











There are so many variables with regards to this section, that again, without the regulations to refer to, it is difficult to make constructive comments.

In summary it is my understanding that the proposed amendments fundamentally introduce the concept that a "tenant" does not need to take any action in the case of a failure of the "lessor". Why is the "tenant" being given such protections? This concept is utterly inequitable.

There is no difference to a lessor having to "take action" to enforce a resolution from "tenants". Laws are created to bring equity and fairness to our society. I am utterly dumbfounded as to why the Government of a free democratic society would attempt to skew the rights of one party to the utter detriment and potential ruin of another? The Government must also bearing in mind that both parties have entered into agreement under their own free will.

Regards