

The Senate

Education and Employment
Legislation Committee

Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill
2014 [Provisions]

September 2014

© Commonwealth of Australia

ISBN: 978-1-76010-089-6

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Australia License.



The details of this licence are available on the Creative Commons website:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/au/>.

This document was produced by the Senate Standing Committee on Education and Employment and printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Parliament House, Canberra.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

Members

Senator Bridget McKenzie, Chair, Nats, VIC

Senator Sue Lines, Deputy Chair, ALP, WA

Senator Deborah O'Neill, ALP, NSW

Senator Barry O'Sullivan, Nats, QLD

Senator Lee Rhiannon, AG, NSW

Senator Anne Ruston, LP, SA

Substitute Members

Senator Linda Reynolds, CSC, LP, WA

to replace Senator Barry O'Sullivan, Nats, QLD (from 8-19 September 2014)

Secretariat

Ms Julia Agostino, Secretary

Ms Jessica Strout, Senior Research Officer

Ms Elise Williamson, Research Officer

Ms Sarah Bainbridge, Administrative Officer (until 12 September 2014)

Ms Sophie Wolfer, Administrative Officer (from 15 September 2014)

PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Ph: 02 6277 3521
Fax: 02 6277 5706
E-mail: eec.sen@aph.gov.au

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE	iii
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	vii
CHAPTER 1	1
Reference	1
Conduct of the inquiry	1
Background.....	1
Rationale for the bill	1
Overview of the bill	2
Human rights implications	3
Financial Impact Statement	4
Acknowledgement	4
Notes on References	4
CHAPTER 2	5
Key Issues	5
Capping redundancy entitlement at 16 weeks	5
Reasonable steps to pursue a debt	9
Offsetting debts owed to an employer.....	11
Does the current Scheme create a 'moral hazard'?	12
Conclusion	16
Recommendation 1	16
LABOR SENATORS' DISSENTING REPORT	17
The committee majority has failed to demonstrate justification for the bill	17
The bill punishes workers without addressing underlying issues or alternate savings measures	20
The bill constitutes a broken promise from the government.....	21

AUSTRALIAN GREENS' DISSENTING REPORT	23
Older employees	23
Cutting redundancy payments	23
Reasonable steps to pursue a debt	24
Exploited employees	24
Phantom moral hazard	24
Making the country less prosperous	25
APPENDIX 1	27
Submissions Received.....	27
Response to Questions on Notice.....	27
APPENDIX 2	29
Public Hearing	29

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

The committee recommends that the bill be passed.

CHAPTER 1

Reference

1.1 On 4 September 2014 the Senate referred the provisions of the Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014 (bill) to the Senate Education and Employment Legislation Committee (committee) for inquiry and report by 24 September 2014.¹

Conduct of the inquiry

1.2 Details of the inquiry were made available on the committee's website.² The committee also contacted a number of organisations inviting submissions to the inquiry. Submissions were received from 14 organisations, as detailed in Appendix 1.

1.3 A public hearing was held in Melbourne on 17 September 2014. The witness list for the hearing is available in Appendix 2.

Background

1.4 The bill proposes to amend the *Fair Entitlements Guarantee Act 2012* (the Act) to provide financial assistance (an 'advance') to cover certain unpaid employment entitlements for eligible employees who lose their job due to the liquidation or bankruptcy of their employer.³

1.5 The Fair Entitlements Guarantee Scheme (the Scheme) is the successor of the General Employee Entitlements and Redundancy Scheme (GEERS) that was introduced in 2001 by the Howard government to protect employee entitlements.⁴

Rationale for the bill

1.6 The bill implements the government's 2014–15 Budget announcement to align the maximum redundancy pay entitlement under the Scheme with the maximum set by the National Employment Standards contained in the *Fair Work Act 2009*.⁵ It also restores the level of redundancy pay entitlement that was available under the GEERS Operational Arrangements that were in effect from 22 August 2006 and 31 December 2010.

1.7 Since the Scheme's introduction, the demand for advances has increased significantly. In 2006–07 there were 8626 claimants being paid \$72.97 million. In

1 *Journals of the Senate*, No. 52, 4 September 2014, p. 1421.

2 Parliament of Australia, Senate Committees, Senate Standing Committee on Education and Employment, Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, (accessed 8 September 2014).

3 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 1.

4 The Hon. Mr Christopher Pyne MP, Minister for Education, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 4 September 2014, p. 1.

5 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 1.

2012–13 there were 16 019 claimants being paid \$261.65 million.⁶ In response to the increasing demand for entitlements under the Scheme and community expectations, the government is seeking to amend the Act to ensure its smooth operation and the Scheme's future sustainability.⁷

Overview of the bill

1.8 Currently, where eligible employees lose their job due to the liquidation or bankruptcy of their employer, they are provided financial assistance under the Scheme to cover certain unpaid employment entitlements. Presently this includes:

- assistance for up to 13 weeks of unpaid wages;
- unpaid annual and long service leave;
- up to five weeks' payment in lieu of notice; and
- redundancy pay, capped at four weeks per full year of service, with no cap on years of service.⁸

1.9 Item 5 of the bill would provide that where a claimant did not take reasonable steps before their employer's insolvency event to be paid debts relating to their unpaid employment entitlements, the Secretary may reduce the amount of the claimant's amount by those debts.⁹

1.10 The explanatory memorandum emphasises that this approach is intended to ensure that employees are still required to actively protect their own interests by pursuing debts, but also allow payments to be made for debts that the employee took reasonable steps to pursue.¹⁰

1.11 Item 6 of the bill would reinstate a claimant's redundancy pay entitlement to 16 weeks' pay in total.¹¹

1.12 In his Second Reading Speech, the Hon. Christopher Pyne MP, Minister for Education, explained that while the advance for redundancy pay under the proposed Scheme will not exceed 16 weeks, employees will still be able to pursue their employers for any remaining unpaid entitlements through the winding-up process.¹²

1.13 The bill also makes a number of technical amendments to clarify the operation of the Act. These amendments will:

6 The Hon. Mr Christopher Pyne MP, Minister for Education, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 4 September 2014, p. 1.

7 The Hon. Mr Christopher Pyne MP, Minister for Education, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 4 September 2014, p. 1.

8 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 1.

9 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 5.

10 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 5.

11 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 6.

12 The Hon. Mr Christopher Pyne MP, Minister for Education, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 4 September 2014, p. 1.

-
- clarify where a claimant is eligible for financial assistance under the Scheme, the claimant's initial entitlement under the Act will be calculated without reference to any amounts required to be withheld by law, such as pay as you go tax withholding;
 - clarify that the death of a person does not prevent the person being eligible for financial assistance, to enable the next of kin or estate to pursue a claim; and
 - clarify when a debt owed by a claimant to his or her employee is greater than the employment entitlement to which it relates, it can be offset proportionally against any of the claimant's other employment entitlements under the Scheme.

1.14 The bill also seeks to establish a funding source in the legislation for certain legal costs associated with applications to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal for review of decisions made by the department. This was suggested by the previous government.

1.15 The bill would commence on 1 January 2015 or the day after the bill has received Royal Assent, whichever is later. However, the amendment relating to the department's funding arrangements would apply from 1 July 2015 to align with the start of the 2015–16 financial year.¹³

Human rights implications

1.16 The explanatory memorandum details the bill's engagement of the right to social security, including social insurance, under Article 9 of the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (ICESCR). The committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has stated that the right to social security encompasses the right to access benefits without discrimination in order to secure protection from lack of work related income caused by unemployment.¹⁴

1.17 The explanatory memorandum states that the bill is compatible with human rights because:

... it seeks to maintain the sustainability of the Scheme of financial assistance without compromising minimum entitlements and to the extent that the amendments may limit rights, those limitations are reasonable, necessary and proportionate to that legitimate objective.¹⁵

13 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 1.

14 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, *Statement of Compatibility with Human Rights*, p. 1.

15 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, *Statement of Compatibility with Human Rights*, p. 4.

Financial Impact Statement

1.18 The explanatory memorandum submits that the bill would have a financial impact, resulting in an estimated saving of \$79.4 million over the forward estimates, as illustrated by the table below.¹⁶

Table 1 - Explanatory Memorandum, Financial Impact Statement¹⁷

2014–15	2015–16	2016–17	2017–18	Total
\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m
9.2	20.8	23.3	26.1	79.4

Acknowledgement

1.19 The committee would like to thank those individuals and organisations who contributed to the inquiry by preparing written submissions and giving evidence at the hearing.

Notes on References

1.20 References in this report to the Hansard for the public hearing are to the Proof Hansard. Please note that page numbers may vary between the Proof Hansard and the official transcript.

16 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 2.

17 *Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 2.

CHAPTER 2

Key Issues

2.1 The committee is supportive of a publicly funded safety net scheme to protect workers who are affected when their employers experience insolvency or bankruptcy, and believes such a scheme should be fair and reasonable for all affected workers and taxpayers.

2.2 The Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014 (the bill) will amend the *Fair Entitlements Guarantee Act 2014* (the Act) by implementing the government's 2014 –15 Budget announcement to align the maximum redundancy pay entitlement under the Fair Entitlements Guarantee scheme (the Scheme) with the maximum set by the National Employment Standards (NES) contained in the *Fair Work Act 2009*. The new maximum redundancy pay entitlement will be 16 weeks' pay.¹

2.3 The committee has received evidence from a range of submitters and witnesses in relation to the proposed changes, and will address several concerns raised.

Capping redundancy entitlement at 16 weeks

2.4 Item 6 of Schedule 1 replaces the current cap of four weeks per year of service on redundancy pay with a cap of 16 weeks' pay in total. The intention is to align the bill with the maximum payment available under the NES contained in the *Fair Work Act 2009*.²

2.5 By way of context, the NES are ten minimum employment entitlements that must be provided to all employees. With the national minimum wage, they make up the minimum entitlements for employees in Australia. An award, agreement or employment contract cannot exclude or provide conditions that are less than the national minimum wage or NES.³

2.6 The committee notes the Department of Employment's (department) submission that explains:

All employees who are in the national workplace relations system are covered by the National Employment Standards regardless of the award, registered agreement or employment contract that applies. Their application to most employees and employers in Australia means the National Employment Standards are an appropriate safety net reference for redundancy entitlements under the FEG.⁴

1 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 1.

2 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Bill 2014, *Statement of Compatibility with Human Rights*, p. 2.

3 Department of Employment, *Submission 13*, p. 11.

4 *Submission 13*, p. 11.

2.7 A number of submitters expressed concerns that despite being compatible with the NES, capping the redundancy entitlement at 16 weeks will result in some workers not being paid the full amount of redundancy payments they are owed by their employer in the event that employer goes bankrupt.⁵

2.8 The Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union (AMWU) argues in its submission that capping entitlements at 16 weeks is not fair because the NES is a minimum statutory entitlement and employment conditions are not set by legislation alone. AMWU emphasised that some workers have negotiated enterprise agreements with redundancy entitlements above the NES.⁶

2.9 Mr Trevor Clarke, Director Industrial and Research, Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) provided evidence to the committee:

Redundancy entitlements are set by awards, by enterprise agreements and by contract of employment. Sometimes unions are involved in setting the entitlements; sometimes they are not. Sometimes the Fair Work Commission is involved in setting those entitlements; sometimes it is not. Whoever sets those entitlements has reasons for doing what they do.

It is not difficult to imagine why the entitlement at some workplaces is set in excess of the bare minimum provided by the law.⁷

2.10 Ms Michele O'Neil, National Secretary, Textile Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia (TCFUA) stated:

To start with a very basic principle of law, workers who accrue, through long years of service, leave, superannuation and redundancy entitlements are entitled to be paid 100 per cent of those entitlements when they are made redundant.⁸

2.11 The committee notes these views, but also received compelling evidence from submitters and witnesses who support the proposed capping of entitlements at 16 weeks because it is an equitable scheme, applying to all employees regardless of any negotiated enterprise agreement.

2.12 Australian Industry Group (Ai Group) submitted:

The 16 week cap mirrors the entitlement to redundancy under the National Employment Standards and hence reflects community standards... It is unfair for a publicly funded scheme to pay extremely generous

5 Slater and Gordon Lawyers, *Submission 11*, p. 3; Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union, *Submission 8*, p. 5; Queensland Nurses' Union, *Submission 10*, p. 3.

6 *Submission 8*, p. 5.

7 Mr Trevor Clarke, Director, Industrial and Research, Australian Council of Trade Unions, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 17 September 2014, p. 9.

8 Ms Michele O'Neil, National Secretary, Textile Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 17 September 2014, p. 11.

compensation to the employees of one insolvent company and much less to those working for another company.⁹

2.13 The committee also heard evidence from the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ACCI), who stressed that while it was open to parties to negotiate entitlements, this came with a level of responsibility, and is a matter of public policy concern.

It should, of course, remain open to parties to employment arrangements to negotiate the terms and conditions they want; however, ACCI believes it is dangerous for there to be an 'all care and no responsibility' dynamic sitting above negotiations. Terms and conditions must be realistic and affordable, with ultimate responsibility for them held by the negotiating parties. The fair entitlements guarantee scheme should not have the effect of being a blank cheque when redundancy entitlements are up for negotiation.¹⁰

...

The non-payment of employee entitlements on insolvency is a relevant public policy concern. Any remedy must appropriately consider and balance the interests of employees, employers, creditors, taxpayers and the economy as a whole.¹¹

2.14 Master Builders Australia submitted the general redundancy standard for the building and construction industry is out of step with the general community standard, and suggested that the proposed cap is in line with the community standard.¹²

2.15 Both Ai Group and ACCI expressed the view that a publicly funded safety net scheme is necessary to protect workers whose employers went bankrupt. However, they stressed that it should offer an appropriate level of protection. Ai Group stated:

When there is an insolvency, everyone is a loser. Often the managers lose their jobs. If it is a private company, the owners of the business often lose their houses. There are no winners. It is a matter of having the appropriate level of protection.¹³

9 Australian Industry Group, *Submission 3*, p. 7.

10 Mr Richard Clancy, Director, Workplace Relations, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 2.

11 Mr Richard Clancy, Director, Workplace Relations, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 2.

12 Master Builders Australia, *Submission 2*, p. 3.

13 Mr Stephen Smith, Director, National Workplace Relations, Australian Industry Group, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 3.

2.16 ACCI further provided evidence:

This scheme provides a very fair outcome there – up to 16 weeks of redundancy pay plus all of those other protections. That, in our view, is an appropriate level of protection.¹⁴

2.17 These views are broadly supported by a number of other submitters, including Business SA¹⁵ and the National Electrical and Communications Association (NECA).¹⁶

2.18 The department advised:

This 16 week cap relates only to the redundancy pay entitlements available under the FEG, it does not operate as an overall cap of entitlements payable under the scheme. In addition to a maximum payment of 16 weeks for redundancy pay, employees will still be able to receive assistance for up to 13 weeks unpaid wages, all accrued annual leave and long service leave that is left unpaid, and up to five weeks payment in lieu of notice.¹⁷

2.19 The ACTU suggested during the hearing that other options could be explored before any reduction in entitlements under the Scheme is contemplated, including ranking employee entitlements above certain secured creditors. The ACTU's position is that 'more can and should be done to ensure that the government can maximise the returns it gets from the scheme and to discourage insolvencies that are brought about by misconduct.'¹⁸

2.20 While this suggestion was not fully explored during the inquiry, the committee notes evidence from the department about the government standing in the shoes of the employee to receive entitlements in the usual order of priority as a creditor.¹⁹

Impacts of the 16 week cap

2.21 The department submitted the proportion of total Scheme expenditure attributable to the redundancy pay has increased since the entitlement cap was increased in 2011, and the dollar value of redundancy pay entitlements has increased disproportionately to other entitlement types covered by the schemes.²⁰ The incidence

14 Mr Richard Clancy, Director, Workplace Relations, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 4.

15 Business SA, *Submission 1*, p. 2.

16 National Electrical and Communications Association, *Submission 12*, p. 1.

17 *Submission 13*, p. 11.

18 Mr Trevor Clarke, Director, Industrial and Research, Australian Council of Trade Unions, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 17 September 2014, p. 10.

19 Ms Sandra Parker, Deputy Secretary, Workplace Relations and Economic Strategy, Department of Employment, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 21.

20 *Submission 13*, p. 7.

of agreements providing a total maximum redundancy payment of more than 16 weeks has also increased since 2011.²¹

2.22 Specifically, the committee heard evidence from the department that:

Demand has increased from 8,626 claimants being paid \$72.97 million in 2006-07 to 16,019 claimants being paid \$261.6 million in 2012-13. The Commonwealth now covers the full cost of the scheme. In relation to this bill, redundancy payments have increased from \$21.2 million in 2006-07 to \$102.2 million in 2012-13. The government's assessment is that these increases are not sustainable. There is also evidence of an increase in redundancy payments above 16 weeks in agreements. The increase is from 22.3 per cent in March 2011 to 28.3 per cent in June 2014...²²

2.23 The department estimates the 16 week cap will affect only around six per cent of future claimants who are paid an advance under the Scheme, or approximately 815 people per year. Over the past three financial years, 41 393 claimants have been paid an advance under the Scheme or its predecessor and of these, 2446 received entitlements equivalent of more than 16 weeks' pay out of 21 752 claimants who were entitled to a redundancy pay entitlement.²³

Committee view

2.24 The committee has carefully considered the view of all submitters and witnesses. The committee is supportive of a safety net scheme and is of the view that the proposed capping of redundancy entitlements at 16 weeks provides an appropriate level of cover for those workers affected by liquidation or bankruptcy of their employer. It notes that redundancy pay is only one of a number of entitlements that can be accessed under the Scheme.

2.25 The committee agrees that employees are entitled to all the benefits owing to them by their employer; however, the committee does not agree that a publicly funded scheme should cover all of these entitlements when they exceed the NES.

2.26 The committee is of the view that the proposed change provides an equitable solution to all affected workers, rather than favouring those who have negotiated a much higher entitlement. The committee notes that where a claimant is owed more than 16 weeks redundancy pay by their employer, they will be able to pursue the portion of that debt that is not paid by the Scheme.²⁴

Reasonable steps to pursue a debt

2.27 Item 5 inserts a new section 17A which provides that where a claimant did not take reasonable steps before their employer's insolvency event to be paid debts relating to their unpaid employment entitlements, the Secretary of the department may

21 *Submission 13*, p. 11.

22 Ms Sandra Parker, Deputy Secretary, Workplace Relations and Economic Strategy, Department of Employment, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p.18.

23 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 3.

24 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 3.

reduce the amount of the claimants' advance by the amount of those debts. The provision is designed to ensure that individuals are still required to actively pursue debts owed to them, but will also allow payment to be made for debts where the person took reasonable steps to pursue a debt. The requirement to take 'reasonable steps' will depend on the individuals' unique circumstances.²⁵

2.28 Some submitters expressed concerns about the inclusion of this provision. The ACTU indicated that while it appreciates the proposed provision is intended to clarify the original intention that an employee ought to have taken reasonable steps to claim debts owed to them, the amendment may lead to circumstances where offsetting occurs other than on a 'like for like' basis.²⁶

2.29 The department explained in its submission that the current Act operates with an unintended consequence, whereby if a part of an employee's unpaid entitlements is considered not to have been reasonably pursued, the employee will not be eligible for payment under the Scheme.

If applied literally, this would have an unduly harsh outcome for employees and would be at odds with the intended operation of the provisions. The Bill seeks to address this unintended narrowing of the provision by shifting the requirement for a person to take reasonable steps to pursue a debt from a consideration under eligibility criteria to a consideration under calculating the amount of entitlements owed.

Under the proposed amendment a fairer and more flexible approach will be available so that a claimant can still be paid those entitlements that are unaffected by the 'did not reasonably [take] steps to pursue' rule. This will provide a more beneficial outcome for employees.²⁷

2.30 The committee sought to clarify the issue during the hearing, referring to examples contained in the department's submission, and requested more information about how 'reasonable steps' might apply in practical terms.²⁸ The department provided the following explanation:

In that situation the only requirement is that the applicant had taken reasonable steps, and that would be judged on a case-by-case basis. We discuss this at length in the explanatory memorandum for the original bill. You look at the totality of the circumstances. Their language skills, for example, are one consideration and what kinds of debts they were. In a situation where a company was consistently telling people that their debts were safe it would be entirely open to the secretary to be satisfied that you

25 Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014, *Explanatory Memorandum*, pp. 5–6.

26 *Submission 5*, p. 5.

27 *Submission 13*, pp 13–14.

28 Senator Sue Lines, *Proof Committee Hansard*, pp 19–20.

would not need to take active steps to pursue that debt when you were being reassured that the debt was safe.²⁹

2.31 The department continued:

A person will be eligible if they have taken reasonable steps, such as bringing the outstanding entitlements to the employer's attention.

This is similar language to what we have in work, health and safety. It is about reasonableness, it is about reasonably practicable. It is a general view of what reasonable looks like, but the secretary is able to take account of circumstances at the time. This is a benefit for employees.³⁰

Committee view

2.32 The committee is satisfied that the provision provides a much needed discretion that will result in fairer decisions for employees as it will allow the Secretary of the department to consider each set of circumstances on a case by case basis to determine whether reasonable steps to recover a debt were taken by an employee.

Offsetting debts owed to an employer

2.33 The committee also considered evidence provided about situations where an employee may owe a debt to the employer at the time the employer becomes bankrupt. New subsection 32(2A) clarifies that where a debt owed by a claimant to his or her employer is greater than the employment entitlement to which it relates, it can be offset proportionally against any of the claimants other employment entitlements that are payable under the Scheme. For example, where an employee has taken annual leave before they have accrued it.³¹

2.34 The ACTU in its submission, expressed some dissatisfaction with this proposed provision, indicating, amongst other things, that:

... it is presently unclear how any "employment entitlements" other than annual leave (which is used in the example in the explanatory memorandum) could bring about a situation where the debt exceeds the entitlement. The amendment should be confined to the circumstance of annual leave paid in advance.³²

29 Mr Matthew Bankins, Senior Government Lawyer, Workplace Relations Legal Group, Department of Employment, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 20.

30 Ms Sandra Parker, Deputy Secretary, Workplace Relations and Economic Strategy, Department of Employment, *Proof Committee Hansard*, pp 20–21.

31 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 7.

32 *Submission 5*, p. 10.

2.35 The department explained to the committee that an employee debt can occur for anything, including for annual or sick leave, or because property has been retained, such as a laptop.³³

... at the moment the rules are that we can offset, if a debt is owed to the employer, if we are satisfied that the debt exists and it is reasonable to offset it. If the debt does not relate to the five entitlements that are covered under the scheme then we can offset it proportionally against all five entitlements.

...

But if the debt does relate to an entitlement that is payable under the scheme, the wording of the act is unintentionally narrow so that we cannot offset it against the other entitlements; we can only offset it against that particular entitlement. So the purpose of this amendment is to correct that unintended narrowing of how you can offset debts where the debt actually relates to one of the entitlements that is covered under the scheme.³⁴

2.36 The department further explained that in terms of working out a value for an item, it would rely on advice from the insolvency practitioner and use other evidence to determine market value.³⁵

Committee view

2.37 The committee is persuaded that this measure is appropriate because it ensures that where an employee has received something from their employer (including leave not yet accrued or property) there is a capacity to offset a public funded payment for its value.

Does the current Scheme create a 'moral hazard'?

2.38 In the Second Reading Speech, the Hon Christopher Pyne, MP, Minister for Education, stated:

This level of protection is very generous by community standards. It creates a moral hazard – it provides an incentive for employers and unions to sign up to unsustainable redundancy entitlements, safe in the knowledge that if the company fails, the Fair Entitlements Guarantee and the Australian taxpayer will pay for it.

2.39 Discussion at the hearing about 'moral hazard' centred on whether the introduction of uncapped redundancy payments has led to employers being coerced by unions to sign agreements including entitlements that are worth over and above

33 Ms Sue Saunders, Acting Group Manager, Workplace Relations Implementation and Safety Group, Department of Employment, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 22.

34 Ms Sue Saunders, Acting Group Manager, Workplace Relations Implementation and Safety Group, Department of Employment, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 22.

35 Ms Sue Saunders, Acting Group Manager, Workplace Relations Implementation and Safety Group, Department of Employment, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 22.

NES levels with the knowledge they will be covered by the commonwealth in the event of insolvency or bankruptcy.

2.40 A number of submitters expressed strong views that a moral hazard in this context simply does not exist. For example, the TCFUA stated that in its experience, 'there is simply no evidence that this is borne out in enterprise bargaining since the commencement of the enhanced GEERS scheme and the FEG Act.'³⁶ In evidence at the hearing, the TCFUA emphasised this point:

This is a contention which is completely unfounded. There is simply no evidence that the existence of provisions in the FEG Act providing for the payment of redundancy beyond 16 weeks creates an incentive for unsustainable bargaining.³⁷

2.41 Similarly, the AMWU stated:

Unions have been in the business of trying to get some security for workers for a very long time, and certainly before my time. So, there is nothing new the unions pressing redundancy claims. It is not true that since the introduction of the federal entitlement guarantee the AMWU has pressed a patent four-week claim. This is simply not the case.³⁸

2.42 The ACTU expressed a similar view:

Let us get the facts straight on this moral hazard argument. There is not one. Nobody has shown a rise in the level of redundancy pay provided in agreement or contracts of employment, and even if they could do that it would be another thing to attribute a cause to it. It is pure speculation. Further, it ought to be remembered that redundancy terms are developed in the context of an expectation that business will continue. No business and no worker wants to see a redundancy of some members of the workforce turn into the closure of the workplace on account of an incapacity to pay...³⁹

2.43 Equally, the committee received submissions and took evidence at the hearing that strongly supported the view that a moral hazard does in fact exist. The Ai Group discussed that it is in fact a small percentage of employers who do the wrong thing that create a moral hazard:

There are major moral hazards present in the current legislative provisions, because there is little protection against employers being coalesced by

36 Textile Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia, *Submission 7*, p. 14.

37 Ms Michele O'Neil, National Secretary, Textile Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 17 September 2014, p. 12.

38 Mr Steve Dargavel, Victorian State Secretary, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 17 September 2014, p. 10.

39 Mr Trevor Clarke, Director, Industrial and Research, Australian Council of Trade Unions, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 17 September 2014, p. 9.

unions into implementing extremely generous redundancy packages in the lead up to insolvency, leaving taxpayers to pick up the tab.⁴⁰

...

[T]here are a raft of laws that seek to ensure that that happens: directors' liabilities, accounting standards, a whole range of things. Over the years we have written a lot about protection of entitlements. The term 'moral hazard' is a very common term in all the literature, not just ours. 99.99 per cent of employers pay their entitlements when due. The other fraction of one per cent, despite all those other laws, do not. That is where we need a fair, publicly funded scheme to come along and provide an appropriate level of protection. Yes, people are free to negotiate whatever they want in the enterprise bargaining system but it should not be the case that taxpayers are exposed to a massive extent by what people agreed to in the bargaining sphere.⁴¹

2.44 ACCI expressed its views about moral hazard in terms of a risk to employers:

But there is a major incentive for unions to coerce employers in the lead up to an insolvency to agree to a redundancy package of four weeks per year of service. The level of protection in the Act is quite minimal on that. From memory, I think there is a six month period where the rationale can be looked at. There is a major risk.⁴²

2.45 ACCI also discussed the potential for the design of the scheme to distort the bargaining process:

What I am saying is that the potential arises in the dynamic it introduces into negotiations. It is one thing for two parties to sit down and negotiate terms and conditions, but if they know at the back of their mind that ultimately the government will pick up this entitlement then our proposition is that that will impact on the bargaining dynamic.⁴³

...

What we are saying is that the design of the scheme should be amended to reflect the safety net in the NES.⁴⁴

2.46 The committee asked the department to expand on the theme of moral hazard, asking for evidence or examples of where employers have signed unsustainable

40 Mr Stephen Smith, Director, National Workplace Relations, Australian Industry Group, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 1.

41 Mr Stephen Smith, Director, National Workplace Relations, Australian Industry Group, *Proof Committee Hansard*, pp 4–5.

42 Mr Richard Clancy, Director, Workplace Relations, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 4.

43 Mr Richard Clancy, Director, Workplace Relations, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 5.

44 Mr Richard Clancy, Director, Workplace Relations, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 6.

redundancy payments in these circumstances.⁴⁵ The department provided the following advice:

... there has been an increase in redundancy payments in excess of 16 weeks in agreements since the scheme came in, that the proportion increased from 22.3 percent in 2011 to 28.3 per cent in June 2014. That parallels the introduction of the more generous redundancy entitlement. No, we do not have evidence of the exact cause and effect, but there is certainly a pattern.⁴⁶

2.47 The committee heard evidence from the department about the cost of the Scheme to the taxpayer, and notes that this is not insignificant:

Some of the stats I provided before showed the growth in the number of claimants and the growth in the amounts. We certainly think that \$297 000 for one redundancy creates risks and we agree with Ai Group when they said that one large company going under can cost the taxpayer millions of dollars. We have lists of companies and the costs that have been paid out to them, and some of them are fairly astronomical – including one for \$15.5 million, going down to \$1 million for the top 10 under FEG and then under GEERS \$10 million down to \$2 million just for a single company. With GEON Australia, for example there were 527 claimants and the amount paid was 15 ½ million.

The government has said that it supports FEG and GEERS. The question is about how much payment and how much of that should [be] borne by the taxpayer. That is a fundamental question. It is also being proposed that it be a safety net and that that be aligned with the NES in terms of redundancy. Some of the discussion has been much broader than that, but in terms of redundancy it is about the safety net and what taxpayers should fund. The department's assessment is that yes, there is a risk to costs. We are very concerned about the cost blowout in the scheme because it just keeps growing.⁴⁷

2.48 In response to this evidence, the committee chair asked the department whether this cost blowout was anticipated and appropriately budgeted for at its inception.⁴⁸ The department confirmed that it was not, and that part of the issue was that with more claims, the department requires more staff which costs more as well.⁴⁹

45 Senator Sue Lines, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 23.

46 Ms Sandra Parker, Deputy Secretary, Workplace Relations and Economic Strategy, Department of Employment, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 23.

47 Ms Sandra Parker, Deputy Secretary, Workplace Relations and Economic Strategy, Department of Employment, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 25.

48 Senator Bridget McKenzie, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 25.

49 Ms Sandra Parker, Deputy Secretary, Workplace Relations and Economic Strategy, Department of Employment, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 25.

Committee view

2.49 The committee accepts that while most businesses do not bargain with the intention of failing, the design of the Scheme could create a risk in some situations whereby some unions negotiate with employers who enter into enterprise agreements on the basis that if the business fails, the government will meet the terms of whatever redundancy agreement is in place, regardless of how far in excess to the NES it is. The committee is of the view that this has the potential to place an unacceptable financial burden on the taxpayer.

2.50 Further, the committee accepts the department's evidence that costs of the Scheme have grown since the cap was removed.

Conclusion

2.51 The committee acknowledges the government's ongoing commitment to providing a safety net scheme to cover certain unpaid employment entitlements when employees lose their job due to the liquidation or bankruptcy of their employer. This scheme has become increasingly generous in recent years, was unbudgeted, and now covers entitlements significantly over and above those in the NES.

2.52 The committee considers the bill is necessary to implement the government's 2014–15 Budget announcement to align the maximum redundancy pay entitlement under the Fair Entitlements Guarantee Scheme with the NES to ensure a sustainable scheme in the future.

2.53 The committee considers that any scheme to compensate employees in the unfortunate position of losing their job under these circumstances should be fair and reasonable to both employee and to the taxpayer. The committee has received overwhelming evidence to suggest that a 16 week cap on redundancy pay entitlement in line with the NES, is fair and reasonable.

2.54 The committee is persuaded that the proposed changes to the Scheme are limited and appropriate. Further, that the cap on redundancy entitlement meets community expectation that the government provide a safety net to those workers affected by the insolvency or bankruptcy of their employer, but that the taxpayer should not meet costs over and above those set out in the NES.

Recommendation 1

2.55 The committee recommends that the bill be passed.

Senator Bridget McKenzie
Chair

LABOR SENATORS' DISSENTING REPORT

1.1 Labor Senators are supportive of a publicly funded scheme to protect workers who are affected when their employers experience insolvency or bankruptcy, but assert that capping the entitlement to maximum redundancy pay at 16 weeks' pay is a government savings measure without justification.

The committee majority has failed to demonstrate justification for the bill

1.2 The intention of the bill is to align one part of the Fair Entitlements Guarantee (FEG), in this case redundancy, with the redundancy standard established under the National Employment Standards (NES) – the NES acts a safety net only, outlining the *minimum* conditions for workers.

1.3 Labor Senators were compelled by evidence expressing concerns that capping the redundancy entitlement at 16 weeks will result in some workers not being paid their full redundancy entitlement they are owed by their employer in the event that employer goes into liquidation or bankruptcy.¹

1.4 Labor Senators discount evidence from the Australian Industry Group (Ai Group) who assert that the scheme is overly generous.² The FEG is not a welfare payment, nor a safety net scheme. Payments under the FEG are entitlements owed to workers, earned during their employment, and agreed to either as part of a bargaining process, contracts of employment or awards negotiated with employers.

1.5 Ms Michele O'Neil, National Secretary, Textile Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia (TCFUA) stated:

To start with a very basic principle of law, workers who accrue, through long years of service, leave, superannuation and redundancy entitlements are entitled to be paid 100 per cent of those entitlements when they are made redundant.³

1.6 Mr Trevor Clarke, Director Industrial and Research, Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) provided evidence to the committee:

Redundancy entitlements are set by awards, by enterprise agreements and by contract of employment. Sometimes unions are involved in setting the entitlements; sometimes they are not. Sometimes the Fair Work Commission is involved in setting those entitlements; sometimes it is not. Whoever sets those entitlements has reasons for doing what they do.

1 Slater and Gordon Lawyers, *Submission 11*, p. 3; Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union, *Submission 8*, p. 5; Queensland Nurses' Union, *Submission 10*, p. 3.

2 Australian Industry Group, *Submission 3*, p. 7.

3 Ms Michele O'Neil, National Secretary, Textile Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 17 September 2014, p. 11.

It is not difficult to imagine why the entitlement at some workplaces is set in excess of the bare minimum provided by the law.

1.7 Both Ai Group and ACCI expressed the view that a publicly funded safety net scheme is necessary to protect workers whose employers went bankrupt. However, they stressed the importance that it should offer an appropriate level of protection. Ai Group stated:

When there is an insolvency, everyone is a loser. Often the managers lose their jobs. If it is a private company, the owners of the business often lose their houses. There are no winners. It is a matter of having the appropriate level of protection.⁴

1.8 This refutes any inference from the Ai Group, referenced by the majority committee report, that employers are being ‘coalesced’ by unions or workers represented by unions into implementing extremely generous redundancy packages in the lead up to insolvency.⁵ The TCFUA confirmed this, giving evidence in their submission that ‘there is simply no evidence that this is borne out in enterprise bargaining since the commencement of the enhanced GEERS scheme and the FEG Act.’⁶ During evidence, the TCFUA state:

There is simply no evidence that the existence of provisions in the FEG Act providing for the payment of redundancy beyond 16 weeks creates an incentive for unsustainable bargaining.⁷

1.9 The AMWU presented similar evidence:

It is not true that since the introduction of the federal entitlement guarantee the AMWU has pressed a patent four-week claim. This is simply not the case.⁸

Nobody has shown a rise in the level of redundancy pay provided in agreement or contracts of employment, and even if they could do that it would be another thing to attribute a cause to it. It is pure speculation. Further, it ought to be remembered that redundancy terms are developed in the context of an expectation that business will continue. No business and

4 Mr Stephen Smith, Director, National Workplace Relations, Australian Industry Group, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 3.

5 Mr Stephen Smith, Director, National Workplace Relations, Australian Industry Group, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 1.

6 Textile Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia, *Submission 7*, p. 14.

7 Ms Michele O’Neil, National Secretary, Textile Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 17 September 2014, p. 12.

8 Mr Steve Dargavel, Victorian State Secretary, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 17 September 2014, p. 10.

no worker wants to see a redundancy of some members of the workforce turn into the closure of the workplace on account of an incapacity to pay...⁹

1.10 The Ai Group, and in turn the committee majority and the government¹⁰ refer to this unfounded view as a ‘moral hazard’. Labor Senators note the strong views expressed during the hearing and by submission that a moral hazard in this context simply does not exist.

1.11 The committee asked the department to expand on the theme of moral hazard, asking for evidence or examples of where employers have signed unsustainable redundancy payments in these circumstances.¹¹ The department provided the following advice:

... there has been an increase in redundancy payments in excess of 16 weeks in agreements since the scheme came in, that the proportion increased from 22.3 percent in 2011 to 28.3 per cent in June 201. That parallels the introduction of the more generous redundancy entitlement. No, we do not have evidence of the exact cause and effect, but there is certainly a pattern.¹²

1.12 When asked directly to provide evidence of this “moral hazard.” neither the Ai Group or ACCI were able to provide evidence to the committee that redundancy claims put forward during a bargaining process were presented because the FEG has an uncapped redundancy scheme. Given that both groups claim to represent large and significant sections of Australian employers and are involved in bargaining outcomes, Labor Senators believe the “moral hazard” claim is unfounded

1.13 Additionally, the committee received submissions and took evidence at the hearing that strongly supported the view that the bill is not justified in a supposed effort to protect employers against unjust claims. The Ai Group discussed that it is in fact a small percentage of employers who do the wrong thing, noting that '99.99 per cent of employers pay their entitlements when due.'¹³

1.14 Labor Senators therefore conclude that where the committee has failed to prove that the increase in redundancy payments in excess of 16 weeks in agreements has been caused by the introduction of the more generous redundancy entitlement, they fail to prove a moral hazard exists in this context.

9 Mr Trevor Clarke, Director, Industrial and Research, Australian Council of Trade Unions, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 17 September 2014, p. 9.

10 <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/sep/04/capping-redundancy-payments-fixes-moral-hazard-says-christopher-pyne>

11 *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 23.

12 Ms Sandra Parker, Deputy Secretary, Workplace Relations and Economic Strategy, Department of Employment, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 23.

13 Mr Stephen Smith, Director, National Workplace Relations, Australian Industry Group, *Proof Committee Hansard*, pp. 4–5.

The bill punishes workers without addressing underlying issues or alternate savings measures

1.15 The department submitted the proportion of total scheme expenditure attributable to the redundancy pay has increased since the entitlement cap was increased in 2011, and the dollar value of redundancy pay entitlements has increased disproportionately to other entitlement types covered by the schemes.¹⁴ The incidence of agreements providing a total maximum redundancy payment of more than 16 weeks has also increased since 2011.¹⁵

1.16 Labor Senators do not refute this evidence, and in fact assert that the evidence given by the department demonstrates the requirement to explore options aside from the capping of redundancy pay in the FEG as a savings measure. However, Labor Senators note that the department failed to take into account the Global Financial Crisis, the average age of workers in the sectors hardest hit by liquidation and bankruptcy and other relevant factors.

1.17 The ACTU suggested during the hearing that other options should be explored before any reduction in entitlements under the Scheme is contemplated, including ranking employee entitlements above certain secured creditors. The ACTU's position is that 'more can and should be done to ensure that the government can maximise the returns it gets from the scheme and to discourage insolvencies that are brought about by misconduct.'¹⁶

1.18 Labor Senators assert that this could be more appropriately delivered by making appropriate changes to the Corporations Act 2001 and improving the ability of the Australian Securities and Investments Commission to enforce penalties on companies and directors when they trade while insolvent, as suggested in the Commission of Audit Report.¹⁷

1.19 We note that the amendments to the FEG happen to mirror recommendation 47 of the Commission of Audit's report:

Where a firm enters into liquidation and is unable to pay employee entitlements, the Fair Entitlements Guarantee Scheme makes certain payments to eligible workers. It is important that employers meet their obligations to fund worker entitlements. The Commission recommends changes be made to the Fair Entitlements Guarantee Scheme to introduce a

14 Department of Employment, *Submission 13*, p. 7.

15 Department of Employment, *Submission 13*, p. 11.

16 Mr Trevor Clarke, Director, Industrial and Research, Australian Council of Trade Unions, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 17 September 2014, p. 10.

17 National Commission of Audit Report, Appendix Volume 2, p. 117.

cap of a maximum redundancy payment equivalent to 16 weeks' pay and limit the wage base for the scheme to Average Weekly Earnings.¹⁸

1.20 It is of concern that the government has drafted amendments to the FEG that punish workers who have been made redundant, restricting their rights to their entitlements, without initiating amendments that work toward keeping businesses afloat.

The bill constitutes a broken promise from the government

1.21 The Coalition Government opposed the lifting of the 16-week cap within the FEG legislation in 2012 and then again in 2013.

1.22 Unlike the process undertaken when Labor introduced the uncapped redundancy within the scheme, evidence was given at the hearing that there was a distinct lack of consultation undertaken between the government and key stakeholders prior to the introduction of the amendments to the legislation.¹⁹

1.23 Labor Senators in particular point to evidence presented by the ACTU in their submission, a letter from Employment Minister, Senator Abetz, dated the 17th of July 2014, stating that workers could “be satisfied that there is no risk to your entitlements”.²⁰ These amendments categorically represent a risk to workers' entitlements.

1.24 Labor Senators therefore hold the view that aligning the FEG with the National Employment Standards is based solely on a view within the Coalition that Australian workers do not deserve any more than the bare minimum. We do not support this view.

Recommendation 1

1.25 The Labor Senators of the committee recommend the bill be rejected.

Senator Sue Lines
Deputy Chair

18 National Commission of Audit Report, Appendix Volume 2, p. 117.

19 Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, response to questions on notice, 18 September 2014, p.1.

20 Australian Council of Trade Unions, *Submission 5*, Appendix 2, P. 15

AUSTRALIAN GREENS' DISSENTING REPORT

1.1 The Greens do not support the Fair Entitlements Guarantee Amendment Bill 2014 (bill) because it will make life harder for employees at the very time they need support: when their employer organisation fails.

1.2 We note that before the election, the Coalition reassured voters that it would not change the Fair Entitlements Guarantee. The current Minister for Employment, Senator the Hon. Eric Abetz, said in July 2013 that 'you can be assured that the Coalition would not seek to do anything that would water down these important protections for Australian workers.' This was yet another broken promise and unarguably deceived voters.

1.3 The Prime Minister, the Hon. Tony Abbott, MP, has no mandate to change the *Fair Entitlements Guarantee Act 2012* (Act) and especially not to reduce employees' redundancy payouts, but that is exactly what he is seeking to do.

1.4 The bill seeks to unfairly shift the financial responsibility onto employees, who have been or are just about to be made redundant, despite the fact that they are not responsible for running the business that has failed and are paid less as a result. The bill would sacrifice the rightfully earned benefits of employees thanks to the actions of others, which may have contributed to or caused the failure of their employer organisation. This means that employees could have their benefits curtailed through no fault of their own.

1.5 The Greens do not believe that this is right in principle or in practice.

1.6 We believe that the bill will weaken the safety net that protects workers when their employer becomes bankrupt or insolvent. In turn, this will make it harder for people to get back into the workforce and that is plainly not in the national interest.

Older employees

1.7 We also believe that this bill would not only potentially compound the impact of redundancy on retrenched employees, but would also hit older employees hardest of all, as they will usually have the highest potential payouts and thus stand to lose the most from a cap that reduces their payout. These are people who have worked medium to long periods with the failed employer yet could pay the highest price for their loyalty and hard work.

1.8 The ability of older employees to recover from the impact of being made redundant will already be harder than for younger employees. We know that it is often much harder for older employees to find work, for example. With the government seeking to raise the age that older people can claim their pension, reducing their redundancy benefits would be particularly egregious. This is grounds alone to reject this bill, although there are plenty more.

Cutting redundancy payments

1.9 The Greens believe that a fair day's pay for a fair day's work is fundamental to Australia's way of life. This bill weakens that historic contract.

1.10 It is equally fundamental and reasonable for employees to expect their entitlements, which are part of their employment contract, to be legally enforceable rights, enshrined in law. It is a continuing affront to basic workplace rights and to employees' workplace rights that, in 21st century Australia, their accrued and rightfully earned benefits can simply vanish when a business fails.

1.11 The bill proposes capping the maximum payout that a redundant employee can receive at 16 weeks' pay. We believe this could mean that an employee is not paid the full amount to which they are entitled. This could therefore impinge one of the fundamentals of fair work, that of being paid what you have rightfully earned. This amounts to institutional theft.

Reasonable steps to pursue a debt

1.12 The bill also proposes potentially reducing a retrenched employee's rightfully earned entitlements if they do not take 'reasonable steps,' before their employer's insolvency, to be paid their debts relating to their unpaid employment entitlements. Even the committee's report concedes that what constitutes 'reasonable steps' will depend on the individual's unique circumstances.

1.13 It is unclear why the onus should be on the employee to recover what is rightfully theirs, earned by their own hard work, and none of the onus is shared by the employer, whose actions may have contributed to or even caused the failure of the employing organisation.

1.14 The Hon. Christopher Pyne MP, Minister for Education, second reading speech suggests this amendment is technical and aimed at ensuring employees aren't excluded from eligibility but merely may have their payments reduced.¹ However, it is not clear that the current provision has resulted in unfairness in its operation.

Exploited employees

1.15 We note the Textile Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia's (TCFUA) submission that 'most workers' in the textile industry work week to week, have few resources, little discretionary income, may be enduring long-held injuries, may have a low education threshold and poor language skills. This bill would make it harder, not easier, for them to claim what is rightfully theirs when their employer organisation fails. We believe that it is simply unrealistic to put the burden of claiming their rightful benefits on the employee, who for these reasons may find it impossible to demand their benefits from an exploitative or unsympathetic boss. Vulnerable employees deserve additional protections to guarantee their benefits, not have what protections they do have watered down even more.

Phantom moral hazard

1.16 We note that the government has tried to make the argument that the current Act creates a 'moral hazard.' By this it apparently means that the Act creates an overly

1 The Hon. Mr Christopher Pyne MP, Minister for Education, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 4 September 2014.

generous redundancy payout regime that is open to exploitation by employees and unions. We note, in equal terms, that the government has failed to provide any evidence for this apparent 'moral hazard' and that the government's own department said in its submission that it did 'not have evidence of the exact cause and effect' of this apparent risk.²

1.17 In reality, the government has created a phantom risk as a pretext to reduce the rights of people at work, while reducing the payouts that company managers and owners may have to pay out.

1.18 The Greens understand that fair work depends on mutual respect between employers and employees, to which a fair day's work for a fair day's pay is fundamental. We believe that the government tilting the playing field against employees is counter-productive and will only result in long-term damage to workplace relations, which is in no one's interests.

1.19 The real moral hazard is trying to shift the burden of responsibility onto retrenched employees when they are at their most vulnerable, despite them having no fiduciary, managerial or legal responsibility for the fate of the company. If those running and claiming higher, often significantly higher, remuneration are not answerable to company law that is commensurate with their level of responsibility, this creates inherent risk. When this happens, we agree with the Ai Group that, in these circumstances, '[i]t is a matter of having the appropriate level of protection.'³

Making the country less prosperous

1.20 This bill would subtly shift the responsibility for income support from the commonwealth to the social security system. This would simply be counterproductive. The funds that the government claims would be saved by cutting people's hard-earned redundancy payouts may be offset by the cost of NewStart Allowance and for other support payments. This is particularly true of older workers.

1.21 Fair redundancy payouts are much more beneficial because they help retrenched workers make ends meet until they get back into work. But just like the flawed logic of making young jobseekers look for work without any income support, cutting redundancy payouts makes the country worse off because it makes it harder for people to find work. The Greens oppose this bill.

Senator Lee Rhiannon
Australian Greens

2 Ms Sandra Parker, Deputy Secretary, Workplace Relations and Economic Strategy, Department of Employment, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 23.

3 Mr Stephen Smith, Director, National Workplace Relations, Australian Industry Group, *Proof Committee Hansard*, p. 3.

APPENDIX 1

Submissions Received

1. Business SA
2. Master Builders Australia
3. Australian Industry Group
4. National Farmers' Federation
5. Australian Council of Trade Unions
6. United Services Union
7. Textile Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia
8. Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union
9. Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry
10. Queensland Nurses' Union
11. Slater and Gordon Lawyers
12. National Electrical and Communications Association
13. Department of Employment
14. Motor Trade Association of South Australia

Response to Questions on Notice

- 1 Response to a question on notice from Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, received 18 September 2014
- 2 Responses to questions on notice from the Department of Employment, received 19 September 2014

APPENDIX 2

Public Hearing

Melbourne, Wednesday, 17 September 2014.

CLANCY, Mr Richard, Director, Workplace Relations, Australian Chamber of
Commerce and Industry

SMITH, Mr Stephen, Director, National Workplace Relations, Australian Industry
Group

CARMODY, Mr Reginald, Affiliate representative, Australian Council of Trade
Unions

CLARKE, Mr Trevor, Director, Industrial and Research, Australian Council of Trade
Unions

DARGAVEL, Mr Steve, Affiliate representative, Australian Council of Trade Unions

O'NEIL, Ms Michele, National Secretary, Textile Clothing & Footwear Union of
Australia

BANKINS, Mr Matthew, Senior Government Lawyer, Workplace Relations Legal
Group, Department of Employment

PARKER, Ms Sandra, Deputy Secretary, Workplace Relations Economic Strategy,
Department of Employment

SAUNDERS, Ms Sue, Acting Group Manager, Workplace Relations and
Implementation Safety Group, Department of Employment