



Speech By

Hon. Meaghan Scanlon

MEMBER FOR GAVEN

Record of Proceedings, 16 September 2025

MANUFACTURED HOMES (RESIDENTIAL PARKS) AMENDMENT (POSTPONEMENT) REGULATION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument



Hon. MAJ SCANLON (Gaven—ALP) (5.01 pm): I move—

That the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment (Postponement) Regulation, subordinate legislation No. 31 of 2025, tabled in the House on 20 May 2025, be disallowed.

This evening this parliament faces a simple but serious choice: do we keep faith with the residents of Queensland's manufactured home parks or do we give the minister a free pass on delaying the protections that were promised last year? Do we honour the reforms that this very House passed in 2024 or do we allow the Crisafulli government to hit the snooze button for another year?

This disallowance motion is about whether we allow a regulation to delay protections that we all voted for—another broken promise by this government made to thousands of Queenslanders now delayed at the stroke of a pen. If members want the short summary of tonight's choice, it is this: residents lose when we delay; park owners who do the right thing lose when we delay; and the government shows it is not ready to govern when it delays. I say to the member for Bonney: if are not prepared to govern, get out of the way and let those who are do the job.

Let us remember how these reforms were passed in the first place. They were not conjured out of thin air. They came from years of consultation, from submissions, from departmental analysis, from residents who told us in plain English what was wrong. They came from park residents who gave their time over a long and significant consultation period—park residents like those who travelled here today. I will take a moment to recognise some of those residents who are in the gallery: Sandy, Vera, Betty, Carol, Relma, Elinor, Roger, Sharon, Sue, Ian and Maggie. Thank you for your generosity and for taking the time today to come to this parliament where these laws were passed last year. The Labor opposition remain committed to delivering the protections that were legislated by this parliament. We are committed to holding the current government to account for the delays to the protections that you helped shape and you deserve to see implemented.

We have seen the minister scramble to appear to act but only after being called out in this House when I gave him notice that I would move this motion today to force him to do his job.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Ms SCANLON: No, that is exactly what happened. This is the second speech I have delivered in this parliament today talking about where progress has only happened after I and the Labor opposition called out the government's delays and inaction. It should not take the opposition giving notice that we will act for government ministers to do their job.

There are roughly 23,700 manufactured home sites across about 200 residential parks in Queensland. Around 38,000 Queenslanders call these parks home and a large majority are retirees, many of them age pensioners and many of them on fixed incomes. These are people who have worked a lifetime, raised families, volunteered in their communities, paid their taxes and deserve stability and respect.

While site rent increase limits now apply for existing home owners, without the now-delayed reforms new residents and future agreements remain exposed to less predictable arrangements. Residents told us that sales processes were too slow and too opaque, leaving people paying site rent month after month while they tried to sell a home so they could move to aged care or close to family. They told us that site agreements can be inconsistent, complex and sometimes one-sided, leaving ordinary people feeling like they were signing away their rights when they moved in. These are not abstract, ivory tower complaints. They are kitchen table realities for many park residents on fixed incomes.

The 2024 act did several things, in stages. Some of those changes have already commenced, but core protections—practical, commonsense changes—were set to commence automatically on 7 June this year. The government is now delaying those protections for up to 12 months. I see the housing minister smiling. He thinks it is funny. These are not boutique, nice-to-have tweaks—

Mr O'Connor: Barely change your timetable.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Marr): Member for Gaven, can I ask you to take your seat for a moment, please. I am trying to listen to the member for Gaven. There will be no cross-chamber chatter.

Ms SCANLON: I take the housing minister's interjection—barely changing the timetable. I would say that a 12-month delay is pretty significantly changing of the timetable. These are important reforms to deliver fairness in this sector. The first is maintenance and capital replacement plans. Without these plans, residents are flying blind. They do not know which capital works are coming, when they are coming, what standard is expected or who pays. A proper, transparent plan means fewer surprises and fewer disputes. It means confidence that essential assets—roads, drainage, community facilities, utility infrastructure—are not left to crumble until a sudden expensive fix is demanded. It also means residents can see forward and understand what the park owner is or is not responsible for.

The second element was limiting bases for site rent increases to approved bases. The parliament voted to clamp down on the free-for-all of so-called market rent reviews that led to confusion and potential unfairness for new agreements. The reform would standardise approved bases and ensure consistency going forward. While I do appreciate that the minister has now conveniently identified a date for bases to come into effect, it is not clear why this delay or the longer delays to maintenance and capital replacement plans are necessary. Consider a resident whose park's communal facilities have been deteriorating for years. Residents keep being told that upgrades are 'in the pipeline'. With a mandatory maintenance and capital replacement plan, the pipeline would be a documented program—not a promise—and residents could see timelines and standards and insist on delivery. These are not outliers; they are the stories you hear when you visit parks and speak with resident communities.

Let me deal squarely with the claim that I expect to hear from the government that these matters are complex and more consultation is required to get them right and the irony given the member for Bonney said in this chamber when the bill was originally being debated that these reforms were 'merely tinkering'. If he thought that then, he should have the toolkit to finish these reforms now. Complexity is not an excuse for paralysis; it is a call to competence. If the Minister for Housing now truly believes these are too complex then he should acknowledge they are important reforms and stop pretending the delay carries no cost to residents.

I anticipate that, no doubt, the minister will want to blame someone else for his delays. He will probably try to blame me, despite the fact that we legislated these protections to come into effect in June. The member for Bonney took on the role of housing minister over six months ago now. It is his job to support the Public Service to deliver priorities that every member of this House voted on, including himself. No doubt the member for Bonney will try to squib responsibility once again. The fact is that it is his decision to delay these protections. If he cannot do his job then, as I said, he should move out of the way for someone else who can.

We passed the act in June 2024. The provisions that did not commence were due to start automatically in June this year. The government has had months. Instead of delivering, they tabled a postponement regulation on 12 May—

Mr Power interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Logan, I remind you that you are on a warning.

Ms SCANLON:—virtually at the eleventh hour. That is not the behaviour of a government on top of their brief. That is the behaviour of a government trying to shift a deadline they knew was coming. They knew it was coming because they voted for those laws. When a parliament votes on reform and a government uses a regulation to postpone it, it tests the trust of this House. It asks us to accept that executive convenience should trump legislative will. That may suit the government today, but it will come at the expense of park residents.

Disallowing this regulation restores the timetable this parliament set, not the agenda of those opposite. It sends a message that when this House passes protections for residents those protections are not optional extras to be turned on and off at the LNP's whim. It says to Queenslanders: the parliament meant what it said. It also says something about standards. If a government wants a different policy, bring in a bill. Face the House. Make your case. Do not use a postponement regulation as a back door to dump a promise to people you thought would not notice.

Mr O'Connor: We're not changing anything.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the member for Bonney who says that they are not changing anything. They are delaying the laws. I do not know whether the member for Bonney just does not understand his own regulation which is probably the case. It delays the reforms that were meant to come into effect in June.

The inconvenient truth for the member for Bonney is that the opposition noticed and park residents noticed. They noticed when this minister said protections could wait—that years of consultation, of working together with residents and industry to fix issues that threaten the security of people's homes, do not matter. That is why last month I gave notice to move this disallowance motion. Then no doubt what happened behind the scenes was that the Minister for Housing panicked and only after we raised this issue publicly did he then go to Executive Council to try to push through some of the reforms.

Mr O'CONNOR: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence. I had signed the regulation before the member moved the disallowance motion. I ask the member to withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, you have been asked to withdraw.

Ms SCANLON: I withdraw. I take what the member has said though. Why on earth has the government moved a regulation to delay reforms if in fact they were planning on delaying reforms? The thing is that what went to Executive Council only dealt with some of those matters. There are still other measures in those laws that have not been adequately addressed by the government in the timeframe that this House—

Mr Ryan: It's still a delay.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection: it is still a delay. It is just a shortened delay on what those opposite tried to move originally. It is a complete shambles over there. What I found particularly interesting though were the explanatory notes for the subordinate legislation that the member for Bonney just mentioned. I quote what they say right at the end. It states—

Industry stakeholders mostly preferred a six-month transition period between proclamation and commencement whereas consumer stakeholders preferred a faster commencement.

It is clear whose side the Crisafulli government is on when their document essentially says that they sided with what industry wanted and not what residents wanted.

Mr O'Connor: No. It's December.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection. In effect, industry have got what they wanted. A six-month delay from when these protections were meant to come into effect is what is eventuating under the changes that the member for Bonney has put forward. The LNP have chosen to back industry rather than park residents. That is what their own document shows.

Mr de Brenni: Profit over people.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the member for Springwood—profit over people once again. No doubt those opposite will change developer donations to assist their mates there, as well.

While we now have a timeline for some of these changes to commence by the end of the year—which, as the member for Morayfield said, still delayed—critical other elements are still deferred until next year. Even some of the changes the government has been forced to act on, such as the sales process, will still remain inconsistent and complicated while the minister kicks the can down the road on standardised sales agreement forms, which was the intent of those reforms to begin with.

To reputable park owners—and there are a number of them out there—I say what many of you already know: certainty works for you too. Clear rules are good for business. Predictable rent bases reduce disputes and legal costs. Transparent maintenance plans build trust with residents and protect asset values. Streamlined sales keep communities moving and reputations strong. Good operators have nothing to fear from a fair field and no favour.

To residents, I say this: you did everything right. You engaged. You made submissions. You told your stories. Parliament listened and acted. I know that there are many residents out there who want to see even more reforms in this space. At a minimum they want to see the laws that we actually voted on in this House passed and implemented. You are entitled to expect the protections to start on time.

This motion is about keeping our side of the bargain, making sure the laws that we passed actually reach those residents' front door. This debate is also a signal about housing more broadly. In a tight market, rules matter. Predictable costs matter. Speed and clarity in transactions matter. Commencing these provisions now is a modest but meaningful step towards a fairer, more functional part of the housing system for Queenslanders.

Those opposite will say, 'What's another six months or one more year?' For a cabinet submission, maybe not much. For a family on a fixed income, it can be an eternity. It is another summer of heat with no shade at the community centre still waiting on maintenance. It is another missed chance to sell while the market is there. Leadership is not about claiming credit; it is about doing the work. The test of government is not whether you can draft a postponement regulation and hope no-one notices.

Mr Stevens: Ten years.

Ms SCANLON: It is whether you can implement your commitments, the law the parliament has already passed in full and on time. The minister has been forced to reveal that these things can be delivered.

Mr O'Connor: If only you'd been the housing minister!

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the member for Bonney again. I was the housing minister and I passed these laws. You are the housing minister and you have delayed them. That is what the record will show.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, members. Member for Gaven and member for Bonney, please direct your comments through the chair. There will be no cross-chamber conversation.

Ms SCANLON: The government has had the time. The excuses have run out. The cost of delay is borne by those most vulnerable. The housing minister cannot square his past dismissal of these reforms as 'tinkering around the edges' with his present plea that these are too complex now to deliver.

Mr O'CONNOR: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Ms SCANLON: They are your own words.

Mr O'CONNOR: I take personal offence. It was a cognate debate. I was talking about the botched rental reforms that were also fixed in that bill. I ask the member to withdraw. I take personal offence.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, I did miss what you said. The member has taken offence. I ask you to withdraw.

Ms SCANLON: I am happy to withdraw. I ask members to stand with residents, not with excuses. Vote to disallow the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment (Postponement) Regulation. Honour the law we passed. Keep faith with Queenslanders who trusted us to deliver it.