



## Consumer Credit Reforms

Prepared as a submission to the Australian Government stakeholder consultation process

**November 2020**

For more information, please contact:

**Major Paul Hateley**

Head of Government Relations

The Salvation Army Australia

**Address:** 2-4 Brisbane Avenue, Barton ACT 2600

**Mobile:** 0413 830 201

**Email:** [government.relations@salvationarmy.org.au](mailto:government.relations@salvationarmy.org.au)

## Table of Contents

Statement of Recognition .....	1
Introduction .....	2
The Exposure Draft .....	3
Responsible Lending .....	5
The Status Quo .....	5
The Case for Consumer Protection .....	7
Asymmetry of Knowledge and Power .....	8
Consumer Vulnerability .....	10
Mental Wellbeing and Stress .....	11
Family and Domestic Violence .....	12
Protecting Consumers Through Prudential Regulations .....	13
Small Amount Credit Contracts and Consumer Leases .....	16
Questionable Practice; Not Questionable People .....	20
Conclusion .....	21
About The Salvation Army .....	22
Appendix A: Stories from the front line .....	23

## Statement of Recognition

The Salvation Army acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of the lands and waters throughout Australia. We pay our respect to Elders, past, present and emerging, acknowledging their continuing relationship to this land and the ongoing living cultures of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples across Australia.



## Introduction

The Salvation Army thanks the Australian Government for the opportunity to share our insight on issues relating to the proposed consumer credit reforms in the exposure draft documentation, namely:

- National Consumer Credit Protection Amendment (Supporting Economic Recovery) Bill 2020 (**the Bill**);
- National Consumer Credit Protection Amendment (A New Regulatory Framework for the Provision of Consumer Credit) Regulations 2020 (**the Regulations**); and
- National Consumer Credit Protection (Non-ADI Credit Standards) Determination 2020 (**the Determination**).

The Salvation Army is one of Australia's largest providers of social services and programs, including our work with people in, and at risk of, financial hardship. The Salvation Army provides a wide range of services and support to people across Australia as part of realising our vision and living our values.

Throughout The Salvation Army's experience walking alongside people experiencing disadvantage, including through our Moneycare financial counselling services, family and domestic violence support services and Doorways emergency relief services, we have found the existing responsible lending obligations provide a necessary safeguard against unsustainable debt and further financial hardship. Removing these obligations would expose consumers to an unacceptable level of vulnerability.

**The Salvation Army recommends that responsible lending obligations be retained in full.**

The government's announced amendments to small amount credit contracts and consumer leases, although not outlined in the Bill, are also of serious concern to The Salvation Army. Legislating against people receiving social security benefits accessing these products, rather than against the products themselves, will not in our experience achieve the policy intent. This will only increase the stigma of social security payments while still leaving other people in vulnerable circumstances or hardship open to these risky loans.

**The Salvation Army recommends the draft Bill and Regulations not be introduced to Parliament or passed in their current form.**

The Salvation Army also endorses the submissions from the Consumer Action Law Centre and Financial Counselling Australia.



## The Exposure Draft

The Salvation Army understands the changes to the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009 (the NCCP Act)* and the *National Consumer Credit Protection Regulations 2010*, as well as the introduction of a National Consumer Credit Protection (Non-ADI Credit Standards) Determination seek to:

- Restrict the application of current responsible lending obligations, including the need to conduct assessments about the ‘suitability’ of a loan and the ability of a borrower to repay the loan, only to ‘low limit credit contracts’. This obliges lenders to:
  - Make reasonable inquiries about the consumer’s objectives for the loan;
  - Verify the consumer’s income;
  - Assess whether the consumer can meet repayments; and
  - Assess whether the loan would cause the borrower ‘substantial hardship’, including forcing the person to sell their house.
- Remove restrictions preventing authorised deposit-taking institutions (**ADIs**) and providers of larger loans from:
  - Suggesting or granting a loan which the above assessments would have suggested was ‘unsuitable’ for a consumer.
  - Suggesting that consumers remain in these unsuitable credit contracts, or from increasing credit on unsuitable contracts.
- Make provisions for the Minister to create standards for non-ADIs and to apply penalties for non-compliance. This includes specifying requirements for systems, policies and processes to ensure the consumer can repay the loan.



## The Salvation Army's Moneycare service

Moneycare is The Salvation Army's financial wellbeing and capability service. It has been operating for over 30 years and has helped thousands of people experiencing, or at risk of experiencing, financial and social exclusion. We have a national footprint of about 85 sites across Australia.

Through Moneycare, we deliver a range of free and confidential services, including financial counselling, financial capability support, financial literacy and capability workshops, and microfinance. These services build on The Salvation Army values of empathy and dignity, with an emphasis on building trusting relationships with people accessing our services.

Moneycare services support people by addressing their immediate financial crisis situation and helping them build long term capabilities and resilience in managing financial hardship.

Research has shown Moneycare's value. In 2012 Swinburne University of Technology found that The Salvation Army's financial counselling services had a positive impact in debt resolution, wellbeing, financial capability and advocacy. 94 per cent of those surveyed wishing that they had sought our help sooner.<sup>1</sup>

Moneycare is focused on evidence-based strategies and high-quality service delivery. In 2016 outcomes measurement tools were developed and a pilot was conducted in the 2017-18 financial year. In 2019 outcomes measurement was embedded into our case work processes.

In the 2019-20 financial year, 13,757 individuals were supported by Moneycare with over 52,000 sessions held throughout the year. A total of 6,371 individuals participated in the outcomes measurement survey nationally. The top five main presenting issues at intake were debt, money management, physical or mental health, employment issues, and gambling or alcohol and other drug addiction.

The survey revealed statistically significant positive changes in clients' financial resilience through their engagement with Moneycare. Significant positive changes were also made in clients' reported debt levels and life satisfaction, as well as improvement in mental health and levels of personal wellbeing.

---

<sup>1</sup> Brackertz, N. (2012). *I wish I'd known sooner! The impact of financial counselling on debt resolution and personal wellbeing*. The Salvation Army.



# Responsible Lending

## The Status Quo

Responsible lending obligations (**RLOs**) have played a critical role in protecting consumers from becoming overburdened by debt. They put responsibility on lenders, who have a much more nuanced understanding of credit products, to find the most suitable product for the client's needs and to ensure they will not undergo financial hardship as a result of the loan.

Although RLOs place a regulatory obligation upon lenders, the evidence is that these processes have not had a substantial impact upon the availability of credit within the market and in fact, may actually have increased the likelihood that marginal borrowers would repay their debt.<sup>2</sup> The argument that removing the RLOs is needed 'now, more than ever' to stimulate spending and job creation has not been evident in lending indicators.<sup>3</sup> On the contrary, we have already seen that the rate of borrowing has recovered almost to the levels experienced in January 2020, despite an initial drop at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>4</sup>

Under the current consumer protections Australia already has one of the world's highest household debt to income ratios. A survey of 52,000 households showed that in October 2020, 40.6 per cent of homeowners were experiencing mortgage stress and 37.9 per cent of respondents were experiencing financial stress.<sup>5</sup>

Our overwhelming evidence delivering financial counselling in Australia for the past 30 years is that credit remains too easily accessible and that this has devastating consequences for the people we support. In the 2019-20 financial year, mortgage debt made up the vast majority (67.6 per cent) of the \$516 million worth of debt owed by Moneycare clients. By contrast, credit card debt was the most common type of debt, representing 21.6 per cent of the cases we saw.

To further illustrate the easy availability of credit, during the drafting of this submission, a member of the team received an offer of an unsecured personal loan from one of the big four banks. This offer was unsolicited and promised a loan of \$50,000 with same day approval. This both demonstrates the aggressive marketing of such loans, and the ability for banks to presumably meet the RLOs and still provide same day approval.

It is our concern that the proposed changes to the NCCP Act are intended to take effect from 1 March 2021, around the same time that JobKeeper subsidies, the Coronavirus Supplement to the JobSeeker Payment and Youth Allowance, and mortgage deferrals are all due to end.

<sup>2</sup> Treasury. (2018). *Financial Services Royal Commission: Submission: Interim Report*.

<https://financialservices.royalcommission.gov.au/Submissions/Documents/interim-report-submissions/POL.9100.0001.1059.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Australian Treasurer. (2020, September 25). *Simplifying access to credit for consumers and small business* [Media release].

<https://ministers.treasury.gov.au/ministers/josh-frydenberg-2018/media-releases/simplifying-access-credit-consumers-and-small>

<sup>4</sup> Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2020, November 2). *Lending indicators*.

<https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/economy/finance/lending-indicators/latest-release#key-statistics>

<sup>5</sup> Digital Finance Analytics. (2020, November 4). Household Financial Stress Reaches New High. *Digital Finance Analytics Blog*. <https://digitalfinanceanalytics.com/blog/household-financial-stress-reaches-new-high/>



For people already experiencing, or at risk of, financial hardship, easier access to credit may mean that they will get caught in a cycle of increasing debt. This has significant implications for physical and mental health.

### Justin's Story\*

Justin\* and his wife have two young children aged 10 and 12. Before the COVID-19 pandemic Justin worked a large amount of overtime in his role as a logistics officer for a large company. He also had significant caring duties at home as his wife has a disability that is likely to deteriorate but is not covered under the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

Justin first approached our Doorways emergency relief service for help as he was severely impacted by a reduction in work due to COVID-19. This resulted in him being unable to pay utility bills, meet loan repayments and feed his family. Mounting medical costs and debt were causing him to feel increasingly stressed.

Justin accepted a referral to his local Moneycare financial counselling service. He explained that his mortgage had been negotiated by a mortgage broker and could not remember if a distinction had been made between his salary and his regular overtime pay. Justin then used the same financial data to apply for a credit card with another bank.

A careful review of Justin's budget showed that his debt was marginally sustainable with his overtime earnings. As an unreliable source of income, it should never have been included in his mortgage and credit card assessment. However there is no other explanation for how his credit limit allowed him to accrue over \$18,000 of debt on an income of \$52,000. Justin also did not fully understand how a change in income might affect his ability to repay his debt.

The Moneycare financial counsellor, after working with Justin, provided him with four options:

1. Sell his house
2. Negotiate a moratorium on both debts to give him time for his work schedule to recover
3. Ask for a return of the fees and charges associated with his credit card and his debt to be waived on the basis that he was not able to afford the debt
4. Do nothing

They discussed the advantages and disadvantages of each option and after careful consideration Justin asked that we apply for three-month moratoriums on both his debts as he felt that his work was returning to normal.

Justin's story highlights the need for robust responsible lending laws and for consumers to be informed about the implications of the level of debt they take out.

*\* Name has been changed*

	<p><i>“The potential removal of responsible lending obligations by the Federal Government will lead to more financial hardship. Leaving responsible lending to our Financial institutions to assess and monitor goes completely against the core purpose of these institutions, “that is to make money”. They have a proven bad track record when it comes to responsible lending.</i></p> <p><b><i>If nothing changes, nothing changes.</i></b></p> <p><i>They will take advantage of the consumer without completing the checks and balances needed. We will have more people struggling with financial hardship and the subsequent impact this has on their family, health, and society. This is a huge step backwards.”</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">(A Moneycare financial counsellor)</p>
---	--

### The Case for Consumer Protection

Many inquiries have been held into the financial services industry over the past five years. These include the 2019 Royal Commission into Misconduct in the Banking, Superannuation and Financial Services Industry (**the Financial Services Royal Commission**), the 2019 Review of the Coordination and Funding for Financial Counselling Services across Australia (**Sylvan Review**), the 2019 Senate inquiry into the credit and financial services targeted at Australians at risk of financial hardship (**Senate inquiry into credit and hardship**), and the 2016 Review of Small Amount Credit Contract Laws (**SACC Review**).

It is not clear how the findings of these inquiries have informed the changes proposed in the Bill and Regulations. In particular, the Bill appears to go directly against Recommendation 1.1 of the Financial Services Royal Commission’s final report, namely that the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009* should not be amended to alter the obligation to assess unsuitability. We note that the government agreed to this recommendation in its response to the final report.<sup>6</sup>

The Royal Commission found that although the financial system had in place appropriate rules and consumer protections, in many instances lenders had not set up mechanisms to ensure compliance and that breaches had not been effectively enforced.<sup>7</sup> We welcome the introduction of changes in this space through the Financial Sector Reform (Hayne Royal Commission Response) Bill 2020 but submit that these improvements would work better as part of the system recommended by Commissioner Hayne, specifically one in which responsible lending obligations governed all credit products.

<sup>6</sup> Australian Government. (2019, February). *Restoring trust in Australia’s financial system: The Government response to the Royal Commission into Misconduct in the Banking, Superannuation and Financial Services Industry*. <https://treasury.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-03/FSRC-Government-Response-1.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Royal Commission into Misconduct in the Banking, Superannuation and Financial Services Industry. (2019). Final Report. <https://www.royalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-02/fsrc-volume-1-final-report.pdf>

The Salvation Army strongly believes that, rather than loosening consumer protection regulations, the Royal Commission’s finding that the existing rules need additional enforcement must be heeded. Appendix A contains stories from our Moneycare financial counsellors that illustrate that, despite responsible lending obligations, lenders are already failing to ensure that loans will not result in ‘substantial financial hardship’. It is reasonable to conclude that relaxing protections will only lead to more people in financial hardship and diminish our ability to advocate on their behalf and alleviate their hardship.



*“If the responsible lending obligations are removed I feel we are going to see lending standards dropping over time with larger institutions and also new business emerging that will target vulnerable and low financially literate communities. This may lead to a surge in bankruptcies in the following years and a definite increase in mental health presentations and poverty”*  
(A Moneycare financial counsellor)

### Asymmetry of Knowledge and Power

The Sylvan Review identified an “asymmetry of knowledge and power” between consumers and financial services, which leaves consumers more vulnerable. It also found financial and credit products offered by the market had become increasingly complex and opaque. Our experience is that understanding these products requires an above average level of literacy and financial literacy.

Data collected by the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics Australia (**HILDA**) survey suggests that around 45 per cent of Australians cannot demonstrate basic financial literacy. Analysis by the University of Western Australia Business School shows there is a real risk when widespread financial illiteracy is combined with complex financial markets, high levels of debt and easy access to credit.<sup>8</sup>

The Salvation Army's position is that when community members are faced with difficult financial decisions, they should be able to trust lenders, who are arguably the experts on the financial products they sell, to help them ensure the product is suitable for them. Our experience over the past 30 years has been that lenders have the resources to pivot in response to legal changes and market need and invest heavily in targeted and enticing promotion of debt. For example, we recall that after the NCCP Act was first introduced in 2009, lenders nimbly responded by offering consumers unsolicited overdrafts instead. The complexity of credit products and the resource imbalance show that it is therefore unrealistic to expect borrowers to bear all the risk when applying for a credit product.

<sup>8</sup> Preston, A. (2020, March). *Financial Literacy in Australia: Insights from HILDA data*. University of Western Australia Business School.

The reduction of scope in the responsible lending obligations under the NCCP Act will reduce regulatory oversight and therefore increase the risks for borrowers. Against a backdrop of high unemployment, a predicted economic downturn, the stressors caused or exacerbated by the global coronavirus pandemic, and an already high debt to income ratio, it is our concern that this will result in more unmanageable debt.

In the 2019-20 financial year, the Australian Financial Complaints Authority (**AFCA**) received 3,616 complaints relating to responsible or appropriate lending, an increase of 14 per cent on the previous year.<sup>9</sup> This was despite the existing consumer protections contained in the RLOs. It is The Salvation Army's concern that the changes under the Bill will expose even more consumers to irresponsible lending practices and that this may limit the scope of AFCA to prosecute these cases.

*“Even when it is blaringly evident in the documents that there is a responsible lending issue, it's necessary to manage client expectations from day one in terms of an outcome success, due to the difficulty in having the financial services provider admit wrongdoing and the limitations of the Australian Financial Complaints Authority to enforce this.*



*I have received correspondence from financial services providers in response to responsible lending concerns that has brought the client to tears, because of the blatant unwillingness to even address the concerns raised. Instead the company uses its resources in attempt to baffle us with lengthy jargon, ignoring the actual concerns raised. Verbally, financial services provider representatives often make statements contradicting the National Credit Code such as “we don't have to give hardship because we've given it before”.*

*If the changes happen, we'll be in a much worse position. We will no longer be able to quote our trusted Consumer Action allies in saying “we have some of the best consumer credit in laws in the world, they're just not enforced well enough”.*

(A Moneycare financial counsellor)

<sup>9</sup> Australian Financial Complaints Authority. (2020). *Annual Review 2019-20*. <https://www.afca.org.au/about-afca/annual-review>

## Consumer Vulnerability

The Salvation Army welcomes the Treasurer's commitment to ensure the "strongest consumer protections" are targeted at the most vulnerable Australians in his announcement of 25 September 2020.<sup>10</sup>

Various factors influence why a consumer may be deemed 'vulnerable'. These include:

- Social factors, such as disability (affecting 1 in 5 Australians) and cultural and linguistic diversity (1 in 5 Australians speak a language other than English at home);
- Educational factors, such as low literacy levels (affecting 44 per cent of Australians);
- Economic factors, such as having few savings (30 per cent of Australians have savings of less than one month's income or none at all); and
- Situational factors, such as an experience of family and domestic violence (affecting 1 in 6 women in Australia).<sup>11</sup>

Although the proposed change to a 'borrower responsibility' framework may seem to be encouraging consumers to 'do their homework', our experience is that poor financial literacy only makes up a small proportion of the cases we see. The majority of community members who approach Moneycare have found themselves experiencing financial hardship due to unexpected life circumstances, such as the loss of a job, significant illness, or family and domestic violence.

Our experience as a nation in 2020 has been a stark reminder that many of us are only a few steps away from vulnerability. Disaster does not discriminate.

<sup>10</sup> Australian Treasurer and the Minister for Housing and Assistant Treasurer. (2020, September 25). *Simplifying access to credit for consumers and small business* [Joint media release]. <https://ministers.treasury.gov.au/ministers/josh-frydenberg-2018/media-releases/simplifying-access-credit-consumers-and-small>

<sup>11</sup> O'Neill, E. (2020). *Exploring regulatory approaches to consumer vulnerability* [A report for the Australian Energy Regulator]. [https://www.aer.gov.au/system/files/CPRC%20-%20Exploring%20regulatory%20approaches%20to%20consumer%20vulnerability%20-%20A%20report%20for%20the%20AER%20-%20February%202020\\_0.pdf](https://www.aer.gov.au/system/files/CPRC%20-%20Exploring%20regulatory%20approaches%20to%20consumer%20vulnerability%20-%20A%20report%20for%20the%20AER%20-%20February%202020_0.pdf)



*“It is unrealistic and irresponsible to place the onus on borrowers and expect people to fully understand whether they will be able to repay a loan, particularly when a lot of people get into debt out of desperation. Unmanageable debt already has adverse impacts on individuals and families including stress, relationship breakdowns and suicide. Removing the responsible lending laws will only increase these impacts and put more pressure on emergency relief providers and the social services and health systems.*



*Removal of responsible lending obligations will allow our already vulnerable clients to be preyed upon by unscrupulous lenders. Why take away these safe guards that are so very necessary to protect the community and to give financial counsellors the ability to advocate for their clients and achieve the just and only fair outcomes that they deserve.*

*Moving from lender responsibility to consumer responsibility is well and good if there is not such a power imbalance in the relationship between finance provider and consumer. Most people are flat out understanding the product they are being sold. Most loan or financial products are not written in everyday language. A large proportion of our community members are financially disadvantaged simply because of barriers to understanding financial terms and conditions.”*

(A Moneycare financial counsellor)

## Mental Wellbeing and Stress

Indebtedness has significant implications for physical and mental health, with rates of suicidal ideation and depression higher in individuals with unmet loan payments.<sup>12</sup> Community members accessing Moneycare support are surveyed at the beginning and towards the end of their engagement with our financial counsellors. Outcomes measurement shows the high levels of mental health concerns of people when they first come to us for financial counselling, as well as significant improvement in the mental health of clients after engaging with our team.<sup>13</sup> This illustrates the mental load caused by financial stress and mounting debt and the benefit of support to address the situation.

<sup>12</sup> Turunen, E. Hiilamo, H. (2014). Health effects of indebtedness: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health* 14(489). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-489>

<sup>13</sup> Loo, J., & Lensun, L. (2020). *Moneycare outcomes measurement annual report*. Sydney, NSW: The Salvation Army Australia.

Behavioural science shows that we make poor decisions when under stress.<sup>14</sup> This includes a diminished ability to determine whether we actually have capacity to afford the loan or credit card we are being sold. Our on-the-ground experience is that people in crisis experience cognitive overload, which impacts their decision making. Their focus, understandably, is on meeting their immediate needs, often to the detriment of their long-term financial health.

Putting the full burden of responsibility on consumers reveals an assumption that every applicant has the current cognitive bandwidth, and is in the right situation, to coolly evaluate the full implications of a credit product. This cannot be further from the truth.

### Jane's Story\*

Jane\* has recently left a relationship in which she experienced both domestic violence and financial abuse by her partner. Her partner had control over the family finances, which he used to fuel his addictions. This forced Jane to borrow under her name to meet basic living expenses. These debts made Jane feel she had no way out of the relationship as it would make life even more unaffordable, and her partner made her feel 'useless with money'.

Since leaving her partner, Jane has been working with a Moneycare financial counsellor to rebuild her confidence in managing her own finances. Jane now sees her experience made her very good at coping with living on very little money. Her financial counsellor has been able to advocate, together with navigation of the responsible lending obligations, to secure manageable repayment and occasional waivers of debts taken out under duress, or where she had no personal benefit.

\* Name has been changed

### Family and Domestic Violence

The current requirement under the RLOs for lenders to make reasonable inquiries and to verify all co-debtors' incomes provide opportunities for lenders to discover instances of financial abuse, for example where a loan has been applied for in a victim-survivor's name without their knowledge. The Salvation Army also notes the industry guidelines produced by the Australian Banker's Association, which include a recognition of the role that banks can play in preventing the potential impact of financial abuse on customers.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Wemm, S. E., & Wulfert, E. (2017). Effects of Acute Stress on Decision Making. *Applied psychophysiology and biofeedback*, 42(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10484-016-9347-8>

Atsan, N. (2016). Decision-Making under Stress and Its Implications for Managerial Decision-Making: A Review of Literature. *International Journal of Business and Social Research*, 6(3), 38-47. doi:<https://doi.org/10.18533/ijbsr.v6i3.936>

<sup>15</sup> Australian Bankers' Association. (2016). *Industry guideline: Financial abuse and family and domestic violence policies*. [https://www.ausbanking.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/ABA\\_Industry\\_Guideline\\_-\\_Financial\\_Abuse\\_and\\_Family\\_and\\_Domestic\\_Violence-Nov-2016.pdf](https://www.ausbanking.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/ABA_Industry_Guideline_-_Financial_Abuse_and_Family_and_Domestic_Violence-Nov-2016.pdf)



Our experience delivering financial counselling, as well as family violence support, is that banks do not always have sufficient protections in place to safeguard against financial abuse. They have however presented opportunities for identification and intervention.

It is our concern that if RLOs are repealed for most credit products, this will also remove a significant opportunity to uncover financial abuse and connect victim-survivors with support.

*“It is essential that lenders are regulated to ensure responsible lending criteria applies. Having worked as a financial counsellor for 20 years and previously in banking processing home loans, it was easy to see many loans should not have been approved due to the high risk for the applicant.*

*My experience shows that self-regulation does not work. Not all lenders adopted the Code of Banking Practice which was the only available standard that we could use to assist our clients.*



*The client heart break at being evicted from their homes was traumatic to witness and oftentimes my role was to support the clients as best as I could with delays in the eviction process or from time to time gaining the agreement for the borrower to have 90 days sell the property and even helping them to find cheap removalists and provide support letters and Statements of Financial Position to support applications for renting.”*

(A Moneycare financial counsellor)

## Protecting Consumers Through Prudential Regulations

The Salvation Army understands the key rationale behind the proposed changes is a supposed duplication caused by the current requirements for lenders. To our understanding the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority (**APRA**) and the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (**ASIC**) play very different regulatory roles.

While APRA is concerned with “maintaining the safety and soundness of financial institutions”, it is ASIC that has responsibility for regulating their conduct.<sup>16</sup> While APRA protects “the interests of depositors, policyholders and superannuation fund members”, ASIC’s focus is on achieving good outcomes for consumers and investors.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Australian Prudential Regulation Authority. (n.d.). About APRA. APRA. <https://www.apra.gov.au/about-apra>  
Australian Securities and Investments Commission. (n.d.). The ASIC – APRA relationship. ASIC - Australian Securities and Investments Commission. <https://asic.gov.au/about-asic/what-we-do/our-role/other-regulators-and-organisations/the-asic-apra-relationship/>

<sup>17</sup> Australian Prudential Regulation Authority. (n.d.). About APRA. APRA. <https://www.apra.gov.au/about-apra>  
Australian Securities and Investments Commission. (n.d.). ASIC vision and mission. ASIC - Australian Securities and Investments Commission. <https://asic.gov.au/about-asic/what-we-do/our-role/asic-vision-and-mission/>

As a result of ASIC's current powers to investigate suspected breaches and prosecute offenders, it already has the expertise and experience necessary to ensure that consumers are protected. Our concern is that by putting the regulatory burden entirely on APRA, whose primary focus is on prudential risk, individual cases will not be prosecuted. As stated above, it is unclear what AFCA's role will be if most credit products no longer need to meet RLOs.

The Salvation Army does not support this change. We note that in considering the regulatory roles, the Financial Services Royal Commission did not recommend that they be changed. We instead recommend that the responsibility for enforcing consumer protection remain with ASIC and that ASIC be given the necessary resources to provide a sufficient deterrent to irresponsible lending practices.

### Recommendations

- Responsible lending obligations be retained in full.
- The Commonwealth Government consider the proposed changes against the findings of the Royal Commission into Misconduct in the Banking, Superannuation and Financial Services Industry, the Review of the Coordination and Funding for Financial Counselling Services across Australia, and the Review of Small Amount Credit Contract Laws.
- The Commonwealth Government prioritise the implementation in full of the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Misconduct in the Banking, Superannuation and Financial Services Industry.
- Responsibility for enforcing consumer protection remain with an adequately resourced Australian Securities and Investments Commission.

## Rosemary's Story\*

When 52-year old Rosemary\* contacted a homewares rental company to organise a small television for her bedroom, she had no idea it would lead to aggressive upselling, intimidation and a significant debt that would have a severe impact on her health and wellbeing.

As a result of skilful upselling techniques employed by the rental company, Rosemary's original plan for a small bedroom television soon turned into a 65-inch TV, an additional TV, two mobile phones, an iPad, MacBook, a bedroom suite and later a washing machine – to a total of 15 individual rental contracts. Concerned that she wouldn't be able to afford what she was being upsold on her low income, she says she was repeatedly told by the company that she would be able to cover the repayments.

"It was the way that they had gone around things to upsell items, not to give the amount ... because they hadn't worked it out. That's what they kept saying to me – they hadn't worked the fortnightly payments out as of yet. But when they do, they will inform me," says Rosemary. "Well into the contract, I was told it was \$450 per fortnight. Well I nearly fell over. I said, 'I can't afford that' and they said, 'well you purchased the goods, so you have to pay for it'."

When she was unable to keep up with the payments, Rosemary was visited by what she describes as a 'large bully' – who came to her door demanding her key card to take out the \$450 owing. He also added an extra \$20 to her fortnightly debt because she was now behind.

Rosemary was unable to meet her basic needs such as rent, food, medication and utilities, after having entered into unaffordable rental contracts. Her financial commitment was exhausting half her income and leaving her in severe financial hardship. Rosemary's health was also suffering due to the stress she was under, trying to keep up with the payments. Already prone to epileptic seizures, she started experiencing them much more frequently, causing her to feel weak and sick on a regular basis.

After three months of not knowing what her payments were and another four months struggling alone to manage the debt, Rosemary sought financial counselling through The Salvation Army's Moneycare service. At this point, Rosemary's debt had snowballed to over \$26,000 – significantly more money than the value of the goods combined.

After investigating and escalating the issue to Internal Disputes it was identified that 'maladministration' had taken place, as no confirmation of Rosemary's place of residence was determined nor how much she was paying in rent, let alone other essential expenses.

This is the first time Rosemary has ever been in a situation like this and wants other people – particularly those on low incomes – to be aware of the dangers of these rental arrangements, which can leave families in very serious debt.

*\* Name has been changed*

### Frank's Story\*

Frank\* is an older community member. He saw an advertisement from a small amount credit company, who advertise that they lend money to “consumers with a very broad range of risk profiles”, including seniors. He applied for a \$1,000 loan but was declined via email and advised to approach another small amount credit company. Frank then received an email from this second company and a \$180 deposit in his bank account. This was despite not having given consent for his personal information to be shared. The company is now demanding repayment of a debt of \$588.

\* Name has been changed

## Small Amount Credit Contracts and Consumer Leases

The Salvation Army is disappointed that the Bill does not seek to apply additional consumer protections for small amount credit contracts (commonly known as payday loans) or consumer leases.

Through Moneycare and our Doorways emergency relief program, The Salvation Army has witnessed a significant correlation between engagement with payday lenders and consumer lease providers, and people living in poverty – typically individuals on lower incomes and people receiving social security payments. In the 2019-20 financial year, Moneycare financial counsellors assisted with 1,081 payday loans to a total of \$1.8 million and 154 consumer leases worth \$0.4 million.

The Salvation Army has for some time advocated for an increase to the base rate of the JobSeeker Payment and Youth Allowance. It is our experience that the payments are too low for a person to afford basic essentials, let alone whether a financial shock like a washing machine or a car breaking down. Almost 50 per cent of loans provided through our No-Interest Loans Scheme (**NILS**) are for car-related expenses and 25 per cent for white goods. This is echoed by data published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which revealed that in 2019, nearly one in five households were unable to raise \$2,000 within a week for something important.<sup>18</sup>

The low amount and quick turnaround time of small amount credit contract loans mean that people on low incomes are the main target market for, and also particularly susceptible to them. Payday loans are enticing when just a little bit more money is needed to pay the week's rent to avoid eviction, the next car loan instalment to continue to get to work, or a higher-than-expected electricity bill to keep the lights on. Our experience is that lenders target people on low incomes, promising cash in minutes with few questions asked.

<sup>18</sup> Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2020). *General Social Survey: Summary Results, Australia*. <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/people-and-communities/general-social-survey-summary-results-australia/2019>



Quick access to finances comes at a cost – because their ability to repay the loan without substantial hardship is not assessed, we find that this can push people into a spiral of debt, leading them to turn to us for emergency relief for help to cover the necessities.

We have seen examples of consumer leases and rent-to-buy schemes where clients end up paying three to four times the normal retail price over the life of the lease. Investigations by ASIC found consumer leases costs can amount to over eight times the retail price.<sup>19</sup> By contrast, when community members come to NILS for assistance, they only pay the retail price of the goods, with no interest, no fees and no charges. The disparity in the price that people end up paying for the same item makes a significant difference for people who are already struggling to make ends meet.

Our experience leads us to believe that if consumer protections could ensure that people taking out a loan have the capacity to pay it back, this would relieve the pressure on emergency relief services and the broader community service system. It also shows that the existing consumer protections under the NCCP Act are not sufficiently robust to prevent people in this situation from being sold a ‘quick fix’ that is ultimately more harmful in the long term. The findings of the Senate inquiry into credit and hardship and the SACC Review detail the changes that are necessary to ensure laws are having their intended purpose.



*“Payday lenders may cause further detrimental impact in our society. I find their conduct unethical and unconscionable. They prey upon and exploit the most vulnerable within our community, resulting in undue stress and financial hardship. I have seen community members in receipt of the aged pension and Disability Support pension lured in by Payday lenders, providing fast money with ease, resulting in severe financial hardship for those caught within the Payday whirlpool. After exhaustive and mostly failed attempts to obtain legitimate debt waivers, I have on many occasions had to involve Financial Rights [Community Legal Service] to continue the fight for those who cannot.” (A Moneycare financial counsellor)*

Additionally, it is our concern that easier access to other forms of credit granted through the proposed changes will mean people experiencing financial stress are able to take on more debt than they can afford. As stated above, this has detrimental effects on mental health.

<sup>19</sup> Australian Securities and Investments Commission. (2015). *Cost of consumer leases for household goods* [Report 447]. <https://download.asic.gov.au/media/3350956/rep-447-published-11-september-2015.pdf>

The Salvation Army urges the Commonwealth Government to use the opportunity that the Bill presents to make changes that will have a significant and positive impact on people experiencing hardship and financial stress. This is an opportunity to strengthen controls around lending practices as recommended by the Senate inquiry into credit and hardship and the 2016 SACC Review, particularly the practices of credit providers regarding credit cards, payday loans and consumer leases.

### Recommendation

- The Commonwealth Government implement Recommendation 2 of the 2019 Senate inquiry into the credit and financial services targeted at Australians at risk of financial hardship.

*The committee recommends that the National Consumer Credit Protection Amendment (Small Amount Credit Contract and Consumer Lease Reforms) Bill 2017 exposure draft released by Treasury be introduced, and passage facilitated by the government.*

### Tim's Story\*

When Tim\* was first referred to The Salvation Army's Moneycare service, he was under a number of payday and other quick loan repayment obligations.

Coming from a background of generational disadvantage, Tim is on a part-disability pension due to a range of health issues. Tim's partner is also on a disability pension and was recently hospitalised. As a result of COVID-19 closures, Tim lost the few hours of weekly work he had driving a shuttle bus for a club. Tim sought out a loan to cover the basic costs of living, but was bombarded with text messages from lenders offering additional loans, which was very tempting considering his already tight financial situations.

Tim's Moneycare financial counsellor was able to guide him to take charge of his finances. She also advocated with lenders on Tim's behalf. Eventually, with the help of his financial counsellor Tim was able to get the interest waived on several loans and negotiated repayment options with others.

A major concern for his financial counsellor was how Tim kept getting payday loans when his circumstances should have triggered the lender's obligations under 'responsible lending' practices. The loans were extremely easy to apply for and get, but the implications would have lasted for a very long time.

For those, like Tim, who are deep in a debt spiral the sense of fear and helplessness can be overwhelming, putting those who are already in financial difficulty into a debt spiral. Usually people who apply for these loans have exhausted all other resources, but the reality is that it is often a deep trap, and that easy fix can soon become a deep, deep hole of debt that only magnifies existing problems.

*\* Name has been changed*

## Questionable Practice; Not Questionable People

The Salvation Army notes that the restrictions for people receiving social security payments, as flagged by the Government in the 25 September announcement, are not detailed in the draft Bill, Regulations or the new Determination. We welcome this omission and urge that they not be introduced at a later stage and that consumer protections continue to be applied to products, rather than specific groups of people.

The solution to preventing consumer exploitation does not lie in restricting access according to income source, or even income level. Increasing the restrictions already experienced by people on low incomes does not address the real problem, neither does it effectively protect people who suffer from predatory lenders. A sector wide regulatory framework, and enforcement of these rules, is critical to protecting all Australians.

Applying restrictions only for people receiving Centrelink payments also risks exacerbating the stigma of 'being on the dole'. Many of our clients describe the sense of shame from receiving social security payments. They talk about not even wanting to go for a coffee with friends so others would not carry the burden of always paying. Some people have also shared that they feel punished for not being able to secure a job, despite their best efforts.

Our NILS experience shows that people on low incomes, including people on social security payments, do have the capacity to repay loans, if the loan has been accessed to be suitable for their income and expenditure levels. Over the past 10 years 95 per cent of loans we administer through NILS were fully repaid.

Regulating lending practices, rather than who can access them, is the only solution that will actually prevent practices specifically designed to take advantage of people experiencing financial hardship. As argued above, lenders have superior knowledge of the products they are offering. It only makes sense for the responsibility to sit with them.

In recent times there have been moves by governments to protect consumers from harmful lending practices. In response to the 2016 SACC Review the Treasury developed the draft *National Consumer Credit Protection Amendment (Small Amount Credit Contract and Consumer Lease Reforms) Bill 2017*. The South Australian Government is currently considering similar amendments to the *Fair Trading Act 1987*. Both amendments sought to regulate lenders, credit products and marketing practices, rather than the people who could access them.

The Salvation Army has consistently argued that these are the superior way of protecting vulnerable Australians from debt.

### Recommendation

- The Commonwealth Government does not proceed with plans to regulate access to credit according to a person's income source or level.

## Conclusion

The Salvation Army again thanks the Commonwealth Government for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed Bill, Regulations and Determination and to share our insights gained from supporting people experiencing hardship and disadvantage in Australia.

The Salvation Army's experience leads us to believe that Australia's consumer credit laws are world-leading and where these have been breached, our financial counsellors have often used responsible lending laws to achieve positive outcomes for the people we support. Reducing their scope will only leave more Australians in financial hardship, with little recourse for relief. We would rather not have to advocate and find equitable remedies for people in unmanageable debt, our vision is for a fairer market place where people are not the subject of irresponsible lending initially.

Consumer protection is important now more than ever in light of the economic impacts of the coronavirus pandemic, high unemployment and high household income to debt ratios. When properly implemented and enforced, responsible lending obligations protect people experiencing, or at risk of, hardship and vulnerability from being enticed into taking out credit products they cannot afford. They can also spark the first indication of financial abuse and can lead to a victim-survivor receiving the support they need. Failure to protect consumers will mean increased demand on other parts of the service sector, including emergency relief, mental health, and homelessness support services.

The Salvation Army has long advocated for stronger regulations regarding small amount credit contracts and consumer leases. We strongly supported the draft Bill developed by the Treasury in 2017. Protections must be achieved through regulating lenders, products and practices, rather than by restricting access based on consumer characteristics.

For these reasons, The Salvation Army urges that the proposed legislation and regulations not be introduced or passed in their current form.

## About The Salvation Army

The Salvation Army is an international Christian movement with a presence in 128 countries. Operating in Australia since 1880, The Salvation Army is one of the largest providers of social services and programs for people experiencing hardship, injustice and social exclusion.

The Salvation Army Australia has a national operating budget of over \$700 million and provides more than 1,000 social programs and activities through networks of social support services, community centres and churches across the country. Programs include:

- Financial counselling, emergency relief and microfinance
- Homelessness services
- Youth services
- Family and domestic violence services
- Alcohol, drugs and other addictions
- Chaplaincy
- Emergency and disaster response
- Aged care
- Employment services

As a mission driven organisation, The Salvation Army seeks to reduce social disadvantage and create a fair and harmonious society through holistic and person-centred approaches that reflect our mission to share the love of Jesus by:

- Caring for people
- Creating faith pathways
- Building healthy communities
- Working for justice

We commit ourselves in prayer and practice to this land of Australia and its people, seeking reconciliation, unity and equity.

### Further Information

The Salvation Army would welcome the opportunity to discuss the content of this submission should any further information be of assistance.

Further information can be sought from Major Paul Hateley, National Head of Government Relations, at [government.relations@salvationarmy.org.au](mailto:government.relations@salvationarmy.org.au) or on 0413 830 201.



## Appendix A: Stories from the front line

The following stories have been shared by Moneycare financial counsellors. Some have not yet been resolved but have been included to show the issues that they have been seeing under the current responsible lending obligations.

### Anne's Story\*

When Anne\* came to Moneycare for help with a car loan that was in arrears. The loan had been taken out a couple of years prior at a car yard while she was living with her partner's mother. When we met her, she was living in transitional housing with her partner and young child. The car in question had broken down, though she still owed close to the level of the original loan and had not been able to successfully negotiate with the lender.

An assessment of Anne's loan revealed that the loan was not affordable and that the creditor had:

- Failed to take reasonable steps to verify Anne's financial situation
- Failed to verify the repayment amounts of the existing debts Anne had disclosed
- Grossly understated costs for vehicle maintenance

We lodged an AFCA maladministration complaint, citing the creditor's breach of their responsible lending obligations and showing evidence that the loan was unsuitable and that Anne could not meet her contracted repayments without substantial hardship. The outcome we sought from AFCA was for Anne to surrender the car, her remaining debt to be waived and for no adverse listing to be made in her credit history.

In response, the lender rejected our claim of maladministration on the grounds that verification had been completed by simply asking Anne. They did not admit to breaching responsible lending laws, yet agreed that the continuation of the contract would result in significant financial hardship for Anne. They ultimately agreed to collect the vehicle from Anne's home, close the loan account, waive the debt, not pursue any debt collection activities, sell the debt or make any adverse listing.

**Time taken to achieve resolution: 4 months**

*\* Name has been changed*

### Catherine's Story\*

Catherine\* is a single mother for four children. When she first came to Moneycare, she was receiving Parenting Payment but was looking to return to work as she was due to be transferred to the lower JobSeeker Payment rate shortly. At the time, she had a secured car loan as well as three consumer leases. She said that she had always felt that she could manage until she took out the car loan but now was feeling overwhelmed by the debt. Catherine expressed that she was willing to surrender the car.

Suspecting a breach of responsible lending laws, Catherine's Moneycare financial counsellor reviewed the car loan and found that Belinda's budget at the time of her loan application showed a deficit of \$187 per fortnight. This meant that the loan should have been deemed unsuitable and the creditor had failed to make reasonable enquiries about Catherine's financial position.

Through the lender's internal dispute resolution process, Catherine's Moneycare financial counsellor advocated on her behalf on the basis of unsuitable lending and sought to surrender the vehicle to the lender, sold, and for any residual debt to be waived with no adverse credit report listing made.

The lender admitted that they had not made reasonable enquiries into Catherine's financial situation. They had obtained a Centrelink income statement at the time of the application but did not take the necessary steps to verify the information within the document. The creditor put this down to a "clerical error", stating that they make "every possible effort to ensure that our analysts reviewing applications meet the RG209 requirement to conduct reasonable enquiries into the consumer's financial position."

Catherine surrendered the vehicle and was relieved of any further obligations.

#### **Time taken to achieve resolution: 1 month**

*\* Name has been changed*

### Charles's Story\*

Charles\* lives with a mental health condition. He is on a good income and has a mortgage on his unit. Charles already had a \$4,500 loan but found himself in need of some additional funds as he wanted to visit family interstate and do some small repairs. He called his bank, one of the major banks, to request his credit card limit be increased to \$10,000. He had called the bank two weeks prior from a mental health ward and was still very unwell at this time.

The bank employee who Charles spoke to over the phone suggested that he instead take out a personal loan and consolidate this new loan with his existing loan. After nearly two hours on the phone, Charles came away with one consolidated \$29,000 personal loan. This is despite his bank statements showing erratic spending and three declined direct debit payments the day before the new loan was granted.

The Moneycare financial counsellor took up the case of possible irresponsible lending with the bank and negotiated for Charles's debt to be partially waived to \$13,000 and a revised repayment of \$100 per fortnight over 5 years.

*\* Name has been changed*

### **Elinor's Story\***

Elinor\* is a single mother of six children and was receiving Parenting Payment and Family Tax Benefit. When she first approached Moneycare, she was in the process of negotiating the settlement of the family home, which had little to no equity. She also had a \$52,000 credit card debt.

Elinor been repeatedly rejected for hardship concessions and was struggling to meet her minimum monthly payments and feed her family. She had originally applied for a credit limit of \$2,000 while out of the workforce but had regularly accepted increases, ultimately reaching a \$48,000 limit. This was despite her financial situation not having changed over the five year period and her then husband having a salary of \$60,000 per annum.

Elinor's Moneycare financial counsellor approached her bank seeking that any debt above the initial \$2,000 be waived, but the request was rejected. We subsequently lodged a complaint with AFCA on the grounds that the bank had continued to offer regular credit increases beyond what Elinor could reasonably afford to pay back, with no effort to make reasonable enquiries about her financial situation.

The bank responded that as Elinor had continued to make payments, they had taken this as proof that she could meet increased financial obligations. Had they made enquiries, they would have found that the increased credit limits were resulting in Elinor becoming increasingly reliant on family and charities for financial support. This was presented as evidence that the credit card was unsuitable and that obligations could not be met without substantial hardship.

The matter was resolved by AFCA, with the bank waiving Elinor's \$52,000 debt in full. As a result, Elinor can now use her income to support her family.

#### **Time taken to achieve resolution: 4 months**

*\* Name has been changed*

## Emma's Story\*

Emma\* is a single mother of five children, one with special needs. When we first met her, she was working part-time in the aged care sector and had recently escaped a domestic violence situation. Emma and her children were staying at her investment property, which she had purchased ten years prior together with her mother, with security taken over her mother's encumbered unit. Emma was unable to sell the property and this meant that her mother was also unable to sell her unit. The property had always been negatively geared and Emma had been making interest-only repayments for the past ten years. She was now struggling to repay both principal and interest.

Our discussion with Emma revealed that the property had been purchased through a mortgage broker. At the time of the purchase, Emma had been earning \$30,000 per annum with two dependents and her mother was receiving the Disability Support Pension. Despite this, she received a credit card with a \$20,000 limit when taking out the loan.

Emma's Moneycare financial counsellor looked in to the mortgage broker that Emma had used and found that they no longer held a credit licence. We then requested that the bank take possession of the property, relinquish the security they held against her mother's property and waive the credit card debt.

The bank rejected this request and a subsequent complaint was made to AFCA on the grounds of irresponsible lending. We argued that security should not have been taken over the encumbered property of a pensioner, that the bank had made no effort to confirm Emma's financial position or the ratio of mortgage to property value, and that the bank had provided an unsolicited credit card with no effort to assess affordability.

The AFCA complaint was progressed to conciliation, with the bank agreeing to take possession of the property, waive residual debt and relinquish the security on Emma's mother's unit. The bank did not waive the credit card debt and after resolution, repeatedly sent legal notices in conflict with the conciliation agreement, for which they have since apologised.

**Time taken to achieve resolution: 1 year**

*\* Name has been changed*

### Harriet's Story\*

Harriet was referred to Moneycare by her adult daughter, who works for a major bank. Despite being unemployed and without a regular source of income, Harriet had managed to obtain two credit cards and two personal loans with two different major banks. When asked how she had got approval for these loans, Harriet explained that though the banks initially declined her applications, they eventually did approve them when she kept returning to the bank branches. Harriet then repeatedly increased the credit card limits.

Now unable to repay, she has borrowed from family and friends to maintain the regular repayments. The borrowings are damaging Harriet's relationships with her family and creating a wedge between her eldest daughter and son-in-law, who are newly married.

*\* Name has been changed*

### Lydia and George's Story\*

Lydia and George\* have an average income level and owe approximately \$650,000 on their mortgage with one of the major banks.

They decided to consolidate their debt to reduce the strain on their budget. When Lydia went to their bank to negotiate this, the bank manager advised her to instead take out a personal loan. The manager advised that she would be leaving the bank soon to start her own business and could help Lydia and George consolidate the two loans in her new role. Lydia trusted the manager and decided to follow her advice. The manager overrode the bank's system, which had automatically declined the new loan, and granted the loan within the hour.

George needed \$10,000 at a different time to replace a broken down van for work. The loan was declined but again the manager overrode it and got \$17,000 approved by stating that the money was needed for an emergency funeral.

This matter is currently being investigated by the bank.

*\* Names have been changed*

### **Marianne's Story\***

Marianne\* was referred to Moneycare by the local drug and alcohol support service. Along with her addiction, she has been diagnosed with various mental health conditions. Marianne had been approved for a \$30,000 personal loan from a major bank over a year prior. This is despite stating in her loan application that her only source of income was the Disability Support Pension. She had also previously defaulted on a property loan with the same bank and had to hand back the property.

Marianne had already been approved hardship assistance on the loan repayments. With a Moneycare financial counsellor's assistance, Marianne requested and received her loan application and assessment of suitability. In it the bank had reasoned that as Marianne had estimated her monthly living expenses to be \$200, this left a monthly surplus of \$800 and that she would therefore be able to meet and maintain her loan repayments.

Marianne had been living in active addiction when she applied for the loan. Regardless, \$200 per month would not cover an average person's essential living expenses, such as food, clothing, medication and transport. This should have raised red flags during the assessment. The financial counsellor concluded that there was no evidence of a reasonable assessment of the loan application by the bank.

Marianne discussed her options with the financial counsellor, including engaging a lawyer and challenging the debt through responsible lending laws. As Marianne would have no capacity to repay the debt in the near future, she ultimately decided to ask the bank if they would consider waiving the debt, which they agreed to do.

*\* Name has been changed*

### Mary's Story\*

Mary\* came to Moneycare with her father for support with several business loans totalling \$172,000 and a mortgage. She was very distressed at the time. She had just lost her husband to suicide and had three young children.

Unbeknownst to Mary, her husband had named her a partner to the business. He had also not been truthful on loan applications, declaring a false income for Mary and overstating the business's earnings. Hearing this, Mary's Moneycare financial counsellor suspected a lack of due diligence and a breach of responsible lending obligations. After discussing the available options, Mary decided to request more information and for her debts to be waived both on compassionate and irresponsible lending grounds. Her financial counsellor then advocated on Mary's behalf, outlining her circumstances.

The creditors waived her business debts in full, meaning Mary could keep her family home and maintain mortgage payments with her parents' assistance. Her financial counsellor also managed to locate a life insurance policy that Mary's husband had held, which had lapsed due to missed payments. Upon persistent advocacy this was eventually paid out.

*\* Name has been changed*

### Tom's Story\*

When we first met Tom\*, he was receiving the Age Pension and had a credit card with a \$9,000 limit. He was having difficulty meeting his repayments and had requested financial hardship assistance. The bank responded with the suggestion that he close his credit card account and instead transfer the balance to a personal loan, which had a higher interest rate and higher monthly repayments.

Tom's Moneycare financial counsellor took this case of irresponsible lending to his bank. While the bank was willing to discuss the matter, no significant hardship arrangement was offered, with George still being unable to afford the repayments.

With our assistance, Tom lodged a dispute with AFCA against the bank. To his delight, the bank responded by offering him a significant discount, which reduced the balance of the outstanding debt and therefore resulted in lower ongoing fortnightly repayments.

**Time taken to achieve resolution: 6 months**

*\* Name has been changed*

### Will's Story\*

Will\* was newly retired and on the Age Pension when he first came to Moneycare. He was having difficulties meeting his mortgage repayments with his new level of income, while supporting an adult son with multiple addiction issues including gambling. He had been approved for the mortgage five years ago while working full-time.

Will's Moneycare financial counsellor took this case of irresponsible lending to the bank, on the basis that at the time of the mortgage being drawn it was foreseeable that he would not continue to be able to afford repayments on the Age Pension.

With the assistance of the financial counsellor, Will lodged a dispute with AFCA. While the bank did not admit to breach of responsible lending laws, it agreed that continuation of the contract would result in significant financial hardship for Will. In response, the bank offered to put the mortgage interest fees and charges on hold while Will sold the property. They also offered him \$5,000 to help with moving costs. Will accepted the offer and was able to buy a smaller property outright.

**Time taken to achieve resolution: 7 months**

*\* Name has been changed*