

Sakellaris, Athena

From: toahouse@iinet.net.au
Sent: 22 December 1999 19:47
To: architects@pc.gov.au
Subject: REVIEW OF LEGISLATION REGULATING THE ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION

Thompson Ong and Associates
PO Box 116
WEST PERTH WA 6872
Telephone: 08 9321 4707

22 December 1999

Productivity Commission
Architects Inquiry
LB2 Collins Street East
MELBOURNE VIC 8003
email to : architects@pc.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: REVIEW OF LEGISLATION REGULATING THE ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION

I am a registered architect in WA and have been registered in NSW.

It is my belief that a form of registration of Architects should be maintained in Australia based on uniform legislation, but for constitutional reasons, administered by State and Territory boards or similar organisations.

I understand the procedure for examination and experience assessment of new architects is now common to all States and Territories despite the various Acts being different. This suggests the various boards are well able to liaise and achieve consistency even if the respective governments cannot.

In WA, despite the Boards' repeated attempts to review the Architects Act, the WA Governments have not moved to legislate the changes. This legislative inaction should reflect on the politicians not the Board or Architects.

Prior to portability of registration the need for registration if practicing in another State was a restriction of trade between practitioners of the same profession in different States. This situation no longer applies and I understand reciprocal agreements now exist with all Australian Boards and I believe the New Zealand registration body.

Registration does not inhibit competition between architects because of the commonality of the licence to all architects competing.

The major benefit of a system of registration is the clear identification of practitioners to the general public, distinguishing them from non-architects.

Although I believe the RAIAC could act as the registering body as occurs with Engineers with the Institution of Engineers and Planners with the Royal Australian Planning Institute, the perception of independence offered by the Boards should reinforce the general public's identification of Architects. This practice for example applies to Surveyors.

I believe the inquiry will achieve considerable public good if it results

assurance, professional indemnity, transparency of discipline practices, and development of Codes of Conduct.

The above thoughts reflect an initial response. I wish to lodge a more detailed submission after the 22 December deadline if permitted.

Yours sincerely

CHRISTOPHER R. THOMPSON