

Master Builders Australia

Submission to the House of Representatives
Standing Committee on Economics

on

*The Parliamentary Inquiry into Impediments to
Business Investment*

11 May 2018



CONTENTS

1	Introduction	3
2	Interaction Between Regulatory Frameworks and Building and Construction Activity	4
	Housing	6
	Infrastructure	9
	Small business regulation	11
3	Taxation Policy and Investment in Building and Construction	13
4	Supplier Payment Times	15
5	Part 5 – Workforce and Industrial Relations Policy	19

This submission is copyright and all rights are reserved. No part of it may be reproduced, stored, transmitted or otherwise distributed, in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of the copyright holder. Images on the cover are winners of Master Builders National Excellence in Building and Construction Awards.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Master Builders Australia (Master Builders) is pleased to provide feedback to the Parliamentary Inquiry into the Impediments to Business Investment.
- 1.2 The construction and property sectors are amongst the most heavily regulated and taxed in the economy. The cumulative impact of regulation is a particular frustration, with inconsistent or duplicated compliance across the different levels of government, between local governments, or across state and territory borders.
- 1.3 This submission focuses on the impediments and impacts of regulations and taxation on the building and construction industry specifically.

2 Background

- 2.1 Master Builders is the nation's peak building and construction industry association which was federated on a national basis in 1890. Master Builders' members are the Master Builder State and Territory Associations. Over 127 years the movement has grown to over 32,000 businesses nationwide, including the top 100 construction companies. Master Builders is the only industry association that represents all three sectors, residential, commercial and engineering construction.
- 2.2 The building and construction industry:
 - Consists of over 370,000 business entities, of which approximately 97% are considered small businesses (fewer than 20 employees);¹
 - Employs close to 1.1 million people (around 1 in every 10 workers) representing the third largest employing industry behind retail and health services;²

¹ ABS, Counts of Australian Businesses, including Entries and Exits, June 2013 to June 2017, Cat. no. 8165.0

² ABS, Labour Force, Australia, Detailed Quarterly, February 2018, Cat, no. 6291.0.55.003

- Represents over 8% of GDP, the second largest sector within the economy;³
- Trains more than half of the total number of trades based apprentices every year, being well over 50,000 apprentices⁴; and
- Performs building work each year to a value of approximately \$200 billion. ⁵

2.3 The construction industry relies heavily on private investment to support activity. This is particularly true for the residential construction industry, with expected private capital investment

2.4 In the last decade private investment in the construction industry exceeded \$2 trillion, contributing:

- more than 2 million extra homes;
- \$435 billion in additional commercial infrastructure;
- around \$320 billion in additional transport infrastructure; and
- supported the largest expansion in resource export capacity in Australia's history. ⁶

3 Interaction Between Regulatory Frameworks and Investment in the Building and Construction Industry

3.1 The building industry is primarily governed by national codes and standards, state and territory building, safety and industrial laws and state, territory and local government planning arrangements. The complexity of the regime,

³ ABS, National Accounts, December 2017, Cat, no. 5206.0

⁴ Master Builders Australia estimates, 2017

⁵ ABS, Building Activity, December 2017, Cat, no. 8752.0

⁶ ABS, Building Activity, December 2017, Cat, no. 8752.0

provides a highly regulated and inefficient operating environment for the building and construction industry.

- 3.2 The sector is also impacted by broader regulatory and compliance arrangements impacting business such as taxation, consumer fairness obligations, environmental standards and regulatory responses to technological change.
- 3.3 There are significant productivity gains that can be achieved from reforming the regulatory environment. For example, productivity benefits from reforms to the National Construction Code over the past few decades were estimated at \$1.1 billion per annum⁷ to the Australian economy.
- 3.4 More still needs to be done around simplifying arrangements for standards and codes; and to harmonise state and territory laws governing the building regime. For example, improvements to the National Construction Code could be made. Layers of regulatory requirements hidden in referenced documents in the National Construction Code reduce clarity, add cost and create uncertainty for the sector.
- 3.5 Master Builders has also recommended for some time improvements to arrangements governing land use, planning and zoning. This includes an assessment of the cumulative cost impacts of regulations levied on building, property and land across the three levels of government.
- 3.6 The most recent Productivity Commission review into national productivity, showed that better functioning cities could yield up to \$29 billion in increased GDP⁸.
 - 3.6.1 Land use regulations that limit the growth of cities mean that Australians increasingly live in places that make it easy to build, rather than places with higher levels of productivity.

⁷ The Centre for International Economics, *Benefits of Building Regulatory Reform from fragmentation to harmonization*, 4 December 2012.

⁸ Productivity Commission, *Shifting the Dial: 5 Year Productivity Review*

- 3.7 Land use controls increase the cost of delivering all kinds of infrastructure, inflate house prices and reduce living standards of ordinary Australians. They are arguably the most costly regulations levied on the economy.
- 3.8 Numerous variations and unnecessary complexity in the regulatory environment add to uncertainty about requirements, greater risk of non-compliance and cost to industry and the consumer.

Building Regulation

- 3.9 Public confidence in building quality has been impacted by incidents like the Grenfell and Lacrosse apartment fires. Governments are responding to public concern by strengthening the regulatory regime. During this process governments need to ensure they are not making the system more complex and less effective.
- 3.10 Numerous reports have concluded that greater harmonisation of building regulations can bring about significant productivity gains. Governments need to act to harmonise where there is a national benefit and to minimise regulatory impact on business. The recent Building Ministers Forum *Building Confidence* report sets out a plan for harmonising compliance and enforcement systems and improving the sectors understanding of the National Construction Code ⁹.
- 3.11 Master Builders recommends industry be engaged early and throughout the implementation of the *Building Confidence* report to ensure reforms can be effectively implemented. Master Builders has advocated in particular for industry to participate and contribute directly to the Building Ministers Forum, so it can address all levels of government collectively in the key forum driving reform.

Housing

- 3.12 A co-ordinated and proactive public policy agenda by Federal, State and Territory, and local Governments is needed to facilitate home ownership. The

⁹ Peter Shergold and Bronwyn Weir, *Building Confidence: Improving the effectiveness of compliance and enforcement systems for the building and construction industry across Australia*, February 2018

cost of a family home has increasingly become unattainable as a confluence of circumstances has worked against would-be Australian homeowners, particularly first home buyers. Housing regulations which limit new supply, create zoning restriction and planning delays are amongst the most significant impediments to home ownership.

3.13 Key factors that have led to a worsening of housing affordability include:

- shortage of available land and inefficient land release strategies;
- infrastructure costs being loaded onto developers and in turn passed on to home owners;
- excessive infrastructure specifications in subdivisions;
- excessive development levies, taxes and charges imposed by State and Territory Governments;
- excessive planning and building requirements;
- regulatory creep pushing codes and standards higher than required; and,
- uncoordinated State/Territory and local Government environmental regulations.

3.14 Master Builders calls on the Federal Government, through a reinvigorated COAG, to provide ex poste 'competitive, efficiency dividend' payments to State, Territory and local Governments for delivering housing affordability policy outcomes against key performance metrics. Master Builders' position is consistent with Recommendation 48 – competition payments, of the Australian Government's Competition White Paper (Harper Review, 2015)¹⁰.

3.15 The housing supply issue has not been resolved. The two key recommendations flowing from the Henry Review's analysis of Australia's housing affordability challenge — free up zoning and planning; and setting

¹⁰ Harper Review, Competition Policy White Paper (2015)

appropriate infrastructure charges (developer charges) must be top priorities for the Federal Government.

- 3.16 Master Builders advocates urgent reform of inefficient and costly infrastructure taxes, charges and levies.
- 3.17 Master Builders research has shown that relaxing zoning restriction in the residential property sector could reduce house prices by 2 per cent, increase new dwelling completions by around 50,000 in over a five years, increase investment by \$1.2 billion, and add more than \$300 million to GDP.¹¹
- 3.18 Some examples of regulations which reduce housing supply include; minimum lot sizes, density restrictions, maximum building heights and delayed or unnecessarily complex planning approvals processes.
- 3.19 Reducing planning delays and lowering developer charges could boost GDP by an additional \$850 million over five years and add \$3 billion to investment.
 - 3.19.1 In Sydney it is estimated that government infrastructure charges alone contribute 12 per cent to the cost of a greenfield housing development and 5 per cent to an infill two bedroom apartment.
 - 3.19.2 Expressed in dollar charges these charges can regularly exceed \$100,000.
 - 3.19.3 Adding the embedded costs of planning delays and regulated land shortages can add an extra \$300,000 to the cost of a new housing development.¹²
- 3.20 Recent research by the Reserve Bank of Australia showed an even greater contribution to land costs. The research estimated that zoning restrictions and planning delays meant that the average land price in Sydney was \$489,000 higher as a result of 'administrative' scarcity. Removing this distortion would

¹¹ Master Builders Australia, Unlocking Supply; Volume 2, consideration of measures aimed at improving housing supply

¹² Master Builders Australia, Unlocking Supply; Volume 2, consideration of measures aimed at improving housing supply

mean that the average house price in Sydney would be \$671,000, rather than \$1.16 million (at the time the research was undertaken).¹³

- 3.21 Removing 'administrative' scarcity construction costs would also make up a much larger share of the final price paid for a new dwellings – from 34 per cent under the current administratively constrained market, to 58 per cent if administrative constraints were removed. Allocating a greater share of costs to building rather than purchasing land is likely to make a significant improvement to the quality of new dwellings.
- 3.22 This research supports the proposition the claim that Australia's most important, and potentially costly regulations are land use controls.

Infrastructure

- 3.23 Master Builders commends the commitment to increased infrastructure spending by the Federal Government and a number of State Governments.
- 3.24 However, the pipeline of major transport projects in our major cities will require a much large commitment from private investors/institutions to deliver at the pace needed to meet the needs of a growing Australian economy and a rapidly growing population.
- 3.25 Master Builders calls for a broader and deeper role for the private sector in infrastructure supply in Australia. This may require a more innovative approach to financing models, or perhaps PPP relationships which include government finance which accounts for the future benefits accrued to government as a result of the infrastructure investment. This should not simply substitute for inadequate public sector infrastructure supply especially in uneconomic (both still fundamentally worthwhile) and/or social infrastructure which is the proper role of government.

¹³ Reserve Bank of Australia, The Effect of Zoning on Housing Prices, Research Discussion Paper, RPD 2018-03

- 3.26 We are seeing a greater focus by government on establishing new mechanisms for financing infrastructure through concessional loans and equity in major infrastructure projects.
- 3.27 Governments may look to encourage superannuation companies into infrastructure assets, whether by purchasing existing infrastructure assets (that is, privatisation; with revenues being used for ‘capital recycling’); and/or funding the creation of net new infrastructure assets (‘additionality’), either directly or indirectly (through the purchase of special purpose tradeable financial instruments).
- 3.28 However we would firmly recommend against any mandated requirement for superannuation companies to invest in any specific asset class. The primary function of Australia’s superannuation industry is to provide retirement incomes for superannuation fund holders, with investment strategies and practices of superannuation institutions directed solely toward delivering the optimal risk-return outcomes for fund holders.
- 3.29 Master Builders calls for a two pronged policy approach for improving the financing of Australia’s infrastructure needs, by the:
- public sector – increased direct financing of public economic and social infrastructure, with incentives for state and territory governments to use funds from the sale of existing assets over debt financing;
 - private sector – identifying and then actioning market-based opportunities, for example, in matching the demand-side (infrastructure providers) with the supply-side (financial institutions and other interested investors); and
 - look into alternate PPP financing relationships to encourage private sector engagement. For example through better value capture models, transit orientated development, or better land use strategies. City Deals are ideally placed to deliver new approaches because formal agreements are established between the levels of government who collectively can deliver better outcomes and test new mechanisms for planning and investment.

3.30 Key elements of the policy which are properly the function of the Government/ public sector include:

- increasing the direct public sector spending on key non-defence related economic and social infrastructure (across all levels of Government) to at least 6 per cent of GDP by 2020;
- minimising bid-costs for infrastructure provision/financing to ensure the broadest possible range of engagement by potential investors (including simplified and streamlined processes for smaller investors in infrastructure);
- minimising the political risk, in particular ‘start-stop’ decision-making, and changing the processes, rules or other key elements of a project once underway;
- expanding the use of capital recycling and privatisations, or other mechanisms for the transfer of existing and prospective infrastructure assets to the private sector; and,
- Progress road pricing reform models to move to a more sustainable platform for transport project funding.

Small business regulation

3.31 Small businesses are the foundation of our economy but they are often subject to unfair tax and regulatory frameworks which impede growth and competition.

3.32 Regulatory reforms which reduce red and green tape and reduce the costs of compliance benefit small businesses more than larger businesses due to scaling and resourcing advantages of large firms. Compliance costs can become a significant barrier to entry and reduce competition in the building and construction industry.

3.33 Master Builders welcomes the Government’s intention to reduce the regulatory burden through an aggressive agenda to cut \$1 billion in red and green tape, and would encourage the Government to focus on removing regulations which have the greatest impact on small businesses.

- 3.34 Any new regulation must be tested rigorously against a standard cost-benefit analysis, endorsed by the Productivity Commission and made available for public scrutiny as recommended in the PC report – Regulator Engagement with Small Business. If the regulation fails these tests then it should not be implemented.
- 3.35 As a highly capital intensive industry made up of more than 360,000 small and medium sized businesses, the extension of the accelerated depreciation program was a big win for building and construction businesses from the previous Budget (2017). Master Builders recommends that these measures be extended for at least one more year.
- 3.36 An independent body, such as the Australian Council for Competition Policy, should be tasked with reporting on progress in reviewing Government commercial policies and ensuring privatisation and other commercial processes incorporate competition principles.
- 3.37 Master Builders further recommends that Government Procurement rules be reviewed to better allow small and medium sized businesses to bid for government tenders in the building and construction industry. This could be achieved in several ways, including:
- By splitting tenders into small projects rather than tendering the total project and then allowing the head contractor to sub-contract the various elements of the project, and
 - Small and medium sized business content clauses which mandate a certain share of the project budget to small and medium sized businesses – this could also require greater local content.

4 Interaction Between Taxation Policy and Investment in the Building and Construction Industry

- 4.1 The increasing ease with which capital (and labour) can cross borders means the tax system must be internationally competitive – this is particularly true for withholding taxes.
- 4.2 Australia’s taxation settings are an impediment to the attraction of private investment capital. We do not receive our fair share of international capital and Australian companies are increasingly choosing to invest overseas rather than domestically.
- 4.3 Treasury estimates that tax compliance costs add up to \$40 billion per year – this is a big drain on the resources of private businesses. Tax reforms should, as a first priority, seek to reduce these costs. The Government should aim to reduce compliance costs by half, or more.¹⁴
- 4.4 Master Builders recommends that the reduction in the company tax rate, proposed in the 2017 Federal Budget be implemented immediately and in full. This includes a reduction in the tax rate for large companies.
- 4.5 There is no justifiable reason for taxing companies of different sizes differently. It provides a significant distortion and may encourage adverse behaviour and reduce private investment.
- 4.6 The timeline for changes in the company tax rate should be accelerated if the Budget position supports it. The sooner the company tax rate is lower the sooner Australia will get its fair share of international (and domestic) capital investment.
- 4.7 A more effective tax incentive to boost private investment by the private businesses would be to allow greater deduction allowances for businesses to

¹⁴ Australian Government, Re-Think, Tax Discussion White Paper, 2015

write-off new plant and equipment in a similar way as recently introduced in the United States.

4.8 For the property sector specifically, Master Builders recommends the Treasury undertake a review of the cumulative impost of taxes levied on property and land. Combined, the property and construction industries contribute a greater share to the tax take than to GDP. This is an unfair tax impost on the industry which pushes up the price of houses, schools and hospitals.

4.9 In sum, Master Builders recommends:

- Given that three taxes – GST, income tax and company taxes – raise around 80% of tax revenue, these taxes must be central to any serious reform process.
- Reform should consider the optimal mix between taxes on income and taxes on expenditure, noting specifically the behavioural impact on specific taxes due to the increased ease of labour and capital mobility.
- Reforms to property taxation must be considered as part of a wider reform agenda which extends across all levels of government. Given land is a factor of production, like capital and labour, a more effective reform must consider the relationship between taxes on these factors of production.
- Given that labour and capital are mobile and land is not, there is merit in exploring reforms to land taxes in the wider context. Doing so could increase efficiency in the tax system – effectively raising revenue without raising the total tax rate.
- Land taxes do not reduce the quantity of land, and they more effectively capture the benefits accrued to land owners from tax payer funded infrastructure investment and cities development. Taxing windfall gains is more equitable than taxing individual effort.
- To reduce the difference between the highest income tax bracket and the company tax rate – this is a distortion which encourages tax avoidance

behaviours. Reducing the highest income tax bracket may also encourage greater compliance and may increase overall tax revenue over time.

- To remove taxes that are unfair or constitute 'double taxation'. GST imposed on stamp duty is unacceptable. It is a tax on a tax. Future tax reforms must also be considered in the same way and should not be implemented if there is a possibility of 'double taxation'.
- Any changes to tax concessions that incentivise savings should be considered very carefully, particularly in the housing market.
- A review of the potential for the GST to be broader based. This could be achieved by independent external reviews. The clear benefit will be the increase in revenue to assist in the rebalancing the structural Budget deficits across State/Territory and Commonwealth Governments and would be in line with Recommendation 51 under section C2 of the Henry Tax Review (2009).

5 Innovation Policies

- 5.1 Master builders supports the development of policy and regulatory frameworks that enable practical pathways for innovation in the building and construction industry.
- 5.2 The National Construction Code (NCC) over the past 20 years has been developed into a single national construction code that provides a performance-based standard for construction. The performance requirements in the NCC allow for more flexibility and innovation in building design and construction and is a model supported by Master Builders.
- 5.3 The preference of Master Builders is that non-mandatory arrangements are introduced to support new and emerging innovations and subsequent policy reform impacting the sector. Non-mandatory options enable targeted market penetration of innovations, for example, in areas such as energy efficiency and accessible housing, with-out placing a cost burden on the sector when demand for the innovation is not strong in the market place.

- 5.4 Non-mandatory options also enable reforms to be tested and industry brought along in the change process as opposed to applying a mandatory one-size fits all option that industry objects to.

6 Environment Regulation

- 6.1 Environmental regulations can add to the cost of delivering construction projects – particularly from compliance costs for major infrastructure and resource related projects.
- 6.2 Research by the Institute of Public Affairs (IPA)¹⁵ has found that “the burden of environmental laws has grown considerably, contributing to a significant red tape problem.” and that, Environmental red tape and regulation in particular has grown significantly in recent years.”
- 6.3 Government is currently implementing measures in the National Construction Code to increase energy stringency, (in commercial buildings and in residential developments with shared spaces) to address climate emission reduction targets. Whilst the sector recognises the need to make a contribution to energy policy reform, governments need to ensure changes can be implemented and that evidence on the performance of previous stringency changes is accurately documented and justifies the case for further stringency increases.
- 6.4 Master Builders also considers non-mandatory options should be widely tested before mandatory options are introduced and this is our recommendation to the Australian Building Codes Board on proposed energy efficiency changes for the 2019 NCC.
- 6.5 COAG energy ministers have agreed through the National Energy Productivity Plan (NEPP) to implement further stringency reforms in the update of the 2022 National Construction Code for residential housing. The case for this is now being developed and considered by COAG energy portfolios.

¹⁵ Institute of Public Affairs, The Growth of Federal Environmental Law 1971 to 2016.

- 6.6 The use of court challenges to delay major projects, and increase the costs of doing business in Australia is a key concern.
- 6.7 Master Builders urges the Inquiry to consider making changes to section 487 of the Environment Act, which allows anyone with a special interest in the environment to change major construction projects.
- 6.8 Environment regulations are important but should be subject to a strict examination of costs and benefits to limit the potential to impede private business investment.

7 Supplier Payment Times

- 7.1 The Building and Construction industry is unique in that its commercial arrangements between participants are governed by a Security of Payment (SoP) framework. This framework takes the form of laws and regulations that are the domain of State and Territory Governments and applies to the bulk of payments for goods and services between participants (for example, the payment to a sub-contractor if engaged by a building during a construction project.)
- 7.2 Uncertain or inconsistent SoP regimes can form a barrier to private business investment by increasing the risk profile of projects.
- 7.3 While the Committee's inquiry is limited to matters involving supplier payment times, and not broader matters of commercial conduct, it should be noted that there is a review of the SoP regime underway with a view to reducing inconsistencies between the various jurisdictions and determining areas of best practice.
- 7.4 The Review is supported by Master Builders as the various regimes, when considered holistically, have been in a state of almost constant review and change over the last decade. This creates problems in terms of compliance and awareness, particularly for those businesses who perform building work in more than one jurisdiction, and does not facilitate business investment.

- 7.5 Master Builders expects the Review will recommend a SoP framework that would generate greater levels of national consistency. Subject to consideration of any such recommendation, it is an outcome industry would support.
- 7.6 In terms of payment times more broadly, Master Builders would note a tendency for policy makers to inaccurately consider or categorise it as method or solution for matters that are far more complex. We are aware, for example, of propositions advocating for a reduction in payment times (for example, from 28 to 21 days) as representing a way to reduce the extent of insolvency events.
- 7.7 While this may be somewhat relevant in other sectors, proposals to alter payment times would not have any discernible impact in the building and construction industry. Such proposals are simplistic, ill-informed and generally fail to understand the circumstances and commercial environment in which building industry participants operate.
- 7.8 Put simply, most delays in payment between building industry participants arise in circumstances that are unique and inherent to the BCI (e.g. defect claims, certification delay, disputed works, contractual disputes, rectification claims) and a simple alteration to payment times does not address those matters. Indeed, it is for this reason that the SoP regime of low cost, rapid adjudication exists.
- 7.9 Master Builders therefore recommends that:
- A focus on supplier payment times, or payment times more generally, should be resisted as a panacea for problems that are far more complex as they related to the BCI; and
 - The Committee should await the findings of the SoP Review and note that greater consistency between jurisdictions, combined with a decent period of regulatory stability, are likely to have positive impacts in terms of BCI business investment.
- 7.10 We annex hereto for background a submission on payment times as submitted to the ASBFEO.

8 Workforce and Industrial Relations Policy

- 8.1 A significant barrier to business investment in the BCI are the regulatory regimes that underpin matters relevant to workplaces. This barrier manifests itself in a number of ways associated not simply with these regimes and their requirements, but the constant and ongoing non-observance of these regimes by building industry unions. These factors, combined with a tendency for regulators and policy makers to focus on quantity of regulation rather than quality of regulation, create a circumstance where levels of investment certainty are low representing a significant barrier.
- 8.2 Master Builders contends that these factors also drive up the cost of construction and reduce productivity levels. This increases costs to consumers and the community overall.
- 8.3 For example, Master Builders has previously observed that the absence of a strong, resourced industry specific IR regulator caused construction costs to be 30% higher than they would otherwise be. A report from the Business Council of Australia (BCA) has broken down the extra costs of constructing different types of major projects in Australia versus the United States¹⁶. It found building in Australia attracted the following cost premiums:
- Hospitals – 62 per cent
 - Schools – 26 per cent
 - Airports – 90 per cent
 - Shopping centres – 43 per cent.

¹⁶ Business Council of Australia, 'Pipeline or Pipe Dream? Securing Australia's Investment Future', June 2012

8.4 Infrastructure Australia commissioned research which found that Australian infrastructure projects were 40 per cent more expensive than the equivalent cost in the United States.¹⁷

8.5 Better industrial relations regulation therefore reduces the costs of delivering major infrastructure projects, making investment in Australian infrastructure projects more competitive.

8.6 Master Builders annexes hereto a series of submissions that expand upon the general propositions advanced above. These are:

No.	Date	Addressee	Subject
2018			
1.	16.02.2018	Treasury	Submission on <i>Treasury Laws Amendment (Taxation and Superannuation Guarantee Integrity Measures) Bill 2018</i>
2.	23.03.2018	Legislative Review Committee	Review of the Building and Construction Industry (Improving Productivity) Act
3.	10.05.2018	Jane Hall, Seyfarth Shaw Australia	Submission on the Review of the WHS Regulatory Framework in the BCI
4.		Marie Boland, on behalf of Safe Work Australia	Submission on the Model Work Health and Safety Laws
5.		Treasury	Submission to Treasury on the Corporations Amendment (Stay on Enforcement of Ipso Facto Clauses) (to be finalised in May 2018)

¹⁷ <http://theconversation.com/factcheck-does-building-hospitals-schools-and-airports-cost-more-in-australia-than-in-the-us-16540>

6.		ACT Government	Submission on the Proposed ACT Secure Local Jobs Package (Prepared in conjunction with ACTMBA)
2017			
1.	27.01.2017	Small Business and Family Enterprise Ombudsman	Payment Times and Practices Inquiry
2.	31.07.2017	Black Economy Taskforce	Interim Report on the Black Economy
3.	08.09.2017	Senate Education and Employment Legislation Committee	Fair Work (Registered Organisations) Amendment (Ensuring Integrity) Bill 2017
2016			
1.	04.04.2016	Senate Education and Employment Standing Committee	Fair Work Amendment (Protecting Australian Workers) Bill 2016
2.	20.04.2016	Senate Select Committee	Establishment of a National Integrity Commission
3.	10.06.2016	Treasury	Improving Bankruptcy and Insolvency Laws Proposals Paper
4.	27.09.2016	Senate Education and Employment Standing Committee	Building and Construction Industry (Improving Productivity) Bill 2013 and the Building and Construction Industry (Consequential and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2013

5.	27.09.2016	Senate Education and Employment Committee	Fair Work Amendment (Registered Organisations) Amendment Bill 2016
6.	02.12.2016	Fair Work Commission	AM2016/23 - 4 Yearly Review of Modern Awards Construction Awards
7.	16.12.2016	Fair Work Commission	Building and Construction On-Site Award 2010 – Work Health and Safety Act/Regulations Comparison Table
2015			
1.	11.03.2015	Productivity Commission	Review of the Workplace Relations Framework, Issue papers 1-5.
2.	18.09.2015	Productivity Commission	Review of the Workplace Relations Framework
2014			
1.	11.07.2014	Royal Commission in Trade Union Governance and Corruption	Duties of Union Officials
2.	11.07.2014	Royal Commission in Trade Union Governance and Corruption	Funding of Trade Union Elections
3.	19.08.2014	Royal Commission in Trade Union Governance and Corruption	Issues Paper 4: Relevant Entities

4.	21.08.2014	Royal Commission in Trade Union Governance and Corruption	Discussion Paper: Options for Law Reform
----	------------	--	--

- 8.7 We recommend that the Committee find that acting upon the recommendations in these submissions that remain outstanding would represent a significant reduction in the extent of barriers to industry business investment.