



Speech by

**Liz Cunningham**

**MEMBER FOR GLADSTONE**

Hansard Tuesday, 28 November 2006

---

## **MAJOR SPORTS FACILITIES AMENDMENT BILL**

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (3.31 pm): I rise to support in particular the antiscalping segment of this Major Sports Facilities Amendment Bill. There are those people who set out to purchase tickets at their initial release with the intent of selling them later on at an inflated price. That is often to the disadvantage of the mums and dads in the community who would possibly be able to scrape together the original selling price if it was something they desperately wanted to go to or take their family to but certainly the inflated price is beyond their reach.

I commend the minister for the provision in the bill that still allows not-for-profit organisations to hold their fundraisers. We have all been to charity auctions where we are encouraged to pay well above the face value of whatever the item is. I have been to some auctions where the auctioneer challenges the bidders to double the price of a \$20 meat voucher: 'Pay \$40, it is for a really good cause.' That is the whole point of the auction. We know why we are there; we know what we are there raising funds for. The bidders in those charity auctions and the like do so with their eyes open; they are well informed and they know that the additional money that is paid above the face value of whatever the item is is going to a charity. I commend the minister for that.

I also commend the minister on the 10 per cent latitude from the original ticket price. It recognises that something will increase in value. It is also recognition of the fact that there are circumstances where people buy tickets in good faith and then subsequently their circumstances change and for a variety of reasons, usually health or family reasons, they cannot attend the event. There is certainly no impediment to them on-selling the tickets, albeit that they cannot sell them for an inflated price.

The question that I have for the minister on this legislation is in relation to the advertising segment of the bill. My initial reaction was that we were being a bit draconian in stopping people from advertising over venues. In years gone by it was seen to be entrepreneurial to organise to fly over a packed venue with a sign. The more entrepreneurial were the ones that dragged a sign behind a plane across their competitor's sponsored activity. We have lost the joy in all of that now and we are going to stop them.

**Mr Beattie:** No-one is going to have any fun anymore. That's it, it's ended.

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** Yes, it is finished—none of this dropping your competition in the noses of the people who have come to watch your sponsored event. Initially my reaction was that we were overdoing it, but I can understand the fact that the major sports facilities' sponsorship is six and seven figures nowadays and that it is an investment by the major sponsor in terms of their corporate badging, their investment in sport but more the marketing of their product.

Could the minister clarify on the record whether people whose businesses visually adjoin the major sports facilities will be obligated to cover up what is their normal advertising. Reading the explanatory notes, it could be construed in an emotional environment that people who have advertising on their buildings or have advertising banners in the vicinity of the major sports facilities could feel vulnerable in terms of the fines, and the quantum of the fines is significant.

As I said, I think we have lost a lot of our sense of humour and our uniqueness that makes us Aussies. However, in terms of the value of sponsorship now, it is understandable. I look forward to the minister's response.