

Taken in Tassie

Blurred lines of advice deprive widow of husband's life legacy



Nick Bruining

A gaping hole in consumer protection legislation, designed to protect investors from poor financial advice, has been revealed as a result of a widow's battle with a major financial advice firm.

The woman, Cindy Parker, whose husband Michael died from cancer, is fighting to obtain compensation from her financial adviser after the couple were told to invest into a rural Tasmanian property development.

With more than \$326,000 in loans to be repaid, the Tasmanian property has been on the market for \$249,000 since Mr Parker died two years ago.

He had been diagnosed with a rare form of cancer in 2012 and met their financial adviser in 2013.

"Mike wanted to make sure we would be all right financially," Mrs Parker said.

"The mortgage payments had previously been suspended while he was receiving chemotherapy and, with everything that was happening in our lives, we were relieved when our adviser assured us that the investment property would be worth more than half a million dollars in 10 years time."

The Parkers were advised to borrow \$300,000 using their family home as security. The loan was facilitated through a mortgage broking firm associated with the financial advising firm responsible for their adviser's conduct.

The same bank that had agreed to suspending the mortgage payments also lent the Parkers the additional \$300,000.

The funds were used to purchase a property in Smithton, Tasmania, recommended by the adviser and in turn, construct a home with a builder, also recommended by the adviser. The builder appears to be associated with the financial advisory firm.

"He said that I could negatively gear the investment and that with the tax breaks, I would be able to afford the repayments," Mrs Parker said. "I work in aged care as a nursing assistant and earn less than \$40,000."



Cindy Parker and her late husband Michael were caught in a crook investment. Picture: Mogens Johansen

She now uses the remainder of her husband's life insurance and superannuation to service the debt.

Mrs Parker has engaged a lawyer who specialises in poor financial advice to pursue the company concerned.

The lawyer, David Huggins, described the case as one of the worst examples of financial advice that he has seen.

"The effect of the advice was to sell a house and land package to a highly vulnerable couple," Mr Huggins said.

"The one-stop shop provided the financial advice, organised the loan through an associated mortgage broker and had an associated company build the house."

The case highlights a deficiency in financial advice legislation which is regulated by ASIC. Under the definition of financial products covered by the law, real estate investments are excluded.

“THE EFFECT OF THE ADVICE WAS TO SELL A HOUSE AND LAND PACKAGE TO A HIGHLY VULNERABLE COUPLE.”

Invest with clarity, sense

Neale Prior

There's an old investment adage that if something is too good to be true, it probably bloody well is a giant lie.

Our investment history has been littered with financial schemes where vulnerable Australians have been separated from their savings by promises that are too good to be true.

Occasionally those promises have involved big returns on investments, such as the dot.com boom and the elevator pitch that became the dot.com delusion of 2000.

But more often than not, fat porkies have involved investments in the nation's almost universal belief in the safety of investment.

We believe there is something especially secure about investing in a bit of Aussie dirt, some bricks or in financial transactions that involve and/or bricks and mortar.

While most of us can't explain the difference between a green title, purple title or a white title, we believe that a paper provides so much protection than a recording in an electronic somewhere in cyberspace.

And the idea that a property developer is "backed" provides a false sense of security. Will get our money back if something goes wrong.

This belief system is particularly vulnerable to demagogues, charlatans, prophets, predator hope pedlars who exploit relative impunity in property investment.

These people promise about having enough to retire on and our greed says we can protect ourselves but our grandchildren will be in a golden pond.

Our hope and greed can blind us to the fact that property investment is another financial trap at all the levels of greed as the underdog.

For a proper

In the late 1990s, ASIC recommended that real estate agents providing investment advice be brought under the umbrella of financial advice laws and subject to the same rules and regulations as someone recommending an investment in shares, superannuation fund or a savings plan.

The move was resisted by the real estate industry which was regulated by State governments at the time.

"ASIC simply does not have jurisdiction so unless it is a financial service, it is unlikely to involve ASIC," an ASIC spokesman said.

The Financial Planning Association's head of policy and government relations, Benjamin Marshan, said: "The provision of advice around investing in property absolutely should be regulated under the Corporations Act to better protect consumers."

"The FPA has been actively lobbying for further reform."