Law Council
OF AUSTRALIA

Treasury Laws Amendment (Victims of Crime) Bill 2026: Access to superannuation for victims of child sexual abuse crimes

The Treasury

24 February 2026

Telephone +61 2 6246 3788
Email mail@lawcouncil.au
PO Box 5350, Braddon ACT 2612
Level 1, MODE3, 24 Lonsdale Street,
Braddon ACT 2612
Law Council of Australia Limited ABN 85 005 260 622
www.lawcouncil.au

Contents

Acknowledgements 1

Introduction 2

Summary of the Exposure Draft Bill 3

Feedback on aspects of the reforms 4

- Additional contributions 4
  - Foreign superannuation interests 5
- Family law payment splits 5
- Interaction between release authorities and garnishee orders 6
- Varied and revoked release authorities 7
- Where perpetrators hold self-managed super funds, or are defined benefit scheme members 8
  - Self-Managed Super Funds 8
  - Defined Benefit Schemes 9
- Illiquid investments 9
- Liability of trustees 10
- Death of the perpetrator 10
- Resourcing for likely demands on legal assistance services 11

Specific feedback on drafting 11

- Consistency of terminology 11
- Item 7—Total amount of release authorities 11
- Item 11—Release authorities 11
- Item 16—Content of notice to Commissioner 11
- Item 21—Amounts paid in relation to a release authority 12
- Item 23—Disclosure of perpetrator superannuation information 12

About the Law Council of Australia 13

Acknowledgements

The Law Council of Australia thanks the Law Institute of Victoria (**LIV**) and the Superannuation Committee of its Legal Practice Section (the **Superannuation Committee**) for their contribution to this submission.

Introduction

1. The Law Council of Australia welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Treasury in relation to its consultation on the draft Treasury Laws Amendment (Victims of Crime) Bill 2026: Access to superannuation for victims of child sexual abuse crimes (the **Exposure Draft Bill**).

2. We note, at the outset, the challenges in engaging with the material in light of the constrained timeframes in which to provide feedback, both for the Exposure Draft Bill and the earlier consultation in 2023.[1] We reiterate concerns that the Law Council has raised across numerous recent Australian Government consultations about the number of important consultations that are being rushed through without adequate time for input and consideration.[2]

3. The Australian Government's Office of Impact Analysis indicates that 30–60 days is usually the appropriate period for effective consultation;[3] consultation on this draft Bill was open for 18 days.

4. Insufficient consultation with civil society threatens the quality of law making in Australia, risks delegitimising the parliamentary process, undermines stakeholder capacity to engage in a robust and considered way, and increases the potential for unintended consequences and the failure of the legislation to achieve its policy objectives.

5. Despite the above concerns about timing, the Law Council continues to welcome appropriate measures to support victim-survivors of child sexual abuse and support the policy intent behind the reforms, namely to prevent convicted perpetrators of child sexual abuse from hiding assets in their superannuation to defeat compensation claims made by victim-survivors.[4] In achieving this policy goal, we also reiterate the need to preserve the fundamental purpose and maintain public confidence in the superannuation system.

6. As noted in our 2023 submission,[5] compulsory superannuation was introduced in Australia for the purpose of delivering "private income to enhance the living standards of retired Australians"[6] and to reduce the financial burden on government by

---

1 The Treasury, *Access to offenders' superannuation for victims and survivors of child sexual abuse* (Discussion Paper, January 2023) ('2023 Discussion Paper').

2 See Law Council of Australia, 'A call for transparent and sensible lawmaking' (Media Release, 3 September 2025) <https://lawcouncil.au/media/media-releases/a-call-for-transparent-and-sensible-lawmaking>.

3 Office of Impact Analysis, *Best Practice Consultation* (Guidance Note, July 2023) 7. See also Law Council of Australia, *Best Practice Legislative Development Checklist* (Policy Statement, 21 July 2025). <https://oia.pmc.gov.au/sites/default/files/2023-08/best-practice-consultation.pdf>.

4 Law Council of Australia, *Access to offenders' superannuation for victims and survivors of child sexual abuse* (Submission, 24 February 2023) 5 [5] ('2023 Submission').

5 Law Council of Australia, *Access to offenders' superannuation for victims and survivors of child sexual abuse* (Submission, 24 February 2023) 5 [2].

6 Review into the Governance, Efficiency, Structure and Operation of Australia's Superannuation System, Final Report (Part One, 2010) <https://treasury.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-03/R2009-001_Final_Report_Part_1_Consolidated.pdf> 15-16.

providing individuals with an "adequate social security safety net."[7] Since its introduction, superannuation has developed into a critical mechanism to ensure that individuals are able to maintain a standard of living in retirement that provides them with dignity and independence.

7. For this reason, strict regulations apply to compulsory superannuation contributions to ensure that accumulated funds are preserved for the intended purpose of providing retirement income. Presently, the law allows for superannuation funds to be accessed prior to retirement in a very limited number of circumstances and subject to strict criteria, including, for example, for reasons of demonstrable financial hardship.[8]

8. Therefore, while supportive of the underlying policy intent of the Exposure Draft Bill, we do voice caution with some aspects of the proposals and note the inherent risk of extending access to superannuation funds as a solution for other policy issues.

Summary of the Exposure Draft Bill

9. The declared intention of the Exposure Draft Bill is to create a framework to enable victims and survivors of child sexual abuse offences (**victim-survivors**[9]) to seek visibility and release of certain amounts of a perpetrator's superannuation to satisfy unpaid compensation orders in specified circumstances. This includes amendments to the *Bankruptcy Act 1966* (Cth) so that a victim-survivor's compensation debt can also survive a perpetrator's bankruptcy.[10]

10. The underlying policy intent is articulated as preventing persons who have perpetrated specified child sexual abuse offences from using their superannuation accounts to shield their assets for the purpose of defeating compensation payments.[11] To achieve this, where a victim-survivor of a specified child sexual abuse offence has a compensation order that remains unpaid after 12 months,[12] the Exposure Draft Bill would introduce a regime with three main elements:

    - a mechanism by which a victim can apply to the Commissioner of Taxation (**Commissioner**) for information about the perpetrator's superannuation;
    - based on that information, a mechanism by which a victim can then apply to the Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 2) for a "perpetrator contributions release order"; and
    - a mechanism by which the Commissioner is then to issue one or more release authorities to one or more superannuation providers to give effect to the perpetrator contributions release order.[13]

---

7 Ibid.

8 Law Council of Australia, *Access to offenders' superannuation for victims and survivors of child sexual abuse* (Submission, 24 February 2023) 5 [3]

9 The Law Council acknowledge that people who have experienced child sexual abuse may prefer the term "victim" or "survivor". Throughout this submission, we have adopted the term "victim-survivor." We recognise that individuals who have experienced child sexual abuse may not identify with either of these terms.

10 Exposure Draft Explanatory Materials, Treasury Laws Amendment (Victims of Crime) Bill 2026: Access to superannuation for victims of child sexual abuse crimes (Cth) [1.1]–[1.2].

11 Ibid, [1.3]–[1.4].

12 Ibid, [1.6].

13 Ibid, [1.7]–[1.8].

11. The Exposure Draft Bill provides for access to a perpetrator superannuation by utilising the existing release authority framework in Schedule 1 to the *Taxation Administration Act 1953* (Cth) but with various adaptions to ensure the rules are fit for purpose.[14]

12. Superannuation providers are already currently required to deal with release authorities for excess concessional contributions determinations, excess non-concessional contributions determinations, Division 293 tax assessments and first home super saver determinations. The Law Council agrees that it makes sense for the proposed perpetrator contributions release authorities to leverage the existing release authority framework as far as is appropriate. However, as currently drafted, the Exposure Draft Bill leaves several practical, legal, and procedural uncertainties that warrant clarification, in addition to a number of relatively minor drafting issues that should be addressed. These matters are set out below.

Feedback on aspects of the reforms

Additional contributions

13. In the Law Council's response to the 2023 Discussion Paper, we observed that the rationale for the proposed reforms appeared to assume that a convicted offender has engaged in two separate kinds of conduct that negatively affected the interests of the victim-survivor. Firstly, the offender has committed the underlying offence. Secondly, it was considered that the offender had intentionally placed assets beyond the reach of the victim-survivor, particularly if they perceive there may be a later claim for compensation, causing financial harm.[15]

14. In the Exposure Draft Bill, the concept of 'additional contributions' (in respect of which a perpetrator contributions release order can apply) is found in proposed new section 139-30. The Law Council has received divergent views on the approach taken, as set out below.

15. The Superannuation Committee is content with the substance of how 'additional contributions' is framed in the Exposure Draft. The LIV, however, has raised concerns that the concept of 'additional contributions' in the proposed new section 139-30 appears to exceed the parameters proposed in the 2023 consultation,[16] suggesting that it will capture all additional contributions made by an offender, not only those made deliberately to thwart payment of a compensation order.

16. The Law Council observes that neither in proposed section 139-30, nor elsewhere in the Exposure Draft Bill, is there explicit reference to the concept of additional payments being made to a perpetrator's superannuation for the intended purpose of evading potential compensation claims. This is despite the apparent focus of these

---

[14] Ibid, [1.8].

[15] Law Council of Australia, *Access to offenders' superannuation for victims and survivors of child sexual abuse* (Submission, 24 February 2023) 7 [14]–[15].

[16] The Treasury, *Access to offenders' superannuation for victims and survivors of child sexual abuse* (Discussion Paper, January 2023) 6-9.

reforms on responding to cases where convicted child sexual abuse perpetrators deliberately shield assets from potential compensation orders.[17]

17. We note that not all additional contributions are motivated by an intention to shield assets. Superannuation contributions can, and are, made genuinely and in good faith, including by a perpetrator. For example:

    - an employer may make discretionary or bonus contributions on behalf of an employee as part of normal remuneration arrangements.
    - an individual may make voluntary contributions for legitimate retirement planning, particularly if they are approaching preservation age or responding to financial advice.
    - a person may increase contributions after a change in employment, salary, or personal circumstances, without any relationship to a potential or actual compensation order.
    - the perpetrator's spouse may genuinely contribute to a joint SMSF with the perpetrator during the eligible period.

18. If the Government's policy intent is to limit "additional contributions" exclusively to contributions made for an avoidance purpose, such as deliberately transferring funds into superannuation to prevent a victim-survivor from accessing compensation, the provision should include explicit language to that effect.

Foreign superannuation interests

19. A separate issue in relation to the concept of additional contributions relates to foreign superannuation interests, which does not appear to have been considered or captured in the Exposure Draft materials.

20. Many individuals transfer overseas super funds to Australia years after migration, and contributions made during the offending period could be embedded within those foreign accounts. Similarly, individuals who transfer foreign funds within the permitted six-month window after arrival may have contributions from the offending period sitting in funds outside Australia's regulatory reach. There is also the unique situation of individuals who are members of United Nations, World Bank, or other exempt international retirement schemes.

21. If offending occurred while contributions were being made to these overseas or exempt funds, it is unclear whether Australian compensation mechanisms would have any reach at all.

Family law payment splits

22. A superannuation provider is not required to comply with a perpetrator contributions release authority in a range of circumstances, including in specified circumstances relating to a family law payment split. In this respect, the applicable provisions are proposed new sections 131-35(6)(b) and (c) and 131-35(7), which refer to provisions

[17] Exposure Draft Explanatory Materials, Treasury Laws Amendment (Victims of Crime) Bill 2026: Access to superannuation for victims of child sexual abuse crimes (Cth) [1.3]–[1.4].

in Part 7A (Superannuation Interests Subject to Payment Split) of the *Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Regulations 1994*.

23. The Law Council refers to our 2023 submission on the interaction of the proposed framework and family law proceedings,[18] and notes that the Exposure Draft Bill suggests that family law proceedings must be resolved before a release of funds under the framework.[19] We acknowledge that this provides certainty, however continue to observe that this may increase the amount of time for victim-survivors to be able to access funds, or may even risk defeating, or materially reduce available funds to settle the victim-survivors compensation order.[20]

24. We further note the Exposure Draft Bill does not include proposed amendments to the *Family Law Act 1975* (Cth) to address competing claims, nor is there clarity about how a compensation claim will be treated during a property settlement. Under current principles, debts, such as tax liabilities, are usually treated as part of the net asset pool and shared between parties. Without legislative intervention, this could unintentionally burden the non-offending spouse. We recommend further consideration is given to this issue.

25. A related issue arises where a significant tax debt exists, and the Commissioner is joined as a party to family law proceedings. This raises whether similar provisions could apply to outstanding compensation claims. It may be appropriate for the Commissioner to consider compensation liabilities when engaging in family law or recovery proceedings, particularly where tax debt recovery actions intersect with the offender's property pool. Establishing a formal mechanism to recognise compensation orders in these proceedings could help ensure that victim-survivors are not pushed to the back of the creditor queue.

Interaction between release authorities and garnishee orders

26. The Law Council acknowledges and welcomes the consideration given to the interaction between the proposed perpetrator contributions release authorities and various forfeiture orders.[21] However, we note that the Exposure Draft Bill does not appear to contain a complete list of all the different types of orders a superannuation trustee may receive in relation to a member's superannuation benefits. A common example is a child support garnishee order, although trustees can receive a variety of other orders.

27. Further, while the Exposure Draft Explanatory Materials state that other proceedings take precedence over a perpetrator contributions release authority,[22] it is not clear which instrument has priority in these situations. We recommend that consideration

---

18 Law Council of Australia, *Access to offenders' superannuation for victims and survivors of child sexual abuse* (Submission, 24 February 2023) 16 [71-77].

19 Exposure Draft Explanatory Materials, Treasury Laws Amendment (Victims of Crime) Bill 2026: Access to superannuation for victims of child sexual abuse crimes (Cth) [1.62].

20 Law Council of Australia, *Access to offenders' superannuation for victims and survivors of child sexual abuse* (Submission, 24 February 2023) 16 [72-73].

21 Exposure Draft, Treasury Laws Amendment (Victims of Crime) Bill 2026: Access to superannuation for victims of child sexual abuse crimes (Cth) Subsection 131-35(5), Subsection 139-50(4).

22 Exposure Draft Explanatory Materials, Treasury Laws Amendment (Victims of Crime) Bill 2026: Access to superannuation for victims of child sexual abuse crimes (Cth) [1.56].

be given to adopting a more general priority rule to assist trustees to meet their various compliance obligations.

Varied and revoked release authorities

28. The Exposure Draft Explanatory Materials state:

> *If multiple superannuation providers hold superannuation interests for the perpetrator, the Commissioner may issue separate release authorities to the superannuation providers, specifying the relevant amount to be released by each. If there are multiple release authorities issued, the total amount released in accordance with the release authorities should not exceed the amount specified by the court in the perpetrator contributions release order. To ensure the correct amount is released across a perpetrator's superannuation interests, the Commissioner may need to account for amounts stated in earlier release authorities which will not be paid by a superannuation provider.*[23]

29. The applicable provisions in the Exposure Draft Bill are the following proposed new sections 131-20(3) and (4).

> *(3) The amount to be released from one or more *superannuation interests under a release authority issued under subsection 131-15(6) must be worked out so that the total amount stated for all release authorities issued following an order under section 139-50 does not exceed the amount specified in the order.*
>
> *(4) For the purposes of working out the total amount stated for all release authorities under subsection (3), disregard an amount stated in another release authority to the extent that a notice given under subsection 131-50(4) states that the amount will not be paid or that part of the amount will not be paid.*

30. However, the Law Council submits that the proposed new sections may not achieve the intended outcome as identified in the Explanatory Materials at paragraph 1.87.

31. Proposed subsection 131-20(3) refers to "*the total amount stated for all release authorities issued following*" a perpetrator contributions release order. On its face, this would include release authorities that are subsequently varied or revoked (noting that variation and revocation are provided for in existing section 131-30).

32. The Law Council therefore suggests that the proposed new sections could be amended to make it clear that release authorities that are subsequently varied or revoked are excluded when determining whether the overall cap set by the perpetrator contributions release order has been reached. This could be achieved in a variety of ways including by adding "(and not varied or revoked)"' after "issued" in proposed new section 131-20(3) or by adding varied and revoked release authorities to what is to be disregarded under proposed new section 131-20(4).

---

[23] Exposure Draft Explanatory Materials, Treasury Laws Amendment (Victims of Crime) Bill 2026: Access to superannuation for victims of child sexual abuse crimes (Cth) [1.87].

Where perpetrators hold self-managed super funds, or are defined benefit scheme members

33. The Exposure Draft Bill appears to be primarily aimed at perpetrators using large APRA-regulated funds to shelter assets. However, some perpetrators may hold self-managed super funds (**SMSF**s) or are members of an older defined benefits scheme. Each of these superannuation funds present their own challenges under the proposed framework.

Self-Managed Super Funds

34. SMSFs are captured under the proposed reforms, with additional consequences applying for non-compliance with a release authority for an SMSF. However, there are some additional issues relevant to SMSF that do not appear to have been considered, nor addressed in the Exposure Draft Materials.

35. SMSFs may present issues where there are multiple members of the perpetrator's SMSF, and the fund holds illiquid assets such as property. Requiring an SMSF to release part of the offender's benefits could disadvantage innocent members whose balances are tied to the same underlying asset. While the Explanatory Materials indicate that non-compliance by SMSF trustees will attract penalty units, they do not address how the interests of non-offending members will be protected. This is a significant omission, given the high levels of interdependence within SMSFs and the potential for unintended harm to family members who are not responsible for the offending.

36. SMSF auditors may face situations where offenders attempt to artificially depress asset values to reduce their exposure to compensation recovery. It is important to consider whether higher penalties or heightened audit obligations should apply where undervaluation occurs, either negligently or intentionally. Ensuring integrity in asset valuation is essential to prevent manipulation of SMSF balances in anticipation of compensation claims.

37. There may also be issues where an SMSF has failed to lodge tax returns for several years and is no longer registered with the ATO. Offenders may continue to operate these funds informally despite their deregistered status. Victim-survivors require a pathway to enforce compensation orders against such funds, but the Exposure Draft Bill does not appear to address how assets held within a non-complying or deregistered SMSF can be accessed, valued, or even identified.

38. Administrative challenges also arise where contribution histories have been lost due to rollovers, particularly in SMSFs where historical data is often incomplete or entirely missing. There must be clarity on who bears the administrative burden of reconstructing contribution histories and a workable framework to ascertain whether it is the responsibility of the ATO, superannuation funds, auditors, or the victim-survivor. Without clear responsibility, reconstruction efforts may be inconsistent or unworkable.

39. We therefore suggest that consideration be given to supervision provisions for SMSFs, to prevent asset manipulation intended to avoid, or undermine, compensation orders.

Defined Benefit Schemes

40. We note that a superannuation provider is not required to, but may choose to, comply with a perpetrator contributions release authority in relation to a defined benefit scheme.[24] The Law Council submits that defined benefit schemes such as the Commonwealth Superannuation Scheme (**CSS**), Public Sector Superannuation (**PSS**) Scheme, and certain legacy government schemes may require particular attention.

41. These schemes do not operate like standard accumulation accounts. Their entitlements are determined by formulae rather than account balances, making it unclear what information will be disclosed to the victim-survivor. Additionally, certain older SMSFs still operate legacy defined benefit style pensions established before 2006. Although most of these arrangements were commuted when total super balance rules were introduced, a small number may persist. These legacy pensions may not operate in a manner contemplated by the draft legislation, creating a risk of inconsistency or non-compliance simply because the scheme type does not align with the assumptions underlying the reforms.

42. Further complexities arise for government schemes where offenders over 60 may otherwise meet a condition of release and withdraw their CSS or PSS entitlements. Consideration should be given to whether these schemes should have a mechanism to pause, restrict, or supervise withdrawals once an offender is convicted of child sexual abuse offences and subject to a compensation order. Without such a mechanism, an offender may be able to lawfully dissipate their entire entitlement before enforcement action is taken, undermining the purpose of the reform.

Illiquid investments

43. The Exposure Draft Bill states that, upon being provided with a release authority, a trustee must pay the Commissioner in accordance with the release authority within 10 business days.

44. From a practical perspective, superannuation trustees offer a variety of investment options with varying levels of liquidity. Some investments are illiquid and cannot be converted to cash within 10 business days or, if they can, converting them to cash within that time period would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the realisable value of the investment. This means that the liquidity of some investments may be inconsistent with the proposed standard 10 business day timeframe to pay a perpetrator contributions release authority.

45. Further, it is unclear whether a trustee can take into account liquidity considerations when determining the maximum available release amount at the time a release authority is submitted. The Law Council suggests that consideration is given to clarifying how trustees are required to respond to a perpetrator contributions release authority where the member is invested in assets that cannot be realised (or cannot

[24] Exposure Draft Explanatory Materials, Treasury Laws Amendment (Victims of Crime) Bill 2026: Access to superannuation for victims of child sexual abuse crimes (Cth) [1.102].

be realised without significant adverse impact) within the 10 business days timeframe—in particular, whether the intention is that:

- illiquid assets do not need to be counted as part of the maximum available release amount (on the basis that they could not be payable from the perpetrator's interest 'at that time'—within the 10 business days timeframe), or
- in these circumstances, the trustee is expected to apply to the Commissioner for a longer period to comply with the authority.

Liability of trustees

46. Paragraph 1.111 of the Exposure Draft Explanatory Materials states that "*a superannuation provider is not liable for any actions taken to comply with the release authority*" under the proposed reforms. However, this principle does not appear to be reflected in the Exposure Draft Bill.[25]

47. There is a distinction between a perpetrator contributions release authority compared to the release authorities currently provided for in the taxation legislation in that it would be issued without the consent of the member. As a result, a trustee could be obliged to comply with a perpetrator contributions release authority but have no instructions from the member on issues like:

- which investment option(s) the release authority should be paid from; and
- if the member's superannuation benefits are invested in an illiquid investment, whether to sell down the investment.

48. The trustee could potentially be exposed to a member claim if, for example, it funded the perpetrator contributions release authority from a high performing investment option or needed to sell the illiquid investment at a discount. As a result, the Law Council suggests that statutory protection be included in the legislation for trustees who comply with perpetrator contributions release authorities using language similar to section 29XB of the *Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Act 1993* (Cth).

Death of the perpetrator

49. The Law Council observes that the Exposure Draft Bill and Explanatory Materials do not appear to address the situation of the death of the perpetrator before a release authority is paid. It is likely that many offenders would reach an advanced age, or even pass away, before being sentenced.

50. It is further observed that it is not uncommon for spouses to make contributions into each other's superannuation accounts as part of tax or estate planning strategies. Against this background, the Exposure Draft Bill also does not specify whether unpaid compensation orders can be recovered against the perpetrator's estate after death (for example, where the perpetrator has nominated their superannuation death benefit to a particular person). It also does not clarify whether access to

[25] This can be compared to section 29XB of the *Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Act 1993* (Cth), inserted as part of the Stronger Super reforms, which provided trustees with statutory protection from liability for effecting the prescribed transfers.

superannuation would operate similarly to a lien, a statutory charge or a caveat-like encumbrance on superannuation or estate assets.

51. We suggest that consideration is given to specifying in the legislation whether and how the death of the perpetrator affects the operation of the release authority regime—for example, the legislation could specify that (for the avoidance of doubt) the death of the perpetrator does not affect the operation of the release authority provisions.

Resourcing for likely demands on legal assistance services

52. It appears likely that once in place, the proposed framework will create a demand for legal assistance from victim-survivors seeking to access the scheme. Consideration should be had to ensuring these reform measures are accompanied by adequate increases to frontline legal services, to ensure there is sufficient capacity to respond to this increase in legal need.

Specific feedback on drafting

Consistency of terminology

53. We note that there is reference throughout the Exposure Draft Bill to "perpetrator contributions order" rather than "perpetrator contributions release order". The materials should be reviewed for consistency.

Item 7—Total amount of release authorities

54. There appears to be a typographical error at proposed subsection 131-20(3) of the Exposure Draft Bill, where it reads "ore" instead of "or".

Item 11—Release authorities

55. Proposed paragraph 131-35(6)(b)(ii) refers to "circumstances mentioned in subsection (7)", however subsection 131-35(7) appears to relate to paragraph (6)(c)(i). We query whether this is intentional—if not, the cross-referencing needs to be addressed.

Item 16—Content of notice to Commissioner

56. If a superannuation provider is not required to pay an amount under a perpetrator contribution release authority, proposed new section 131-50(4) sets out additional requirements for the notice that the superannuation provider must give to the Commissioner.

57. The Law Council notes that the section refers to "subsection 131-35(4)", however, we suggest that the cross reference should be to "either subsection 131-35(5) or (6)" with the relevant proposed provisions copied below for reference.

Item 21—Amounts paid in relation to a release authority

58. We query whether there is a typographical error under item 21 of the Exposure Draft Bill that proposes the insertion of new subsection 131-65(5). Currently the last provision in section 131-65 is section 131-65(3), indicating the new provision should be section 131-65(4).

Item 23—Disclosure of perpetrator superannuation information

59. There appears to be a typographical error in proposed paragraph 139-30(1)(a) which in the text of the Exposure Draft Bill refers to "subsection (3)" when the reference should possibly be to "subsection (4)".

60. It is further suggested that in proposed new section 139-30(1)(a)(iii), the words "(within the meaning of Part 1 of the *Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Regulations 1994*)" should be inserted immediately after "employer contribution" (noting that "employer contribution" is defined in regulation 1.03(1)).

About the Law Council of Australia

The Law Council of Australia represents the legal profession at the national level; speaks on behalf of its constituent bodies on federal, national, and international issues; promotes and defends the rule of law; and promotes the administration of justice, access to justice, and general improvement of the law.

The Law Council advises governments, courts, and federal agencies on ways in which the law and the justice system can be improved for the benefit of the community. The Law Council also represents the Australian legal profession overseas, and maintains close relationships with legal professional bodies throughout the world. The Law Council was established in 1933, and represents its constituent bodies:

- the Australian Capital Territory Bar Association;
- the Law Society of the Australian Capital Territory;
- the New South Wales Bar Association;
- the Law Society of New South Wales;
- the Northern Territory Bar Association;
- the Law Society Northern Territory;
- the Bar Association of Queensland;
- the Queensland Law Society
- the South Australian Bar Association;
- the Law Society of South Australia;
- the Tasmanian Bar;
- the Law Society of Tasmania;
- the Victorian Bar Incorporated;
- the Law Institute of Victoria;
- the Western Australian Bar Association;
- the Law Society of Western Australia; and
- Law Firms Australia.

Through these bodies, the Law Council represents more than 110,000 Australian lawyers.

The Law Council is governed by a board of 23 Directors: one from each of the constituent bodies, and six Executive members elected by Directors. The Directors meet quarterly to set objectives, policy, and priorities for the Law Council. Between Directors' meetings, responsibility for the policies and governance of the Law Council is exercised by the Executive members, led by the President. In 2026, the Law Council Executive comprises:

- Ms Tania Wolff, President
- Ms Elizabeth Shearer, President-elect
- Mr Lachlan Molesworth, Treasurer
- Ms Jennifer Ball, Executive Member
- Mr Justin Stewart-Rattray, Executive Member
- Mr Ante Golem, Executive Member

The Chief Executive Officer of the Law Council is Dr James Popple.

The Law Council's Secretariat is based in Canberra. Its website is www.lawcouncil.au.