#### Number 50 August 1989

### SOCIAL SECURITY

## UNIV. KSITY OF N.S.W.

- 4 APR 1990

### LAW LIBR / RY

## Opinion

### Number 50

This issue of the Reporter represents a modest achievement — 50 issues in 9 years. Our first issue was published in June 1981, and we've managed to come out every 2 months since then. The credit for that goes to our writing and production team - listed below. Meanwhile, the AAT and Federal Court continue to pour out social security decisions; and the Government continues to develop legislative and administrative changes — so there is no prospect of the Reporter running out of work. Here's to the next 50 issues!

This issue carries the usual fascinating range of decisions. For example . . .

# Incapacity and impairment

Two decisions noted in this issue throw a bright light on the relationship between 'impairment' and 'incapacity for work' — referred to in s.27(b) of the *Social Security* Act. In Zanos (p.658), the AAT was critical of the DSS procedures for calculating a level of impairment and matching that to incapacity. The procedures, the AAT said, were contrary to the Act, internally inconsistent and showed 'considerable confusion of mind'.

That critical approach follows the general ideas developed in *Kadir* (1989) 49 *SSR* 638; and is reinforced by *Sumanovich* (p.657 of this issue).

### Compensation and preclusion — a tight regime

Over the past 12 months, AAT decisions have regularly applied the retrospective

amendment to s.153(1) of the Social Security Act (the preclusion provision) made in June 1988, despite the crude drafting of the amendment, reinforcing the Government's policy to prevent 'doubledipping' into compensation and social security funds. Now, in McKenzie (p.663 of this Reporter), the Federal Court has endorsed the AAT's approach and declared that the June 1988 amendments to s.153(1) were effective to 'catch' any compensation payment made after 1 May 1987.

Over the same period, the AAT has confirmed the generally conservative approach of the DSS to the discretionary power (conferred by s.156), further reinforcing the Government's policy. Examples of this conservative approach in this Reporter are *Bolton* (p.650), *Gibala* (p.651) and *Stevens* (p.651). *Bolton* contains a thorough review of the range of factors which could amount to 'special circumstances' — financial hardship; the retrospective legislative change to the Act; incorrect legal advice; and ill health.

Gibala raised an interesting rationalisation which could be used to deny 'special circumstances' where a person settled her or his compensation claim at a 'discount' in ignorance of the preclusion rule. The AAT suggested that, in such a case, the person would not suffer, because the lower the settlement figure, the shorter the preclusion period: the well-advised person who insisted on a higher compensation settlement (to see them through the preclusion period) would have to serve a longer preclusion. This the AAT described as a mechanism, provided by the Social Security Act, for 'a self-adjusting preclusion period'.

P.H.

The Social Security Reporter is published six times a year by the Legal Service Bulletin Co-operative Ltd. Tel. (03) 544 0974 ISSN 8017 3524 Editor: Peter Hanks

Contributors: Peter Hanks, Denny Meadows, Jenny Morgan, Beth Wilson Typesetting & Layout: Graphic Zone

Subscriptions are available at \$30 a year, \$20 for Legal Service Bulletin subscribers. Please address all correspondence to Legal Service Bulletin, C/- Law Faculty, Monash University, Clayton 3168. Copyright © Legal Service Bulletin Co-operative Ltd 1989

Registered by Australia Post - Publication No. VBH 6594

	In This issue
!	Opinion
	AAT decisions • Compensation
- l F	Bolton 650 • Compensation award: discretion to disregard
5	<i>McMahon</i> 651 • Compensation payment: preclusion
) 1	• Preclusion: looking behind a
5	compensation award Vuckovic 652 • Cohabitation H 653
/ :	• Stay order
1 2	Bishop 654 Webber 654 • Jurisdiction:
ı f	withdrawal by applicant Nicholson 655 • Unemployment benefit:
1 2	living in remote area Atkinson 656 • Unemployment benefit:
ç	postponement Boon-Kiat Foo 656 • Invalid pension:
, L L	incapacity for work Sumanovich 657
1	• Invalid pension: measuring incapacity and impairment
;	Zanos 658 • Income test: victim of Nazi persecution
·	Albera 659 • Income test: redemption of investment
	fund units <i>Kitchen</i> 660 • Sickness benefit recovery: looking behind the
	• Assets test: • Compensation award • Assets test:
-	debt owed by a company <i>Clarke</i> 661 • Overpayment:
	custody, care and control <i>Leppala</i> 661 • Dependent children overseas:
	additional pension? <i>Calleya</i> 662 <b>Federal Court decisions</b>
	• Compensation award: preclusion
	<i>McKenzie</i> 663 • Unemployment benefit: full-time student?
	11

Harradine ... 663