

Dear Kiri,

Thank you for circulating the Interim Report and related consultation papers.

In my view, the *National Construction Code* and the various Building Acts across Australia are sound in their drafting.

The problem is not with the framework, but with the execution of those Acts.

Matters that properly belong in Heritage should remain under Heritage, Education matters under Education, Building matters under Building, and Workplace Relations under Workplace Relations.

Blurring these boundaries creates confusion, duplication, and unnecessary disputes.

The *Home Building Contracts Act 1991 (WA)* is one example where the framework remains relevant, but the pricing thresholds are outdated and no longer reflect contemporary market conditions.

That is a practical adjustment, not a structural flaw.

If governments are serious about competition policy and productivity, the priority should be in applying the law consistently and competently, rather than creating new prescriptive layers midstream.

Finally, while we debate technical reforms, the broader reality is that Australia faces a housing affordability crisis.

Spending \$146 billion on housing supply and delivery would do far more for national resilience and WA's trade with its largest partner than allocating that sum to AUKUS.

Warm regards,



Gordon Morton MAIB AFAIM
ADR Practitioner