

The Senate

---

Community Affairs  
Legislation Committee

---

Family Assistance Amendment (Further 2008  
Budget Measures) Bill 2009 [Provisions]

June 2009

© Commonwealth of Australia 2009

ISBN 978-1-74229-133-8

Senate Community Affairs Committee Secretariat:

Mr Elton Humphery (Secretary)

Ms Leonie Peake (Research Officer)

Ms Ingrid Zappe (Executive Assistant)

The Senate  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600

Phone: 02 6277 3515

Fax: 02 6277 5829

E-mail: [community.affairs.sen@aph.gov.au](mailto:community.affairs.sen@aph.gov.au)

Internet: [http://www.aph.gov.au/senate\\_ca](http://www.aph.gov.au/senate_ca)

This document was produced by the Senate Community Affairs Committee Secretariat and printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Parliament House, Canberra.

# MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

## 42<sup>nd</sup> Parliament

### Members

Senator Claire Moore, Chair	ALP, Queensland
Senator Rachel Siewert, Deputy Chair	AG, Western Australia
Senator Judith Adams	LP, Western Australia
Senator Carol Brown	ALP, Tasmania
Senator Sue Boyce	LP, Queensland
Senator Mark Furner	ALP, Queensland



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE.....	III
FAMILY ASSISTANCE AMENDMENT (FURTHER 2008 BUDGET MEASURES)	
BILL 2009.....	1
THE INQUIRY .....	1
THE BILL.....	1
CONCLUSION .....	2
APPENDIX 1 - Comments by National Welfare Rights Network.....	5
APPENDIX 2 - Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs response to issues raised by National Welfare Rights Network (NWRN).....	11



# **FAMILY ASSISTANCE AMENDMENT (FURTHER 2008 BUDGET MEASURES) BILL 2009**

## **THE INQUIRY**

1.1 In accordance with a Senate Order of 14 May 2009 to refer certain budget-related bills to Senate Committees, the provisions of the Family Assistance Amendment (Further 2008 Budget Measures) Bill 2009, introduced into the House of Representatives on 3 June 2009, have been referred to the Community Affairs Legislation Committee for inquiry and report by 16 June 2009.

1.2 The Selection of Bills Committee noted in Report No.7 Of 2009, dated 4 June 2009, that it had considered a proposal to not refer the Bill to the Community Affairs Legislation Committee but drew the Committee's attention to paragraph (4) of the Order of 14 May. The Selection of Bills Committee made no further recommendation in respect of the Bill.

1.3 Due to the inquiry timeframe the Committee sought comment from peak groups in relation to the Bill. The National Welfare Rights Network (NWRN) provided comment on the Bill. The Committee then sought a written response from the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs to the issues raised by the NWRN. In order to fully inform the Senate on the issues raised, the NWRN comments are reproduced at Appendix 1 and the Department's written response is reproduced at Appendix 2. They may also be accessed through the Committee's website at [http://www.aph.gov.au/senate\\_ca](http://www.aph.gov.au/senate_ca).

## **THE BILL**

1.4 This Bill will amend the family assistance law to implement certain 2008 Budget measures that aim to reduce customers' family assistance debts and assist customers to avoid accumulating debts into the future.<sup>1</sup>

### ***Continuous adjustment of rate of family tax benefit by instalment***

1.5 The first measure introduces mandatory continuous adjustment to allow for the reduction of a claimant's rate of family tax benefit where there is a revised estimate (by the person or the Secretary) to assist in preventing overpayments following reconciliation.

1.6 Continuous adjustment is currently a voluntary practice that assists customers to avoid being overpaid family tax benefit where there has been an increase in their

---

1 Outline of the Bill is from the Explanatory Memorandum and Minister's second reading speech.

income estimate during the income year. Around three-quarters of all families currently utilise continuous adjustment on a voluntary basis. This measure will make the continuous adjustment practice used by Centrelink and the Family Assistance Office mandatory for families who have an increased income estimate that reduces their ongoing rate of family tax benefit.

### ***Non-payment of family tax benefit for non-lodgement of tax returns***

1.7 The second measure will cease fortnightly family tax benefit payments, and payment for a past period in the same income year in which a claim is made, for claimants and/or partners who fail to lodge income tax returns. It is aimed at reducing the number of existing and newly-accrued family tax benefit debts among families who have not lodged necessary tax returns.

1.8 In November 2006, the Australian National Audit Office recommended in its report *Management of Family Tax Benefit Overpayments* that measures be introduced to reduce this type of debt, known as non-lodger debt. This measure responds to the ANAO recommendations on non-lodger debt. Within 18 months after the end of the relevant financial year, families will be required to lodge their tax returns or advise the Family Assistance Office that they are not required to lodge a tax return. If a tax return is not lodged within this time frame, the Family Assistance Office will temporarily restrict a customer's family tax benefit payment options, precluding options that are based on an estimate of income. The most commonly used payment mechanism that uses income estimates is fortnightly payments of family tax benefit. Therefore, where a family has not lodged their tax returns within 18 months of the end of the relevant financial year, they will not receive fortnightly payments of family tax benefit.

1.9 During the non-payment period, the family will continue to be entitled to family tax benefit as a lump sum, which can be paid following lodgement of required tax returns. The measure limits only the method by which those families can be paid.

### ***Information sharing***

1.10 The third measure will include amendments to the tax file number provisions in the family assistance law to ensure accurate information sharing between the Australian Taxation Office and Centrelink for the purpose of reconciliation and debt offsetting.

1.11 The NWRN did not comment on this measure.

## **CONCLUSION**

1.12 The Department has responded to the issues raised by the NWRN. In the circumstances the Committee has no further comment to make on this Bill.



**Recommendation**

**1.13 The Committee recommends that the Family Assistance Amendment (Further 2008 Budget Measures) Bill 2009 be passed.**

Senator Claire Moore  
Chair

June 2009



# APPENDIX 1

## Comments by National Welfare Rights Network

12 June 2009

Committee Secretary  
Senate Standing Committee on Community Affairs  
Department of Senate  
PO Box 6100  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600

### **re: Family Assistance Amendment (Further 2008 Budget Measures) Bill 2009**

The National Welfare Rights Network Inc (NWRN) welcomes the opportunity to provide comment to the inquiry into the Family Assistance Amendment (Further 2008 Budget Measures) Bill 2009. Having said this however, we wish to place on record our disappointment at the very short time made available to prepare a submission on this very technical and complex piece of legislation.

The limited time available has not permitted NWRN to undertake an examination of the provisions contained in Schedule 3 of the Bill. Given the short time frame for this inquiry our comments are necessarily brief and are limited to Schedules 1 and 2 of the Bill.

### **Schedule 1: Continuous adjustment of rate of family tax benefit by instalment**

This Schedule proposes to insert a new section 31E into Subdivision C of Division 1 of Part 3 of the Family Assistance Administration Act to apply in the case of ongoing family tax payment instalment payments. The effect of the provision is to make the current voluntary option of continuous adjustment mandatory. The section will require the Secretary upon the revision of an income or maintenance estimate to firstly determine whether a Family Tax Benefit (FTB) recipient has a notional overpayment for an earlier period of the income year because of the revised estimate and if so, to then reduce the ongoing rate of FTB to cover the notional overpayment. This will be worked out in accordance with the method statement set out in the proposed subsection 31E (2). In the event of a notional overpayment, the method statement will produce a daily overpayment rate by which the Secretary must reduce the recipient's daily rate of Family Tax Benefit for the remainder of the income year, unless a new application of section 31E occurs due to a subsequent revised estimate. As a consequence, the application of the method statement can result in the daily rate of Family Tax Benefit being reduced to nil but explicitly prevents the daily rate being reduced below nil.

Whilst NWRN has long championed for a greater focus on debt prevention in both the design of policy and administration of the Social Security and Family Assistance systems, we are concerned that the introduction of mandated continuous adjustment will create an undesirable level of rigidity into the program making it less responsive to the diverse needs of families that it is designed to assist. The proposed change will reduce the choice and flexibility that families currently have to manage income variations in the income year and make payment arrangements which best suit their family circumstances through the 'More Choice for Families' and voluntary continuous adjustment option. For this reason, NWRN believes that consideration ought to be given to providing Centrelink with a discretionary power not to apply the continuous adjustment measure when satisfied that there is a more appropriate means available to manage the notional overpayment.

NWRN accepts that continuous adjustment is a sensible and practical debt prevention option. However its current value lies in it being part of a suite of options that Centrelink has in its toolbox to assist families to manage the implications flowing from income variations throughout the income year. This was also recognised by the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) in its 2006/07 Audit Report on the Management of Family Tax Benefit Overpayments. The Minister in her second reading speech states that approximately three quarters of all families already utilise the continuous adjustment option on a voluntary basis yet no analysis is offered in relation to other families who elect not to use the option. The Minister promotes the change on the basis that it 'will assist in reducing the risk of the claimant having an overpayment on reconciliation and limiting the possibility of a debt' without taking any account of the impact of reduced fortnightly instalments which is a likely explanation of why some families elect not to take up this option.

Whilst reducing debts is a worthwhile objective it is not the primary objective of the Family Tax Benefit system which is to help people on low to middle incomes to meet the costs of raising dependent children. For this reason, it must be balanced against the impact on families receiving less than their legislated rate for the remainder of the income year. This is particularly important when the continuous adjustment results in a significant reduction in the fortnightly rate, reduces the fortnightly rate to below the base rate or produces a zero entitlement for the remainder of the income year. The risk of a mandated system of continuous adjustment is that its immediate impact may place families under greater financial strain denying them any advantages that might be associated with spreading the notional debt over a longer period of time through being able to negotiate a lower debt withholding rate on reconciliation or utilising the end of year supplement payment to offset the reconciliation debt. For some families, receiving a higher fortnightly entitlement for the remainder of the financial year in lieu of the lump sum end of year supplement may be what is required to meet their family's fortnightly expenditure during the year. Also, continuous adjustment may not be the best option for families whose remaining entitlement may be insufficient for the year to fully recover the overpayment already accumulated because the increase in estimate annual income was quite high or it occurred late in the income

---

year. It might be better managed, through, for example, the setting off of the debt against an anticipated income tax refund.

Families should not be placed in further financial hardship through curtailing the flexible options available to manage the disadvantages inherent in the fundamental design of the system which makes overpayments inevitable given that the rate of fortnightly instalments can only be calculated on the basis of a forecast or estimate. Given that it is not possible to envisage all the circumstances where a mandatory continuous adjustment might not be in the best interests of the family, we believe that a degree of flexibility should be retained through conferring Centrelink with general discretion not to apply the provision when the circumstances warrant it.

**NWRN recommends** that the Bill be amended to give Centrelink a general discretion not to apply the continuous adjustment measure when having regard to the recipient's individual family circumstances, there is a more appropriate means available to manage the notional overpayment.

### **Schedule 2 – Non payment of family tax benefit for non lodgment of tax returns**

Whilst NWRN recognises the need to provide some incentive for families to lodge their tax returns within a reasonable period (so that the FTB reconciliation process can be finalised), we are opposed to the current proposed legislative provisions on the basis that it is a retrograde measure, is unfair by comparison with other tax provisions and is unjustifiably punitive in nature. For example while a person who lodges a tax return after the deadline may be subject to penalties, any entitlement to a refund is not affected. Further the Australian Taxation Office may grant a deferral beyond the period permitted by the Family Assistance legislation.

The proposed change carries an unacceptably high level of risk that innocent children will be punished through the denial of fortnightly statutory entitlements because families are unable to comply with the prescribed time frames due to reasons beyond their control, lack of resources or incapacity. This has the very real potential to undermine the statutory objectives behind the Family Assistance legislation by increasing financial hardship and child poverty.

Under the proposed legislative framework, a person subject to a variation under the current non lodger debt provisions because they have not lodged an income tax return within 12 months of the end of the relevant tax year will be prohibited from receiving fortnightly instalment payments following the grace period. The grace period is generally defined as a period of 75 days but may be as little as 14 days in the case of another prohibited period. The effect of these provisions is that a person can be prohibited from receiving ongoing fortnightly FTB instalments from as little as 15 months after the end of the relevant financial year even in circumstances where a person is in the process of preparing or lodging ATO returns or the failure is outside of the person's control because of the refusal of their partner to lodge their return.

Whilst the provision does confer the Secretary with discretion to extend the grace period, the special circumstances test is too tough especially when compared to the taxation provisions.

The ATO Receivables Policy – Chapter 51 Lodgment of Documents notes:

#### *INTRODUCTION*

2. Taxpayers are required to lodge correct documents by the due date.
3. At times, taxpayers may experience circumstances that prevent them from lodging by the due date. Legislation allows the Commissioner to defer the time for lodgment of an approved form and other prescribed forms.
4. Where taxpayers fail to meet their lodgment obligations, the Tax Office will differentiate its treatment of taxpayers according to their individual circumstances and the reasons for their non compliance.
5. The policy seeks to make it as simple as possible for taxpayers to meet their obligations under the law, to lodge documents on time and to ensure the integrity of the tax system.

The key policy is contained at Chapter 55. At the very least, NWRN is of the view that the Bill would need to ensure that it is consistent with deferral (for example under 38-55 of the Taxation Administration Act 1953) and suspension options to the Commissioner under this policy.

The Deferrals legislation is supported by a non-exhaustive list of factors at Chapter 55:

#### *Exceptional and unforeseen circumstances*

25. A deferral will usually be granted in exceptional or unforeseen circumstances where the taxpayer can demonstrate that the inability to lodge by the due date can be reasonably attributed to those circumstances. Such circumstances may include:  
natural disasters (flood, fire, drought, cyclones, earthquake and similar events) or other disasters that may have, or have had, a significant impact on a taxpayer or region or particular industry or grouping of taxpayers  
the serious illness of the taxpayer  
impeded access to records (for examples, records seized during a police search or retained as evidence in a court matter), or  
the advanced age or the youth of a taxpayer, the serious illness of a family member or a problem due to language difficulties.

26. Each request will be considered on its merits and the deferred due date will be determined having regard to the particular circumstances of the taxpayer and those that led to the inability to lodge by the due date. The fact that a taxpayer may have a poor lodgment compliance history should not prevent consideration of a request for a deferral of time to lodge, where the inability to lodge was caused by circumstances beyond their control.

---

28. Deferrals may be granted to a class of taxpayers affected by a common event, for example, bushfire or delayed legislation. Where the Tax Office can reasonably assume that a common event has sufficiently impacted on all of a defined population, a deferral may be granted without individual applications by the taxpayers. For example, where industrial instruments prevent employees of schools and associated bodies from working over the Christmas holiday shutdown period, deferrals may be granted to all entities affected in this way.

We note that this includes:

- Natural disasters
- Illness
- Access to records
- Age
- Language difficulties

Although opposed to this measure, NWRN believes that it could be improved through broadening the grounds on which the grace period can be extended to include the factors set out above. In addition, the circumstances should be extended to provide not only for the victims of domestic violence who are unable to comply because of the unwillingness of a partner to lodge and their inability to resolve matters for fear of retribution by way of further physical or psychological abuse but also to where the inability to lodge was caused by circumstances beyond the immediate control of the FTB recipient. The intention here would be to cover situations where notwithstanding the best endeavours of the FTB recipient, their current partner has simply refused to comply. Again, because it is not possible to predict all the circumstances that might need the protection of this provision, Centrelink should also be given the power to grant an extension 'for any other special or compelling reason'.

Further given the harsh financial consequences that will flow as a consequence of not lodging the ATO returns within the stipulated time frames, NWRN is concerned that the Bill does not provide adequate safeguards so that payment cancellation only occurs once Centrelink has exhausted all reasonable strategies to facilitate compliance and then only as a last resort. We would urge amendments to the Bill which address the following flaws in the framework:

The absence of a statutory requirement for a notice which clearly articulates the steps to be taken, a timeframe for taking these steps and the consequences of non compliance before the Schedule 2 provisions are activated.


The absence of provisions whereby FTB recipients can be exempted from the Schedule 2 process in the event that reasonable action is being taken to prepare and/or lodge the tax returns, the tax returns can not be lodged due to circumstances beyond the person's control or where a person has been granted an ATO deferral.

The absence of a provision to preserve a person's entitlement to the Family Tax Benefits which would have been received but for the cancellation in the event that the tax returns are lodged after the 2 year limitation period.

NWRN recommends in the event that Schedule 2 is allowed to stand, that it be amended to provide adequate safeguards to address the identified flaws in the provisions and further that the grounds for the extension of the grace period are broadened to take account of the concerns that we have highlighted above.

Should you require any further information regarding this submission, please do not hesitate to contact Ms Genevieve Bolton, our National Liaison Officer on (02) 6257 2931.

Yours faithfully



Kate Beaumont  
President  
National Welfare Rights Network Inc



## **APPENDIX 2**

### **Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs response to issues raised by National Welfare Rights Network (NWRN)**

#### **Schedule 1 – Continuous adjustment of rate of family tax benefit by instalment**

NWRN recommends that the Bill be amended to give Centrelink a general discretion not to apply the continuous adjustment measure when having regard to the recipient's individual family circumstances, there is a more appropriate means available to manage the notional overpayment.

The amendments in Schedule 1 do not provide for discretion as it is considered appropriate for the method of adjusting a person's ongoing rate to be applied in a consistent and fair manner. The method applied is considered to be fair as it compares the amount that a person has already received in the earlier part of the financial year based on the previous estimate, with the amount that would have been paid in that period based on the higher revised estimate. Adjusting the person's ongoing rate for the remainder of the financial year to recoup the amount of the notional overpayment already received in that financial year is considered reasonable as the adjustment is effectively 'smoothing out' the person's remaining entitlement for the financial year. The adjustment will act as a timely and fair mechanism to reduce the incidence of debts at reconciliation.

The provision of discretion to not apply the adjustment would add complexity, would weaken the effectiveness of the measure for reducing the incidence of debts, and would be less equitable as it would provide different outcomes for families who revise their estimate and have the same remaining entitlement for the financial year.

The adjustment method is flexible as it allows for a subsequent recalculation of the ongoing adjustment if a person provides a further revised estimate that is lower than the first revised estimate. This reflects the continuous nature of the adjustment, and takes into account that a person's circumstances may continue to change, or that the person may have new information leading to a further estimate. Centrelink will reassess the person's rate based on a revised estimate of income if Centrelink considers the revised estimate to be reasonable.

A person who is prompt in notifying Centrelink of a change in circumstances that results in an increased estimate of income will minimise the amount of the ongoing adjustment. This is because prompt notification will reduce the amount of the notional overpayment and will increase the length of the remaining period to recoup the notional overpayment. An adjustment may be higher than it would otherwise have

been if the person delays notifying Centrelink. It is not considered appropriate to allow for a different approach in such circumstances.

If the adjustment is significant because the increase in the estimate is quite high, this also means the person's financial ability has significantly improved. It is not considered appropriate to allow for a different approach in such circumstances.

It is considered inappropriate to continue to allow people to receive ongoing payments that would allow the amount paid during the financial year to exceed the amount payable based on the revised estimate. This measure is designed to prevent that outcome. Allowing alternative mechanisms to manage the overpayment would undermine the intent of the measure.

### **Schedule 2 – Non-payment of family tax benefit for non-lodgement of tax returns**

NWRN recommends in the event that Schedule 2 is allowed to stand, that it be amended to provide adequate safeguards to address the identified flaws in the provisions and further that the grounds for the extension of the grace period are broadened to take account of the concerns that NWRN have highlighted.

We consider that the concerns raised by NWRN may to an extent reflect a misunderstanding of the way in which the provisions will operate.

When Centrelink decides that a person is not entitled to Family Tax Benefit (FTB) for a previous financial year due to the non-lodgment of relevant tax returns for that year (a non-lodger decision), the provisions provide for a grace period after that decision before a prohibited period would start. In general, the grace period will be 75 days. In practice, as Centrelink makes non-lodger decisions in November each year, this would result in a prohibited period starting in mid-January of the next year if relevant tax returns had still not been lodged by that time. This means a person will have more than 18 months to lodge an outstanding tax return before a prohibited period starts.

The provisions allow for the minimum grace period of 75 days to be extended in special circumstances. The provisions also allow for a prohibited period that has already begun to be ended in special circumstances. Further, where a prohibited period is ended in special circumstances, a new grace period will be set which will be a minimum period of 14 days, or such longer period as justified by the special circumstances.

While 'special circumstances' is not defined, it is a concept that is well understood due to its use in various provisions in family assistance and social security law and decisions by courts and tribunals on its meaning. In *Re Beadle and Director-General of Social Security* (1984), the Administrative Appeals Tribunal (Toohey J presiding) said:

An expression such as "special circumstances" is by its very nature incapable of precise or exhaustive definition. The qualifying adjective looks to circumstances that are unusual, uncommon or exceptional. Whether circumstances answer any of these descriptions must depend upon

---

the context in which they occur. For it is the context which allows one to say that the circumstances in one case are markedly different from the usual run of cases. This is not to say that the circumstances must be unique but they must have a particular quality of unusualness that permits them to be described as special.

As a matter of policy, in all cases where the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) decides to grant a person an extended time period to lodge a tax return or decides to suspend enforcement action against an outstanding tax return, Centrelink will also extend the grace period or suspend the prohibited period to correspond with the ATO decision. Also, independently of any ATO decision about the lodgment of an outstanding tax return, Centrelink will be able to apply the discretion in other special circumstances. This includes situations involving domestic violence, severe illness or severe financial hardship. This policy for special circumstances will be reflected in policy guidelines.

NWRN has proposed that the discretion to extend the grace period or suspend a prohibited period should be broadened to cover situations where it is the current partner of the FTB recipient who has not lodged the relevant tax return and the partner is simply refusing to comply with the requirement to lodge the outstanding tax return.

If the prohibition measure was to exclude an outstanding tax return of the current partner of an FTB recipient, it would undermine the effectiveness of the measure. This is because the application of the measure could easily be avoided simply by the couple agreeing to swap who receives FTB for the family. The inclusion of an outstanding tax return of the current partner also recognises that payment of FTB based on an estimate is affected by the combined income of a couple.

While a prohibition applies, this will not prevent payment of FTB as a lump sum at reconciliation for a particular financial year, as this payment would be based on actual income for that financial year. The measure limits only the method by which payment can be made. That is, the measure prevents the method of payment based on an estimate.

The measure does not affect the existing provision which precludes the payment of a top-up and the end of year FTB supplements if a person fails to lodge a required tax return within two years after the end of the relevant financial year. However, the measure will help people to avoid missing out on a top-up and the supplements by providing a further incentive for relevant tax returns to be lodged before the existing two year limit lapses.

Centrelink will write to people in advance to advise them that the method of payment based on an estimate will cease at the end of the grace period if they have not lodged relevant tax returns by that time. For existing cases that will be potentially affected by the measure from mid January 2010, Centrelink will write in August 2009 to advise them about the measure. For new cases, this information will be provided each year in November at the same time that a person is advised about a non lodger decision.

