



**Response to the Review of  
Australia's Consumer Policy Framework  
Draft Report**

**Productivity Commission**

---

February 2008

**For more information about this submission please contact:**

Chris Jones  
Chief Executive Officer  
GPO Box 1620, HOBART TAS 7000  
phone (03) 6231 9602  
fax (03) 6231 9589  
email [c.jones@anglicare-tas.org.au](mailto:c.jones@anglicare-tas.org.au)

## Contents

1.	Executive summary	3
2.	Background to Anglicare Tasmania’s response	3
3.	Anglicare’s response to the draft recommendations	4
3.1.	A national approach	4
3.1.1.	A national, generic consumer law	4
3.1.2.	A national regulator	5
3.2.	Industry-specific regulation	6
3.2.1.	The need to retain existing protections	6
3.2.2.	The regulation of finance brokers and credit providers	6
3.3.	Unfair terms in standard form contracts	7
3.4.	The need for proactive enforcement: the example of consumers in the private rental market	8
3.5.	Consumer advocacy, information and education	10
4.	References	13

## **1. Executive Summary**

Anglicare Tasmania welcomes the opportunity to contribute to this review of Australia's consumer policy framework. Anglicare's interest in this area arises out of our delivery of financial counselling services in Tasmania and our commitment to advocating on behalf of low income, disadvantaged and marginalised groups.

In general, Anglicare supports the Commission's proposals to improve the consistency and coverage of Australia's consumer policy framework by moving towards a national, generic consumer law with a single, national regulator, the ACCC. This will assist in overcoming many of the problems caused by inconsistency between jurisdictions and the slow pace of change and reform, and the need for national regulation is particularly marked in the case of finance brokers and credit providers. Fringe lending is emerging as a serious issue for vulnerable and disadvantaged Tasmanian consumers.

In addition to a national generic law, Anglicare believes there is a strong case to support the retention of industry-specific regulation in many instances, including the provision of essential services and the provision of potentially harmful or high-risk products. Regulation is an important preventative measure in areas where consumers are particularly vulnerable or disadvantaged.

Anglicare also urges that any moves to establish the ACCC as a national regulator, including the subsuming of obligations and powers currently held by state and territory consumer affairs agencies, be sufficiently resourced and clearly defined to ensure no reduction in existing consumer protection and the retention of accessible, local avenues through which to obtain information, seek advice and address concerns. There will also need to be mechanisms to ensure states and territories are still able to have input into policy development and articulate regional concerns at a national level.

Anglicare is committed to robust consumer protection policies. For this reason we are proposing that the five year review included in the proposed provision in relation to unfair contract terms explicitly consider whether the provision is achieving adequate protection for consumers. Anglicare also urges that regulators practice proactive enforcement as many disadvantaged consumers lack the knowledge, capacity and sense of empowerment to assert their own rights under legislation. Tasmania's residential tenancy legislation is one example of a situation where despite a reasonable level of protection being provided by legislation, breaches are commonplace and the regulator's response is inadequate.

Finally, Anglicare raises a number of concerns in relation to the implementation of recommendations designed to improve consumers' understanding of consumer issues and their capacity to assert their rights. In particular, many consumers have problems with literacy and numeracy, some groups do not have ready access to the internet, short-term awareness campaigns do not provide adequate coverage, many consumers are reluctant to engage in formal processes and proceedings, including legal proceedings, without intensive support, and the most vulnerable and disadvantaged consumers are the ones most likely to miss out on consumer education opportunities. These issues need to be taken into account when designing or implementing strategies to communicate with consumers.

## **2. Background to Anglicare Tasmania's response**

Anglicare is one of Tasmania's largest community organisations, offering a range of services to the Tasmanian community including accommodation support, counselling and family support, disability and acquired injury support, mental health and employment services, a Registered Training Organisation, a social enterprise and a social policy, advocacy and research centre. Anglicare is committed to social justice and to supporting people in need to reach fullness of life.

Anglicare's original and oldest service, our financial counselling service, opened its doors in 1983, and now operates across the state. Like financial counselling services throughout Australia, it is facing rising demand for support with a range of issues. Waiting lists in the service have grown over the last two to three years, with a three to four week wait for an appointment now standard. The clients of Anglicare's financial counselling service come from a range of backgrounds, but the majority are on low incomes, including Centrelink benefits, and struggling to make ends meet. Their capacity to manage debt, juggle bills and meet unexpected costs is restricted by their incomes, they have limited access to affordable credit and many also lack financial literacy skills that would help them protect themselves against exploitation, unwise choices and unfair treatment. A growing number have complex needs, such as intellectual or psychiatric disabilities that affect their capacity to manage their finances; the financial counselling service is picking up on these cases because these clients are not classified as sufficiently disabled to qualify for more intensive support. The cases themselves are also growing in complexity. In addition to providing financial counselling, workers are providing support with developing general life skills and in some cases, long-term emotional support. Yet despite these pressures, the service is still able to deliver, on invitation, a range of consumer education workshops, and various workers are members of a number of committees and working groups, including the Telstra Consumer Consultative Committee Credit Management Working Group, the Energy Regulator's Customer Consultative Committee, the Australian Financial Counselling and Credit Reform Association, the Tasmanian Child Support Stakeholder Engagement Group and the Tasmanian Consumer Advisory Committee. The service achieves all this with a capacity of just six full time equivalent positions.

Anglicare welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Commission's draft report. The response is confined to those areas where Anglicare feels it can most usefully make comment. The response is drawn in part from the experiences of our clients and in part from original research we have conducted into relevant policy areas. Examples of particular aspects of consumer issues have been provided to illustrate how the broader policy framework plays out on the ground in the lives of real people. Because of our area of interest, Anglicare's submission focuses mainly upon the implications of consumer policy for disadvantaged people. But this approach can usefully inform broader perspectives; Justice Roslyn Atkinson points out, in relation to access to justice, "disadvantaged or marginalised groups ... may lack access to the courts but [their] problems with the law may point to the way in which systemic change can increase the prospects of a fairer legal system" (Atkinson 2004). In the same way, the issues facing disadvantaged and vulnerable consumers can draw early attention to areas of consumer policy that are in need of review and reform – as Lowe (2007) points out, some consumers have greater resilience to detriment than others, but ultimately if there is a problem with the policy framework, all consumers will suffer consequences.

### **3. Anglicare's response to the draft recommendations**

#### **3.1. A national approach**

##### **3.1.1. A national, generic consumer law**

In general, Anglicare supports the Productivity Commission's proposals – contained in **Draft Recommendations 4.1. and 4.2.** – for a new, national, generic consumer law that applies throughout Australia and that covers all consumer transactions.

Many of the problems with Australia's consumer policy framework relate to inconsistencies between jurisdictions, the sluggish process of reform when multiple jurisdictions are involved in the process and

gaps that have arisen within the consumer policy framework over time as a result of these problems. For these reasons, Anglicare has recommended a national approach to privacy regulation in relation to residential tenancy databases (Anglicare 2007a, 2007b) and Anglicare's financial counselling service has been involved in the campaign for national regulation of finance brokers and other credit providers. However, there is still a case for retaining industry-specific regulation in some areas. If consumer law is too generic and too centralised, there is a danger that poor practices will slip through gaps in the framework.

According to Consumer Affairs Victoria, general regulation, such as the *Trade Practices Act* and fair trading legislation, has the advantage of providing universal and consistent coverage, has lower associated costs and a reduced risk of regulatory capture, but industry-specific regulation can provide targeted solutions, especially to technical issues, is easier to enforce, and has the capacity to address problems before they occur. An industry-specific approach is most appropriate where general regulation is not working and there is no capacity for improvement, the problem is significant enough to warrant an additional response, the problem and its industry can be effectively targeted by regulation, and the industry is stable enough to make the regulation effective over time (Consumer Affairs Victoria 2006). Industry-specific regulation, because it is able to be tailored to the particular industry, is usually more specific than general regulation; according to the OECD, it is usually adopted in situations of market failure as a means of replacing the market with direct control (OECD 1999 in Consumer Affairs Victoria 2006).

Consistent, comprehensive regulation and consumer protection provisions can promote consumer confidence (Lowe 2007). But Anglicare would argue that industry-specific regulation is also justified as a preventative measure when the industry involved is one in which consumers are highly vulnerable or at risk. Generic regulation is generally reactive, while industry-specific regulation can establish ground rules for participation in a particular industry (Venga 2007). Anglicare believes that there is a strong case for industry-specific regulation in areas of consumer affairs where the service or product is an essential one, such as electricity, or where a consumer can potentially be harmed as a result of the transaction, such as the sale of tobacco, alcohol and gambling products. As well as essential services and high risk products, the Consumer Action Law Centre also supports industry-specific regulation in the case of new markets and credence goods (Lowe 2007).

### **3.1.2. A national regulator**

Anglicare supports **Draft Recommendations 4.4 and 4.5.**, the introduction of a single, national regulator, the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC), to administer the new national, generic consumer law, and the introduction of provisions under which states and territories could elect to transfer their regulatory and enforcement powers to the ACCC prior to the introduction of a single national model.

However, if this approach is to be adopted, it will be absolutely critical that the ACCC receives the resources it will need to deliver on its responsibilities. The Productivity Commission has noted this. Providing information via the internet or telephone will not be enough (the reasons why are discussed at length in section 3.5 of this submission). To ensure that consumers have accessible, local avenues through which to obtain information, seek advice and address their concerns, the ACCC will need to have shopfront offices disbursed throughout the community. In places like Tasmania, the actual distances involved may be small, but highly deficient intrastate transport and the geographical isolation of many communities means that a single office in the capital would not be sufficient. Achieving this level of coverage could be possible through partnerships with local consumer affairs agencies. There will also need to be a budgetary allocation for ongoing consumer education and

proactive enforcement across the country. It would be appropriate for the states and territories to make a proportional contribution to this funding.

The Productivity Commission's proposal is that the ACCC take on the administration of the new national generic law, which will replace individual generic trade practices laws administered by the state. There will still be a vital role for local consumer affairs offices in administering industry-specific state legislation. It will be important that there is clarity around the process and clear delineation of responsibilities and jurisdiction between the ACCC and the state and territory agencies to ensure that the transfer of some powers to the ACCC is not used as an excuse by state consumer affairs offices to avoid or scale back their responsibilities in other areas.

It will also be important, as the chairman of the ACCC Graeme Samuel (2007) points out, to ensure that the local voice is not lost in the development and enforcement of national consistency, and that states and territories are still given the opportunity to have input and convey regional concerns and that the new system has the flexibility to respond to variations in local situations and circumstances if they arise.

## **3.2. Industry-specific regulation**

### **3.2.1. The need to retain existing protections**

As already stated, Anglicare supports the use of industry-specific regulation in preference to generic law in some circumstances. The Consumer Action Law Centre has expressed anxiety that overreaction against regulation could lead to the loss of necessary and effective measures (Lowe 2007). While the review of industry-specific regulation outlined in **Draft Recommendation 5.1.** could be useful in streamlining the regulatory approach, it is important not to lose any existing consumer protections as a result of this process.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That draft recommendation 5.1 be amended to state:**

*CoAG should instigate and oversee a review and reform program for industry-specific consumer regulation that would:*

- *identify and repeal unnecessary regulation, with a particular focus on requirements that only apply in one or two jurisdictions;*
- *drawing on previous reviews and consultations with consumers and businesses, identify other areas of specific consumer regulation that apply in all or most jurisdictions, but where unnecessary divergences in requirements or lack of policy responsiveness impose significant costs on consumers and/or businesses;*
- *determine how these costs would be best reduced, with explicit consideration of the case for transferring policy and regulatory enforcement responsibilities to the Australian Government and how this transfer might be best pursued; and*
- *ensure that existing standards of consumer protection are maintained. In particular, where regulation is to be harmonised across jurisdictions, the higher standard of consumer protection should prevail.*

### **3.2.2. The regulation of finance brokers and credit providers**

Anglicare wholeheartedly supports the transfer of regulation of finance brokers and other credit providers to the Australian Government and the appointment of the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC) as the regulator, as proposed in **Draft Recommendation 5.2.** This is an issue of particular concern for Anglicare's financial counselling clients, especially in relation to fast

finance and fringe lending. 'Pay-day lenders' are a growing problem both in Tasmania and nationally, with one financial counsellor reporting that pay day lenders featured in every new case they saw, with clients using the loans to fund essential expenses, including food, and then becoming trapped in the debt cycle. A national regime such as the Productivity Commission proposes would overcome many of the concerns in relation to the length of time it takes to obtain essential amendments to the Uniform Consumer Credit Code and the many gaps in regulation that currently exist.

However, it is critical that the move towards a uniform approach occurs quickly. It is of considerable concern that action on this issue has been delayed for over 12 months despite there being a consensus between jurisdictions in relation to its necessity (Lowe 2006).

As with the transfer of regulatory powers from the states and territories to the ACCC, it will also be necessary to ensure that ASIC is appropriately funded to carry out the tasks involved. Mandated membership of alternative dispute resolution schemes will mean that consumers will not face the disincentives involved in direct court action, but issues of accessibility, responsiveness and a local presence will also be particularly critical given the high level of vulnerability of many of the consumers affected by poor practice in finance broking.

### 3.3. Unfair terms in standard form contracts

In their submissions to the Productivity Commission's original issues paper on this issue, the Tasmanian Council of Social Service (TasCOSS 2007), the Australian Financial Counselling and Credit Reform Association (AFCCRA 2007), CHOICE (CHOICE 2007), the Consumer Action Law Centre (CALC 2007) and the Centre for Credit and Consumer Law (CCCL 2007) all make reference to the need for action on unfair contract provisions. Anglicare supports this call.

The targeted approach adopted by **Draft Recommendation 7.1.** is cautious, and Anglicare welcomes the inclusion of a review within five years of the introduction of the new provisions. However, from the body of the Commission's report, it is clear that consumers wishing to challenge potentially unfair provisions would need to take the matter to court to have it determined (see p.34). Many of Anglicare's clients will simply not take this course of action – due to being unable to understand the process, being fearful of it or being unable to afford it – or even approach consumer advocates to take action on their behalf. For this reason, Anglicare recommends that the five year review explicitly consider whether the new provisions are achieving adequate protection for consumers, especially disadvantaged and vulnerable consumers, or whether more stringent regulation is required.

#### RECOMMENDATION

**That Draft Recommendation 7.1. be amended to state:**

*A new provision should be incorporated in the new national generic consumer law that voids unfair terms in standard form contracts, where:*

- *the term is established as 'unfair': that is, it is contrary to the requirements of good faith and causes a significant imbalance in the parties' rights and obligations arising under the contract;*
- *there is evidence of material detriment to consumers;*
- *it does not relate to the upfront price of the good or service;*
- *all of the circumstances of the contract have been considered; and*
- *there is an overall public benefit from remedial action.*

*Where these criteria are met, the unfair term would be voided only for the contracts of those consumers subject to detriment, with suppliers also potentially liable to damages for that detriment. There should also be a capacity for an industry or business to secure regulatory approval for 'safe harbour' contract terms that would be immune from any action under this provision. The operation and effects*

*of the new provision should be reviewed within five years of its introduction. The review should explicitly assess whether the provision is achieving adequate protection for consumers, particularly vulnerable or disadvantaged consumers and make appropriate recommendations.*

### **3.4. The need for proactive enforcement: the example of consumers in the private rental market**

Australia's consumer policy framework is reliant on consumers having the capacity to participate effectively in the market, make complaints when things go wrong and instigate their own, private actions when appropriate (Samuel 2007). But some consumers cannot do this. No piece of legislation, set of guidelines or code of practice can be truly effective unless it is proactively enforced. Reactive enforcement depends on complaints being made, but, for a range of reasons, many disadvantaged people do not complain when their rights are disregarded.

An example with which Anglicare is very familiar is that of the rights of consumers under Tasmania's *Residential Tenancy Act 1997*. Anglicare's accommodation support workers regularly hear reports regarding the unlawful termination of leases, inappropriate retention of bonds, intolerable delays around essential repairs and maintenance and inadequate or non-existent condition reports, despite provisions in the legislation providing clear guidance on these issues (Jones 2006). But despite the fact that landlords have broken the law, many tenants feel disempowered and vulnerable and are reluctant to assert their rights for fear of jeopardising their tenancy or their chances of obtaining a positive reference from their landlord.<sup>1</sup> Given the widespread issues observed by accommodation support workers in relation to compliance with the RTA, it is surprising that according to CAFT's annual report (Department of Justice 2007), not one complaint in relation to tenancy issues was received in 2006-07, despite 2,216 enquiries, and just one prosecution was undertaken in relation to the RTA, ending unsuccessfully.

Part of the problem is that CAFT is under-resourced and has a limited state-wide presence, which means it frequently refers complaints, on a range of issues, to other organisations (TasCOSS 2007). There is a specialist legal service in Tasmania for people experiencing problems with their tenancies, the Tenants' Union of Tasmania, but it is also limited by funding constraints in what it can provide (TUT 2007). The limited reach of the service means that tenants are often unaware of its existence, or find confiding their difficulties over the telephone alienating and disempowering (Flanagan 2007).

The reluctance of tenants to pursue complaints through formal avenues is not confined to residential tenancy issues. Research has also found that many people facing social or economic disadvantage do not go directly to specialist services for assistance, and instead approach family, non-legal services, government agencies or MPs for support. This may be in part because people already have connections with non-legal support, such as a caseworker or trade union, and in part because people do not know how to access legal services or choose to address non-legal aspects of problems but leave legal aspects unaddressed (Clarke and Forell 2007). In the residential tenancy context the latter might mean seeking support to find alternative housing rather than challenging an unlawful eviction in the courts. But while many services offer advocacy support to clients, the workers do not necessarily have the

---

<sup>1</sup> Unlike other states, Tasmania does not have a residential tenancy tribunal or a residential deposit authority (although after long delays, a deposit authority is scheduled to be operational by the middle of 2008). There is a Residential Tenancy Commissioner, but that person only has power under the Act to "determine disputes arising in relation to the disbursement of security deposits and, in the case of boarding premises, act in the mediation or conciliation of any disputes between the parties" (s.8.1). Under the Act, the only redress tenants in the private rental market have in relation to other breaches of the legislation is to take the matter to court.



appropriate expertise to handle legal issues (Anglicare Tasmania 2007), and may be at risk of providing inaccurate advice due to blurred understanding of the differences between 'legal information' and 'legal advice' (Clarke and Forell 2007). Services like the Tenants' Union could do more to reach out to these clients but lack the resources and the on-the-ground presence to even begin to do so.

Without adequate support from specialist government or community services, the access of many Tasmanian consumers experiencing problems with any consumer issue to any remedies provided by the court is in reality very limited. The obstacles for disadvantaged people in accessing justice and legal services, including the courts, have been well documented. Consultations conducted by the Law and Justice Foundation of New South Wales found that people who were socially and economically disadvantaged experienced a number of barriers in obtaining legal assistance, including the high cost of legal services, the relative financial power of the other party and the inaccessibility of legal information websites and help-lines. Legal aid services, which are meant to fill some of the gaps, are poorly funded and can be subject to restrictive guidelines, which limit people's access to support (Schetzer and Henderson 2003). People can find court proceedings intimidating, especially if they have limited or negative experience of the legal system (TUT 2006).

In 2006-2007, the Residential Tenancy Commissioner<sup>2</sup> received 177 applications for a determination on security deposit issues, the highest number since the Office opened (Department of Justice 2007), indicating that when a non-adversarial, accessible means of resolving concerns is provided, people will use it. As a result, Anglicare has recommended extending the Residential Tenancy Commissioner's role so that the Commissioner becomes the first point of contact for all tenants when violations of or disputes around the RTA occur (Jones 2006).

CAFT's current approach to the regulation of the private rental market is reactive rather than proactive. In the report on the post-implementation review of the RTA in 2000, CAFT put forward the following view in response to concerns about the lack of enforcement of the legislation:

While prosecution is important in the event of a blatant breach of a provision of the Act, this is not the only means by which the Act is enforced. Generally, the framework of the Act provides a set of rules which both parties can follow. Some of these rules provide for penalties if not complied with but many provide resource in a court and certainty in the event of a dispute. Having provided, in effect, a set of tools with which to ensure market fairness, it should not be necessary for government to intervene in the event of every dispute (CAFT 2000).

In contrast, the ACCC sees the deterrent and clarification effect of litigation as an extremely valuable element of the policy tool kit (Samuel 2007). The ACCC has made good use of 'strategic litigation' in addressing issues affecting vulnerable and disadvantaged consumers (Samuel 2005). But there is little evidence to suggest, in the more than seven years since the above statement was written, that CAFT's attitude in relation to enforcement of the RTA has fundamentally changed. While it is true that the private rental market is a market, and a highly competitive market at that, the competition in this market is not about providing housing to tenants, especially not to disadvantaged tenants – it is about providing returns, particularly in capital gains, to investors, and this depends on increases in rent and house prices. In this context, given the absolutely fundamental necessity of access to adequate housing, stronger intervention, including proactive enforcement targeting systemic problems and prosecution of breaches of the RTA is absolutely critical to protect consumers.

---

<sup>2</sup> See note on previous page.

Residential tenancies legislation is just one example of where many consumers are disempowered and excluded: adequate regulation exists, but there is no commitment to proactive enforcement to protect consumers' rights. Problems with enforcement can occur because the regulator lacks resources or does not prioritise the issue, or because the enforcement provisions in the legislation are inadequate (Consumer Affairs Victoria 2006). A proactive approach from regulators is more likely where there is both adequate funding and an understanding by the regulator that even if the regulator 'loses', establishing the boundaries of the law is a good outcome in itself (Lowe 2006). Samuel (2007) argues that it is important to respond even to individual issues, as in aggregate, they are no less important to consumer wellbeing. A single complaint can point to a bigger problem: "[t]here is a systemic lesson to be found in most complaints" (McMillan 2007: 3).

**Draft recommendation 10.3** would place more onus on regulators and enforcement agencies such as CAFT's residential tenancies division to justify their actions in relation to enforcement decisions, and requiring the inclusion of stakeholder groups would ensure the process was rigorous and objective. However, Anglicare recommends the specific inclusion of a reference to the responsibility of regulators to address systemic issues to encourage agencies to respond to structural problems as well as to complaints.

## RECOMMENDATION

**Draft recommendation 10.3. should be amended to state:**

*Australia's consumer regulators should be required to report on the nature of specific enforcement problems, including problems relating to systemic issues, their consequences, steps taken to address them and the impact of such initiatives. Such commentary should be informed by surveys of targeted stakeholder groups.*

### 3.5. Consumer advocacy, information and education

*Explanatory note: In this section, Anglicare addresses content relating to Draft Recommendations from chapters 8, 9 and 11 of the discussion draft of the Commission's report. These recommendations are discussed out of sequence because they relate to a set of common issues.*

As the Productivity Commission notes in its report, consumers are unable to participate effectively in competitive markets unless they are well-informed about the products and services they are purchasing and their rights if things go wrong. Unfortunately, many of the consumers that Anglicare's services see on a daily basis are not well-informed, do not understand their rights – or how to assert those rights – and may face a number of critical barriers towards becoming more knowledgeable, including social isolation, numeracy and literacy issues and learning disabilities. In supporting these consumers to assert their consumer rights, advocacy, information provision and consumer education go together.

**Draft Recommendations 8.1., 9.1., 9.6., 11.1., 11.2. and 11.3.** all contain provisions relating to the ways in which suppliers, agencies and regulators can connect with consumers. **Draft recommendation 8.1.** refers to the need for regulators to raise awareness among consumers about their statutory rights and responsibilities under generic consumer law, **9.1.** suggests using a national website to direct consumers to appropriate dispute resolution bodies, **9.6.** recommends increasing the funding of legal aid and financial counselling services so that they can more effectively engage in consumer advocacy, **11.1.** requires that mandatory disclosure requirements be reformed to so that information is provided in a more comprehensive and consumer-friendly framework, **11.2.** seeks to evaluate consumer information and education measures, and **11.3.** provides for capacity building in the consumer advocacy sector.

In implementing these recommendations, governments, agencies and regulators will need to have regard to the following points:

**Many consumers have problems with literacy and numeracy.** The ABS survey of literacy and life skills assesses the skill levels of Australians in relation to prose literacy, document literacy, numeracy and problem solving. The survey divides respondents into five groups, according to their level of skill. People at Level 1 have the lowest level of skill, while people at Level 5 have the highest. According to the 2006 survey (ABS 2006), 46.4% of Australians are assessed at either Level 1 or Level 2 in relation to prose literacy and 31.5% at either Level 1 or 2 in relation to document literacy. Over half, 52.5%, are at Levels 1 or 2 for numeracy, and nearly three quarters, 70.1%, at Levels 1 or 2 for problem solving. These figures indicate that a significant proportion of the community – a far higher percentage than would commonly be thought – have real difficulties in correctly completing tasks like locating a single piece of information in a piece of text, entering information based on personal knowledge into a form, understanding simple mathematical operations and evaluating alternatives with regard to well-defined criteria. They may require information to be presented in a range of different formats and where appropriate, support to understand it correctly.

**Reliance on the internet to deliver consumer information is not always appropriate for some consumer groups.** The reasons for the popularity of the internet as a means of conveying information are fairly intuitive – supporting a website is relatively low cost, information can be updated and new content added very quickly, the internet can be a very effective means of engaging with some groups, particularly young people, the information can be accessed by consumers at any time regardless of the opening hours of the organisation, and a large amount of information can be provided in an interesting and engaging format relatively easily.

However, the internet is not always an appropriate means to contact some groups, especially older groups and people on low incomes. An Anglicare survey of the Tasmanian community found that only 29% of people over 70 years of age had a computer at home, and only 19% had the internet connected. More than half of people aged over 60 had never used the internet. People on Pension Concession Cards or Health Care Cards (a common indicator of low income) were less likely to have either computers or internet connections at home (Madden and Law 2005). While external options exist, such as the Tasmanian Communities Online network of community computer centres, which are based in schools, libraries, government service outlets and community facilities, and which provide training, there is evidence to suggest that for some users, particularly those with a need for special equipment (such as a large screen monitor), the available technology in these centres itself is a barrier (ACT Government 2002). To reach the maximum number of people possible, information must be distributed in as many forms as possible.

**To be effective, consumer education campaigns must be adequately resourced and ongoing.** Many consumer education campaigns run only for a short period, or in short bursts. Unfortunately Anglicare financial counsellors advise that many people do not notice information unless they actually need it, and then, it may not be immediately available. The solution to this is to ensure that information is provided in as many different formats and locations as possible so that when people do need the information, it is easy for them to locate. Anglicare financial counsellors recommend that instead of directing resources into highly visible but short-term media advertising campaigns, information should be provided through people's usual networks, including health and welfare services, community and neighbourhood houses, churches, schools, Centrelink offices, public transport (many buses and trains have space for information to be displayed), workplaces, unions, neighbourhood associations, MPs' offices, community newsletters and councils.

**Formal processes can be intimidating for many people.** Section 3.4. of this submission outlines some of the reasons why people are reluctant to engage in formal legal processes. Anglicare's financial counsellors also report that many of their clients, even if barriers such as costs or lack of access to legal support were overcome, would see court proceedings, even in the small claims division, as 'too hard'. People who are vulnerable and disempowered, who have had negative experiences with the legal system or formalised processes in the past or who are extremely distressed by the legal issue affecting them need intensive support to go through with formal proceedings.

Community legal services attempt to provide some of this support, but in Tasmania their funding is extremely restricted. Tasmania also lacks a dedicated consumer legal service. Financial counsellors, community legal services and peak bodies are able to provide basic information, but they cannot provide specialist advice on complex consumer matters. The Commission's recommendation that additional resources be allocated to consumer advocacy is particularly welcome. The funding recommended for areas such as policy development and research will also support this process by providing an evidence base and identifying ways forward for many systemic concerns.

**The most vulnerable and disadvantaged consumers are the ones most likely to miss out on consumer education.** Consumers facing the most significant barriers to exercising their rights are those who are significantly socially isolated, with very limited capacity in relation to literacy, numeracy and life skills and a profound and enduring sense of disempowerment. One of the priorities for research into consumer issues should be how to reach these consumers. At the same time, it is important to recognise that many of the issues affecting them cannot be solved through a consumer policy framework, however comprehensive. Lack of access to essential health and welfare services, secure housing, adequate incomes, education and training and personal and social support are structural problems. A consumer policy and a consumer protection framework, however fair and robust, cannot on their own create a different, more supportive structure. They are, however, an important component of a just society.

#### 4. References

- ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics) 2006, *Adult literacy and life skills survey, summary results – Australia*, cat. no. 4228.0 (reissue), Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra
- ACT Government 2002, *Community IT Access Plan*, Chief Minister's Department, Canberra
- Anglicare Tasmania 2007a, *Response to Issues Paper 31: Review of Privacy by the Australian Law Reform Commission*, Anglicare Tasmania, Hobart
- Anglicare Tasmania 2007b, *Response to Discussion Paper 72: Review of Australian Privacy Law by the Australian Law Reform Commission*, Anglicare Tasmania, Hobart
- Atkinson, R., *Law reform and accessibility*, address to the Australasian Law Reform Agencies Conference on 'Access to justice: rhetoric or reality' in Wellington, 13-16 April 2004, Queensland Law Reform Commission, Brisbane
- CAFT (Consumer Affairs and Fair Trading) 2000, *Post Implementation Review: Report on the impact of the Residential Tenancy Act*, Consumer Affairs and Fair Trading, Hobart
- CALC (Consumer Action Law Centre) 2007, *Submission to the Productivity Commission inquiry into Australia's consumer policy framework*, Consumer Action Law centre, Melbourne
- CCCL (Centre for Credit and Consumer Law) 2007, *Submission to: Productivity Commission review of Australia's consumer policy framework, Issues Paper*, Griffith University, Brisbane
- CHOICE 2007, *A principled approach to the review of Australia's consumer policy framework*, Australian Consumers' Association, Sydney
- Clarke, S. and Forell, S. 2007, *Pathways to justice: the role of non-legal services*, Justice Issues Paper 1, Law and Justice Foundation of New South Wales, Sydney
- Consumer Affairs Victoria 2006, *Choosing between general and industry specific regulation*, Research Paper No. 8, Consumer Affairs Victoria, Melbourne
- Department of Justice 2007, *Annual Report 2006-2007*, Department of Justice, Hobart
- Flanagan, K. 2007, *Housing: Building a Better Tasmania – the bigger picture*, Anglicare Tasmania, Shelter Tasmania and the Tasmanian Council of Social Service, Hobart
- Jones, C. 2006, response to request for information from Murray Gordon, Acting Director, Consumer Affairs and Fair Trading from Chris Jones, CEO, Anglicare Tasmania, 21 July 2006, <[www.anglicare-tas.org.au](http://www.anglicare-tas.org.au)>
- Lowe, C. 2007, *Empowerment and protection – updating Australia's consumer policy framework*, address to the National Consumer Congress in Melbourne, 14-15 March 2007, Consumer Action Law Centre, Melbourne
- Madden, K. and Law, M. 2005, *The Tasmanian Community Survey: Financial Hardship*, Anglicare Tasmania, Hobart

McMillan, J. 2007, *Thirty Years of Complaint Handling – What have we learnt?*, presentation at the opening of the 30th anniversary seminar of the Commonwealth Ombudsman in Canberra, 9 August 2007, Office of the Commonwealth Ombudsman, <[www.comb.gov.au](http://www.comb.gov.au)>

Samuel, G. 2007, *The foundations of good consumer protection policy: strong law, vigorous enforcement and the educated consumer*, address to the National Consumer Congress in Melbourne, 14-15 March 2007, Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, <[www.accc.gov.au](http://www.accc.gov.au)>

Samuel, G. 2005, *The new enforcement regime: changing priorities, processes and legislative powers*, presentation to the University of South Australia Trade Practices Workshop in Adelaide, 22 October 2005, Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, <[www.accc.gov.au](http://www.accc.gov.au)>

Schetzer, L. and Henderson, J. 2003, *Legal Needs: A Project to identify legal needs, pathways and barriers for disadvantaged people in NSW – Stage 1: Public consultations*, Law and Justice Foundation of New South Wales, Sydney

TasCOSS (Tasmanian Council of Social Service), *Submission to the Productivity Commission's Review of Australia's Consumer Policy Framework*, Tasmanian Council of Social Service, Hobart

TUT (Tenants' Union of Tasmania) 2007, *The Rent Rant: Newsletter of the Tenants' Union of Tasmania Inc.*, Autumn 2007 edition, <[www.tutas.org.au](http://www.tutas.org.au)>

TUT (Tenants Union of Tasmania) 2006, *Through the Roof: Unreasonable rent increases in Tasmania*, Law Reform Issues Paper, Tenants Union of Tasmania, Hobart

Venga, R. 2007, *Submission to the Productivity Commission Inquiry into Australia's Consumer Policy Framework and its administration*, Credit Ombudsman Service Limited, Sydney