McKelvie (National Party Rangatiki) and Member Mike Sabin (National Party Northland), have stated in a letter to the Federation that a full investigation of the complaints received since 2012 is not warranted in that the complaints received are very similar in nature to previous complaints.

They went on to state that the previous RRC conducted a full examination of an earlier complaint from the Federation raising very similar matters to those identified in the recent complaints which culminated in it reporting to the House in February 2011. Now why were they reported to the House? Oh that's right, the regulations failed in a number of areas!

This has happened to us before – a situation where the RRC has fobbed us off and then later has reviewed the complaint. Last time it resulted in the Government having to change the law of the country to correct the situation and then the RRC put out its conclusion of the complaint once the Government had already taken action.

They are stating these complaints are similar to previous ones which went before the House. You'll remember the two, as they are the recommendations that the Government voted against, one of which has already returned to bite them in the arse with regard to fees. If everyone had done their jobs right then, instead of following like sheep, the recent Plumbers Gasfitters and Drainlayers Amendment Bill probably wouldn't have been required.

Now this RRC is saying recent complaints are of a similar nature to the previous ones, which we know were reported to the House, so if they were wrong then and the Government chose to vote against them, then it would stand that they are still wrong - and what is more, in our opinion, the RRC is failing in its duty.

This just reeks of political interference - but not to worry - it will be egg on the face of the RRC and the Government once again when it is proved in other arenas or the Courts that they have again got it wrong. We believe a new complaint about new regulations should be reviewed anew not looked at based on previous decisions. It

*early in the New Year with a view to arranging a mutually convenient Board meeting for you to attend.*

*Yours sincerely*

*Alan Bickers Board*

*Chairman.*

The Federation will attend the meeting and put a case forward for the consultation.

If you have any views on Registration Classes please send them to us for inclusion in the discussions.

Ask yourself do the current Licensing and Certifying classes meet our needs?

#### Letters to the Editor



#### Sponges

Police are arming themselves with sponges to help clean up the streets.

Do they not know that sponges don't work?

The plumbing, gasfitting and drainlaying industry has had sponges on its Board for years and they haven't cleaned up bugger all.

Have a great week and keep up the good work.

#### Dear Editor

Regarding your article on free accreditation to the Board's CPD Scheme; I find this totally disgusting that our money is being used to support people who are providing

really places into question the status and worth of the RRC. Another function of legislation put in place for the protection of the public that has been hijacked for political advantage rather than what is right.

It's appears more about following the "party line" than about what is right. It looks like it is left up to the industry to prove the wrong doings, and then the bodies put in place for our protection step in and take action.

The John Banks saga is another good example where it took a citizen to take a private prosecution before the people who should have been taking the prosecution stepped up and said they would take over.

#### Our View



The second article giving you our view on issues affecting the industry. These views are again based on the current situation because as we know, a lot of people in positions of authority in this industry have their hidden agendas and operate on a secret

society basis.

This week; do submissions and participation in consultation get listened to? What does it mean if people don't have their say? Is silence a yes?

It seems to us that the industry has had enough of "consultation" over the last decade - but it's not so much the task of "consultation" but more the fact that nothing seems to be improving. The perception is there is a predetermined direction the consultation takes, and if that direction isn't achieved then it is re-consulted on so the direction can be achieved.

A lot of the consultation looks like a fishing expedition to see what views the industry has so the Board can plan ways to combat arguments and other lines of thought should they arise.

Look at Continuing Professional Development (CPD). It was rejected during initial consultation so the Board re-consulted and it was rejected again, however they made a compromise with Master Plumbers and accepted their version of the system, despite the numbers. Reports seem to indicate that the Board took the view that if people didn't respond to consultation then it could be taken that they supported the activity.

This same attitude has carried over to the recent consultation on qualifications where some on the panel have viewed the poor attendance at consultation as being support for the recommendations and direction.

It seems that anyone who opposes consultation is a malcontent, a stirrer or whatever you want to call them, due to them having a different view. Just because people are on a panel or a board

training as a profit making venture.

I took time to count the courses provided by Master Plumbers, who I am not a member of, and they have about 30 courses. This would have cost them about \$6,000.00 for accreditation.

Now that I have paid for the re-accreditation of courses, do I get a discount?

It seems to me that the Board are a bit like the Government who buy votes at election time to get people to like them so they can keep their jobs.

#### A week in the Federation

This has been a very busy week for the Federation where committee members have:

- been interviewed by investigators from the Ombudsman's office,
- have placed a considerable submission with the Office of the Auditor General,
- have spoken to and provided advice to Bill English's office as a result of a Federation member laying a complaint with his office
- and a small delegation went to parliament and met with a member of the opposition to discuss Tertiary training and other industry issues.

Thanks to all those involved for your time and efforts.

doesn't mean that they are better than anyone else or that their views are right. Last time we looked we still lived in a democracy although it is somewhat restricted by some who believe their position places them above others.

For silence to be a yes in consultation there would need to be ultimate trust in those in the decision making positions. Those people would need to be voted in by the industry, not appointed by the people determining the direction.

Consultation should be more than an administrative task; it should be meaningful and representative of industry opinion.

#### Will Politicians Pay?

We as an industry fund: the investigation of missing cylinder straps; tradespeople not being supervised; failing to buy Continuing Professional Development points and continuing to operate in the industry we are qualified to work in, and the list of minor infringements goes on.

We wonder if the politicians are going to pay a percentage of their wages for the investigations into:

- leaks of the GCSB report,
- withholding information from parliamentary inquiries,
- allegations that a list MP threatened to get the Prime Minister's office involved to have a waiter sacked,
- allegations of breaking the law during by elections,
- abuse of travel perks,
- abuse of Parliamentary privilege
- not to forget corruption, bribery and perverting the course of justice and
- allegations of electoral fraud.

Are all the PGD Board members going to pay a fee for the costs involved in proving they unlawfully took money from the industry and the changing of the law to cover their arse?

All these discipline and incompetence issues caused by the people who look down on us and say we are incompetent because we don't buy CPD points and prove at least three times a year that we are competent.

Whatever happened to leading by example?

