Extract from Hansard

[COUNCIL - Tuesday, 5 September 2000] p577b-578a Hon Nick Griffiths; Hon Helen Hodgson; Hon Norman Moore

STATE SUPERANNUATION BILL 1999

Referral to Standing Committee on Legislation

HON N.D. GRIFFITHS (East Metropolitan) [5.53 pm]: I move -

That the order of the day be discharged and referred to the Standing Committee on Legislation for consideration and report not later than 9 October 2000.

A number of clauses in the Bill contain, at the very least, arguable deficiencies that should be dealt with. Amendments to clause 3 have been listed in a Supplementary Notice Paper and issues have been raised about the status of police officers and parliamentary and electorate staff. Clause 6 is the subject of an Australian Democrats' amendment to ensure the legislation complies with commonwealth standards. Clause 8 refers to membership of the Government Employees Superannuation Board and I am contemplating moving an amendment that will prevent an officer or member of the staff of the board becoming the chairman, employer or director of the board. That issue is partly dealt with by a proposed amendment to the schedule. Clause 12(1)(a) appears to provide very wide powers of delegation. Clause 13 raises concerns about the process of review of decisions of the board, while clause 16 raises questions about the accounting standards. Why are they not spelt out? Clause 18 contains the phrase "assets of the Fund", whereas clause 19 refers to the "investment of the Fund". That difference in wording needs examining, which need not take very long. What does clause 23(3) mean? Clause 24 refers to the power to borrow, and an alternative clause 24 is listed in the Supplementary Notice Paper. Clause 26 is also the subject of a proposed amendment. I question whether the heading for clause 30(2)(c) is accurate, although it is not part of the Bill, while clause 33(1)(a) and (b) is very ambiguous. Clause 36 defines "parliamentary purposes". Will its operation inhibit the obligations of ministers to a House of Parliament? Clause 38(4) raises the prospect that the Treasurer will be able to veto the operations of Executive Council. The regulation making power in clause 38 also raises concerns about the protection to be afforded to and the reasonable expectations of current members of the schemes, particularly regarding disability pensions, which are pertinent to police officers. The Australian Democrats have proposed new clause 40, which again deals with commonwealth compliance. Amendments to schedules 1 and 2 listed in the Supplementary Notice Paper also raise issues to which I have already referred.

HON HELEN HODGSON (North Metropolitan) [5.58 pm]: The Australian Democrats will support the referral of this Bill to the Standing Committee on Legislation. Superannuation issues are particularly difficult as there is a need to ensure protection for people entitled to certain arrangements so that they are not adversely affected in the future. This legislation has been toing-and-froing between the minister's advisers. I have had a number of meetings with them, as I am sure have a number of other people. A lot of work has been done on the amendments to try to deal with outstanding issues; however, it would be far more efficient for that to be done in the committee process. We therefore support the referral.

HON N.F. MOORE (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the House) [5.59 pm]: The Government is happy to support the referral of the Bill. It is a way of resolving some of the difficulties mentioned by Hon Nick Griffiths. Question put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm