



Speech by

CARRYN SULLIVAN

MEMBER FOR PUMICESTONE

Hansard 25 March 2003

FAIR TRADING FEES AMENDMENT REGULATION [NO. 1] 2002

Mrs CARRYN SULLIVAN (Pumicestone—ALP) (5.02 p.m.): I agree with my colleague the member for Cairns who has just spoken about the Office of Fair Trading compliance activities in relation to real estate agents and motor dealers. As the member has just stated, these industries will continue to be monitored in both Brisbane and regional areas to ensure their compliance with the requirements of the Property Agents and Motor Dealers Act 2000 and the Property Agents and Motor Dealers Regulation 2001.

So far the opposition has not mentioned that since 1 July 2002, five security providers, six second-hand dealers and 13 travel agents have been visited in Brisbane as part of the proactive compliance monitoring activities of the Office of Fair Trading. The Office of Fair Trading is continuing to liaise with the Queensland Police Service Property Crime Squad in relation to second-hand dealing and pawnbroking activities. Unfortunately, these compliance measures cost money.

Ms Jarratt: And they cost a lot of money.

Mrs CARRYN SULLIVAN: They do. It is an ongoing cost. If everyone played by the rules—and, unfortunately, some do not—we would not need the revenue. I reiterate that only the application fees for new business licences under the Property Agents and Motor Dealers Act 2002, the Security Providers Act 1993, the Second-hand Dealers and Collectors Act 1984, the Pawnbrokers Act 1984 and the Travel Agents Act 1988 were increased. That means that existing industry participants were not affected; only new entrants entering these industries after 1 January 2003 have been affected. This increase is a low, one-off cost to new businesses and is not significant when we compare it with the other costs of establishing new businesses.

Most importantly, a regulatory impact statement, public benefit test and public consultation process were all undertaken in relation to the proposed fee increases. These highlighted that the public benefit from increasing the fees to improve compliance activities, consumer education and regulatory development significantly outweigh any costs incurred by business. As members would expect, business and consumer sector peak agencies were generally supportive of the proposals because of the additional revenue being directed to compliance and educative activities undertaken by the Office of Fair Trading—a factor that members opposite have failed to grasp.