

T R A N S C R I P T

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL LEGAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES COMMITTEE

Inquiry into the Redevelopment of Melbourne's Public Housing Towers

Melbourne – Wednesday 6 August 2025

MEMBERS

Joe McCracken – Chair

Michael Galea – Deputy Chair

Ryan Batchelor

Anasina Gray-Barberio

Renee Heath

Ann-Marie Hermans

Rachel Payne

Lee Tarlamis

PARTICIPATING MEMBERS

Melina Bath

John Berger

Georgie Crozier

Jacinta Ermacora

David Ettershank

Sarah Mansfield

Tom McIntosh

Aiv Puglielli

Sonja Terpstra

Richard Welch

WITNESS (*via videoconference*)

Jackson Payne, Organiser, Stop the Demo.

The CHAIR: Welcome back to the next session of the Legal and Social Issues Committee Inquiry into the Redevelopment of Melbourne's Public Housing Towers. I am Joe McCracken, Chair of the inquiry, and we are going to go through and introduce our members. I will go to my left first.

Renee HEATH: Hello, my name is Renee Heath, and I am a Member for Eastern Victoria Region.

Ann-Marie HERMANS: Hello, Jackson. I am Ann-Marie Hermans. I am a Member for the South-Eastern Metropolitan Region.

Anasina GRAY-BARBERIO: Good morning, Jackson. My name is Anasina Gray-Barberio, Northern Metro Region.

Aiv PUGLIELLI: Hi, I am Aiv Puglielli, Member for North-Eastern Metro.

Michael GALEA: G'day. Michael Galea, Member for South-Eastern Metro.

Jacinta ERMACORA: Hello. Jacinta Ermacora here from Western Victoria Region – online.

The CHAIR: Thank you to you too, Jackson, for being here today. All evidence taken is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the *Constitution Act 1975* and further subject to the provisions of the Legislative Council standing orders. Therefore the information that you do provide during the hearing is protected by law. You are protected against any action for what you say during the hearing, but if you go elsewhere and repeat the same things, those comments may not be protected by that privilege. Any deliberately false evidence or misleading the committee may be considered a contempt of Parliament.

All evidence is being recorded. You will be provided with a proof version of the transcript, and ultimately the transcript will be made public and put on the committee's website.

Just for the Hansard record, can you say your full name and any organisation, if any, you are appearing on behalf of please, Jackson.

Jackson PAYNE: Yes, for sure. My name is Jackson Charles Payne. I am appearing here on behalf of a grassroots collective of housing workers called Stop the Demo.

The CHAIR: Awesome. Thanks for that. I understand you have got a presentation, so we will hand over to you to go through that. We probably have about 5 minutes, give or take, for that, and then we will go to questions from the committee. Jackson, welcome, and we will hand over to you. Thanks.

Visual presentation.

Jackson PAYNE: Wonderful. Thank you all for taking the time to have me as part of the inquiry today. It is something I am very appreciative of. And just to note, my speech goes for about 5½-ish minutes, so not too much longer over my 5-minute deadline.

The CHAIR: That is all right.

Jackson PAYNE: I would like to acknowledge the land from which I join this meeting and the lands from which you are also joining this meeting, the land of the Wurundjeri people of the Kulin nation, while also acknowledging that the 44 public housing towers earmarked for demolition are on unceded Aboriginal land, and the traditional owners were not consulted about this demolition. I speak to you today as a former support worker in housing and homelessness, where I worked for a decade until June this year. I speak to you as one of the organisers of Stop the Demo, a grassroots collective of housing workers motivated to stop demolition of public housing. But I also speak to you as someone who is deeply interested in stories, so bear with me while I share with you a few.

In 1960 two men drove a car through Melbourne's inner-city suburbs. These men were research architect Grahame Shaw and the Victorian housing commission slum research officer JH Davey. They were deciding which houses to tear down as part of the slum reclamation project. Here are the words of Mr Shaw describing the methodology they used:

The survey was carried out by two persons travelling in a car up and down each street of the areas under consideration.

Classification –

of which houses to demolish –

was made from the external appearance of the house and its fences, and was assessed by streets or portions of streets rather than by individual houses.

After these men conducted this survey, they wrote a report called *The Enemy Within Our Gates* that was used by the Victorian housing commission to justify demolishing housing on 400 hectares of Melbourne's inner-city land. Thousands of people were displaced through this process, with whole communities lost. This dreadful story is also the story of how Melbourne's public housing towers came to be, because these very same sites are where the towers exist today.

In 2025, just 60 years later, the towers are now facing demolition. But we do not even have the privilege of a dodgy report made by two blokes who went for a drive in a car; we have secretive engineering assessments hidden from the public by parliamentary privilege. And we are told by politicians like former Premier Daniel Andrews that the towers fail against contemporary minimum standards. But I ask: where is the evidence?

I fail to understand that the solution to the housing crisis of today is to demolish the safety net of tomorrow – public housing. Yes, a small percentage of the redeveloped land will be used for social housing, but we already know this will be predominately, if not all, community housing. We know this because Homes Victoria has alluded to it on its website, as you see here on my slide.

Replacing public housing with community housing is something my former colleagues and I already know does not work. It means private organisations deciding the types of people who deserve housing. It means higher rents, dodgy service fees and larger utility bills. It means people missing out on housing because a housing manager does not like the sound of someone – yes, I have experienced that as a worker. What are the impacts of this? These quotes that you can see are drawn from a large number of case studies Stop the Demo has gathered from its members that show community housing providers decline people for reasons of mental health, drug use, for having a pet, receiving JobSeeker and in one instance because of a worker's email signature. Do not trust my word for it. Here is Homes Victoria openly acknowledging that community housing providers do not take people from the top of the Victorian housing register waitlist, instead using their own opaque practices.

Nearing the end of this talk, I wish to return to my very first day working in housing and homelessness. On that day I shadowed an experienced staff member as a way to learn my new role. We reviewed a client's case notes and asked them to join us in a small room we use for client interactions. The client sat down on the chair opposite and looked to the floor as my colleague told him something that to me, new in the sector, was shocking – there was no funding for emergency accommodation, there were no rooming house vacancies, no beds in supported accommodation and, worse, his priority public housing application was likely 10 years from making it to the top of the list. 'Have you got any friends or family you can stay with?' my colleague asked. 'I've got no-one,' this man replied, something I would hear countless times over the 10 years I worked in the sector. This man then stood up, ripped the phone from the desk in front of us and threw it in our direction. I must emphasise that this is no aberration; these acts of frustration and violence happen every day in homelessness services all over Victoria. Why? Because there are so few housing options, and existing ones, like public housing, are being taken away.

In 1966 the Housing Commission wrote that the high-rise towers would not be 'the slums of the future'. They would make sure of this by 'ensuring constant supervision and maintenance'. We know now that this never happened, and we also know that this is being used for the apparent justification of the towers' demolition. But here, in being confronted with the broken promises of governments past, we must also contend with broken promises in the future. So I ask: is demolishing 44 public housing towers the best thing for the Victorians of tomorrow? Is community housing the solution to housing crises 20, 30 or 40 years from now? Almost every housing worker in this state will tell you it is not even the solution for today. Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thanks very much for your presentation, Jackson. I appreciate that. I will start off with questions, and then we will go through the rest of the members of the committee. Part of what you said in your submission are concerns about the relocation and the process around that. Given your 10 years experience, which as you said, ended in the last little time, what have you seen in supporting those throughout your work?

Jackson PAYNE: People who are in public or community housing?

The CHAIR: Yes. What is the reaction that you are seeing from people that are being asked to relocate?

Jackson PAYNE: Well, to preface this question, I did not work in a Tenancy Plus program. Tenancy Plus programs in Victoria are the funded programs to assist people in public and community housing who are facing difficulties with their tenancies, so they would be the primary workers who would have engaged directly with clients facing the likelihood of displacement. But what we do see, though – or what I have seen specifically – is people cycling back into entry points. Entry points are initial assessment and planning services, where I worked for the predominant period of my time in housing and homelessness, both in direct practice and in roles of leadership. What we see is people who are displaced – who lose their communities, who for whatever reason are kicked out of public housing – returning to entry points, which are the very bottom of the housing ladder. They are where people come when they have literally nowhere else to go. They are the crisis point of housing, and we see this repeatedly when people are displaced.

The CHAIR: Okay. Thank you for that. I guess one of the matters that has come up from a number of different witnesses is the right to return and whether that is a guarantee or whether it is, as many have put it, a qualified right. Do you have a view on that?

Jackson PAYNE: I do, in that the transparency or lack of transparency through what is said to be a right of return is, as you quite rightly put it, conditional. On the Homes Victoria website it uses language to that effect, where if people's needs determine their right to return. As we have seen previously through what I alluded to in regard to the slum reclamation project, we have seen evidence of the impact of displacing these communities in the past. Just to read to you briefly from a book by Leonie Sandercock, it is called *Cities for Sale* and it assessed the impact on displaced people through the slum reclamation project:

As practised in Victoria, that policy distributed immeasurable social and economic costs to the original communities who were displaced and relocated, social and psychological costs to those rehoused in the –

Victorian Housing Commission's –

... high rise family flats, yet great advantages to those developers ... who built on cheaply acquired clearance sites, and to those middle-income earners who are able to buy these flats.

And I bring this to your attention, obviously, to highlight the likely emotional impact of displacing these communities, removing them from their areas of support, but also the fact that we are repeating a dynamic that happened 60 years ago where the only people who profited from this process were private developers and the middle-income earners who will be able to afford the 'affordable housing' that will take the place of public housing on its current sites.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Jackson. My time has unfortunately expired, so I am going to hand over to Mr Galea now.

Michael GALEA: Thank you, Chair. Thanks very much for joining us today, Mr Payne. I just want to check on something that you said in your opening remarks that there have been no reports released about the condition of the towers. Are you familiar with the reports by Approval Systems that were tabled in the Legislative Council?

Jackson PAYNE: No, I am not.

Michael GALEA: You have not read those reports?

Jackson PAYNE: Can you summarise what is exactly in those reports and the level of detail that goes into each of the 44 sites?

Michael GALEA: Sure. It is multiple pages. I will not read everything, but the conclusion of the one on Elgin Street says that:

... retrospective upgrade with respect to several building features would not be feasible or practicable, namely:

- Structural provisions and in particular seismic loading
- Access to and within the building, including within sole occupancy units for people with disabilities
- Ceiling heights
- Energy efficiency
- Condensation

Jackson PAYNE: The Elgin Street sites were approved for redevelopment before the announcement of the Big Housing Build, so I suspect that what you are alluding to there does not signify the issues or apparent issues related to all 44 sites.

Michael GALEA: I am happy to read through reports on one of the other sites on Malvern Road as well, and if you wish to, I am happy for you to come back to us on notice if you want to take the time to look at those reports. I am not going to try and put words in your mouth or put you on the spot there, but I would appreciate some feedback on that because they have been on the public record for quite some time now.

In terms of the living conditions in the towers, what do you believe the government's role is in ensuring that these homes are livable and habitable, and what standard do you think it should be? Do you think it should be of a high standard? Should it be of a bare minimum? And how do we get to that?

Jackson PAYNE: Yes, I think that is a great question. There have been various reports about the feasibility of refurbishing the existing high-rise apartments. Of course I do not believe that there would be anyone that would suggest that the standard of housing for all people should be anything less than high. In regard to the current condition of the high-rise towers, I quite rightly alluded to, in my presentation, that the degradation of those conditions has been because of government neglect. So it is, I would say, contingent on government to ensure that those apartments are refurbished – not demolished, but refurbished in a way that can keep those communities intact and can commit to the Victorian housing commission's promise back when they were built that these would be maintained and that these would be built with construction standards that would negate the need for us to be at this present point.

Michael GALEA: So how would we refurbish these buildings without requiring relocations, especially when we are talking about things like ceiling heights and other things and disability access? How would you actually do that without also having to relocate people during that process, because we have not had anyone that has actually been able to give us an answer to that.

Jackson PAYNE: Well, at the moment we are facing whole buildings that are being relocated at the same time. So a way to refurbish a multistorey high-rise tower would be to do it floor by floor, therefore –

Michael GALEA: So they would remain living on a construction site whilst works are going on around them, and whilst works are being done to change ceiling heights – that is the solution?

Jackson PAYNE: You could probably find multiple examples – in fact in the apartment building where I live there have been construction sites that have happened in apartments in my block that have not wholly disturbed my ability to live there. So I believe that there is a staged process that you could enact that would not displace entire communities and have the effects on entire communities, rather than seeking alternative accommodation, floor by floor, to enable the refurbishments of these properties as they exist.

Michael GALEA: My time is up. Thank you very much.

Jackson PAYNE: Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thank you. I am going to pass over to Ms Gray-Barberio now.

Anasina GRAY-BARBERIO: Thank you, Chair. And thanks very much, Jackson, for joining us this morning and for your grassroots advocacy in this space. The examples that you shared in your presentation are very distressing. I would like to start with: would you say in your view that community housing providers are able to cherry-pick tenants from the Victorian housing register?

Jackson PAYNE: Absolutely, and if I am able to, I can draw on some specific examples I have with me today.

Anasina GRAY-BARBERIO: That would be great, if you would not mind.

Jackson PAYNE: So if you just give me one second – sorry to take up more of your time; my screen is just loading. We know through case studies that we have gathered through Stop the Demo and across our workers in housing that examples of discriminatory practices, or rather the fact that they do not have to take from the top of the Victorian housing register, can be said most explicitly in the words of an allocation worker from a community housing provider.

I am currently viewing applications on higher income as it is a requirement for rent setting.

We also have, for example, community housing managers deciding that – here is a quote from a member:

I have a case of a community housing provider saying they will not accept any clients who are using ice, and they request the referrer to comment on the client's POD issues in the application as well as requesting an attached IAP, which is an assessment document.

We have discriminatory practices around income. Again, this is quoting from a member of Stop the Demo:

... this is often women of migrant backgrounds who have been on partner visas and had to leave their relationship due to family violence. Special benefit, which is the equivalent to JobSeeker in monetary terms, is often less than someone on parenting payments would receive. We find that despite having an approved priority application on the VHR and a government income, many community housing providers won't accept these women for vacancies as they could earn more from renting out to someone else who receives higher government payments.

We also have examples of people being rejected because they have had a pet. And as I referred to in my slide presentation, here is a quote from a member:

I had a referral declined from a community housing provider due to having 'youth justice' in my email signature.

So as we can see, there are myriad ways in which discrimination is enacted.

Anasina GRAY-BARBERIO: Yes, absolutely. Just because I am conscious of time, Jackson, I do want to ask you another question before I run out, but I do appreciate you providing the committee examples of operation here. Why do you think community housing providers accept higher income earners, and do you think, in your view, does their business model necessitate this?

Jackson PAYNE: I believe it does. In my time – my 10 years working in the housing sector – I worked for a place that was a small organisation that then joined with another medium-sized organisation and has since become one of the largest housing organisations in the state. What that means is an over-reliance on tendering for contracts or government funding to run programs, and the tendering process usually requires organisations to under-tender, so they run these programs at a loss. So if these are the same organisations – and we know there are examples of this in Victoria where services are community housing providers and support providers – what this means is that because of the way in which community housing providers can extract income, which is unlike the 25 per cent of income for public housing, and community housing is 30 per cent of their income plus 100 per cent of their rent assistance plus service fees of a nominal amount decided by the organisation, it creates an income stream that can counter the limited funding they get from government.

Anasina GRAY-BARBERIO: Appreciate your time, Jackson. Thank you.

Jackson PAYNE: You are welcome.

The CHAIR: Thank you. I am now going to hand it over to Ms Ermacora, who is online.

Jacinta ERMACORA: Thanks for your presentation. I too found particularly the first elements of what you were talking about historically very distressing, but what struck me was, from what you are saying, the decisions about clearing slums and potentially the decisions about the construction of the towers were not really underpinned by a sense of right to high-quality housing for all Victorians. It was as if a different set of values applied to those people than other people. I think we have even seen those values implied in some of the discourse here this morning. From that perspective, which you so clearly articulated, I guess the value set of the Victorian government now is that everybody deserves good quality housing, no matter their circumstances. When in the face of the reports which Mr Galea referred to, would you see that it is logical that providing that

quality housing is the most important thing to do now to rectify that imbalance in the application of human rights values?

Jackson PAYNE: Absolutely, I would agree with your sentiment there that everyone deserves high-quality housing regardless of their support needs, regardless of their income, regardless of their cultural or ethnic background. However, I do question the way in which we appear to be going about this by displacing, again, whole communities from places where they have lived for generations, with no right or guarantee of return to this better set of housing that is being built. We know that large proportions of these sites will actually be private dwellings and not public housing, and in actual fact, community housing and not public housing. So while, yes, I entirely agree with the sentiment of what you are saying, I think applied to this specific context, there is no guarantee that the lived experiences of the people who are being displaced will be dramatically improved.

Jacinta ERMACORA: Part of the value of an inquiry like this is that you can get a diversity of views on the same problem. You are saying, 'This is how we've solved this problem,' but then there are 10 different ways from another 10 experts who say how a problem could be solved. Eventually governments have to make decisions and get on with doing things. Do you agree that, for the most part, the actual structure and functionality of the towers are extremely problematic?

Jackson PAYNE: I would say that the neglect of maintenance of the public housing towers has led to the condition in which they are today.

Jacinta ERMACORA: That is a historic thing. Here we are in government right now doing things – looking back on who has neglected it, probably, or whether it has been neglected. The reality is there are extreme problems with the towers – if you apply the value, say, of that.

The CHAIR: Sorry, Ms Ermacora, your time is up, but I am happy for Jackson to respond to this last part of the question if you are happy to.

Jackson PAYNE: I guess I would just respond by asking: what specific problems are you identifying with the towers? I would say that because this process has been so opaque and there has been such a lack of transparency, and the towers are being dealt with as all bad rather than addressing the individual problems themselves, I am unable to answer the question accurately.

Jacinta ERMACORA: I will just say that report – the report that you said you had not read.

The CHAIR: I am going to hand it over now to Mrs Hermans. Over to you.

Ann-Marie HERMANS: Thank you, Jackson. Speaking as a former housing support worker myself, I thank you for the work that you have done in this space. We both know how incredibly important it is. You did mention that there is a current lack of crisis accommodation, supported accommodation and now, of course, a significant increase in the lack of public housing in Victoria due to the demolition and relocation of a number of individuals and families. Can you tell us, in terms of the public housing – you have taken it upon yourself, with others, to try to stop the demolition – what difference do you think it will make in terms of housing support work if the demolitions do not take place and the properties are maintained and perhaps refurbished as well?

Jackson PAYNE: News stories have been coming out in the last couple of weeks about Homes Victoria buying private dwellings at market rates to rehome some of the people who are already being relocated from the towers, so we can therefore assume that the people who are being relocated are being put into either these properties or existing Homes Victoria homes that would otherwise go to people who are already on the public housing waitlist, with some figures suggesting that is up at around 60,000 people presently. We can infer, then, that the impact would be a lack of options or rather a lengthening of the time it takes for people to get housed, even if they are on a priority housing waitlist application.

Ann-Marie HERMANS: Some of the ones that have perhaps been on the waitlist that may have come to the services that you worked at for housing support – what are some of the situations, and how long have some of them been waiting? Can you just talk a little bit in that space about what you have actually found to be perhaps the greatest need or perhaps the greatest area of neglect?

Jackson PAYNE: Well, I think the greatest area of neglect is successive governments' neglect of public housing and the fact that Victoria has the lowest percentage of public housing of any state in this country. But in terms of the issues that I see, I could not name one singular presenting issue that I would say is more important than others, but we can explore the plethora of presentations that we get in housing services in Victoria. As I discussed, there are migrant women here on partner visas fleeing family violence. We get other folks like women and gender-diverse people presenting with no housing options because there are no safe options for people in conventional housing options that are available through housing organisations – like rooming houses, for example. We have endemic rough sleepers who have been sleeping rough sometimes for up to 10 years because there is not suitable housing for them, and in the context of all of this we have an increase in what we have described and discussed today as community housing, where all of these presenting issues are used not to give these people housing.

Ann-Marie HERMANS: Yes. Thank you. I wish I could ask more questions, but my time is up. Thank you, Jackson.

Jackson PAYNE: Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thanks very much. I will now hand over to Mr Puglielli.

Aiv PUGLIELLI: Thank you, Chair. Hi. Good morning. Jackson, in your opening presentation you spoke about the actions which precipitated the slum reclamation project where, correct me if I am paraphrasing this badly, two dudes drove through inner metro Melbourne picking and choosing which homes to demolish based on their external appearance – the vibes, essentially. From the information that you and your colleagues have been able to access so far, is this government's proposal really much different?

Jackson PAYNE: Absolutely not, and the reason I included it in my presentation was to highlight the extreme parallels between a harm already inflicted on communities of people living in substandard housing and the actions of this current government – for example, not consulting with residents, not consulting with housing organisations, not consulting with the traditional owners and instead announcing something so dramatic and so grand in a way that is going to clear away swathes of housing for the purpose of building what will be predominantly private dwellings, which we know from the past, from the slum reclamation project which that also was a part of, these private developers and middle-income earners were the ones who benefited most from this. So we are repeating the mistakes of the past, when we have examples both of the social cost and in terms of the housing cost that this does not work.

Aiv PUGLIELLI: Thank you, Jackson. My next question is on another matter. It relates to community housing providers. Can you tell me, in terms of applications, are they using a uniform application form, and per the discrimination that you were speaking about earlier that people are experiencing, do some providers include questions in these forms that therefore enable them to discriminate in this way?

Jackson PAYNE: Absolutely. Each individual community housing provider has its own set of forms. However, to receive community housing in the state of Victoria you have to have a Victorian housing register application, so you have to have a government housing application, and in that application you choose whether you are open to public or community housing or both. In the first instance you have to have one of these applications, but the selection practices of these community housing providers are idiosyncratic and opaque, whereby they get to decide who is housed within the so-called rental settings that they prescribe. Sometimes these are based on the support needs, as I described, but oftentimes they are based on the level of income they can extract from someone. So someone, for example, on DSP or on parenting payments is a much more attractive tenant than someone who is on JobSeeker or special benefits, which is a lesser government payment. So to answer your question, the practices of these individual organisations are themselves individual and not collective, not uniform like they are for public housing.

Aiv PUGLIELLI: Thank you.

Jackson PAYNE: By the way, public housing does not ask for support needs or a history of support needs in the same way that community housing does.

Aiv PUGLIELLI: Okay, thank you. Specifically for migrant and refugee women who are unable to be housed due to their income, just picking up some of the points you were raising earlier, is it a common phrase to say to women fleeing family violence to ‘find someone in the community’? I mean, what does that mean?

Jackson PAYNE: It is something that is used, or rather a discussion that is had, in housing organisations throughout the state every day – yes, with migrant women fleeing family violence, but with all cohorts. So when you come to an entry point or an IAP service – I mean, the model of IAP services has not ever really worked that well, but the increased demand in those services post pandemic, where the cost of housing has increased so drastically, means that we are having these conversations with people every day where we say, ‘Well, there’s no supported accommodation and no rooming houses and there’s no funding for emergency accommodation. Do you have someone that you can stay with in the community?’ The fallacy of that question is that we know that that is not the case because if there was they would not have presented to our service in the first place.

Aiv PUGLIELLI: Thank you. That is my time.

The CHAIR: Thanks very much. I will now hand it over to Mr Batchelor.

Ryan BATCHELOR: Thanks very much. I will be pretty quick this afternoon. Mr Payne, you have made some pretty serious allegations of discriminatory practices by community housing organisations. It would assist the committee in understanding those and the veracity of them if you are able to tell us the names of the organisations – not the names of the individuals but the names of the community housing providers – who you are alleging have committed discriminatory practices.

Jackson PAYNE: Well, unfortunately, I am unable to name the specific providers because that would mean implicating potentially the clients involved and the workers who have provided these case studies anonymously. However, if you would like to meet with me personally to discuss these discriminatory practices, I would be more than welcome to do that and so would many members of my organisation.

Ryan BATCHELOR: It is just that the committee needs to understand the veracity of the allegations that you have made. We have mechanisms in place and the protections of parliamentary privilege for that so that you yourself are not liable for any action by virtue of the evidence that you provide to us. I do worry about anonymous allegations being made in a public forum, and if you are unwilling to provide us with further detail, we will have to leave it there. But I think it is incumbent upon those who make serious allegations to be able to back them up, and if you are willing to do that, then I am sure the committee would be willing to receive that information.

Jackson PAYNE: Yes. Not speaking directly to any of the quotations that I used but from my former work in the housing and homelessness sector, I can say that if you would like to explore the discriminatory practices of community housing providers, then you should look towards the biggest community housing providers in the state. For example, Community Housing Limited would be a place that I would ask you to explore. Housing Choices and HousingFirst would be other examples that you might wish to explore also.

Ryan BATCHELOR: What are the particular things that you are alleging those providers have done?

Jackson PAYNE: Again, I am not speaking specifically to these organisations, but I am saying, in aggregate, the experiences of the workers in the sector and indeed from the case studies that I have shared with you – I can read you about a dozen case studies that I have got in front of me right now, but I can read one or two if we do not have time.

Ryan BATCHELOR: I do not think we have got time. But any further information you are able to provide the committee on notice that helps us to actually examine the veracity of the claims and put those claims, where appropriate, to be tested would be helpful so that we are not just left with a series of anonymous case studies.

Jackson PAYNE: Well, it is my understanding that a number of housing organisations have also contributed to this inquiry, and they would be able to bring to your attention specific instances where, on an organisational level, they have encountered these practices. But a good place to start would be to look for the application forms or the submission forms for [Zoom dropout].

Ryan BATCHELOR: Sorry, we are just about out of time. You are the one making the allegations. Anything you can provide the committee to substantiate those allegations would be welcome.

Jackson PAYNE: Yes. I am substantiating those allegations by saying if you need evidence of the discriminatory practices of these organisations, have a look at their forms. If you would like me to send those to you personally or to the inquiry, I am welcome to get a hold of those forms and send them to you.

The CHAIR: If you are happy to send those through, that helps us. We have just finished and we are out of time here, Jackson. I want to thank you for your evidence today. I really appreciate you appearing here. You will be provided with a proof version of the transcript as well. But from us, thanks very much and enjoy the rest of your day. I appreciate it.

Jackson PAYNE: Thank you for your time – I really appreciate you taking the time to hear some of these stories – and for your questions also.

The CHAIR: Thank you.

Witness withdrew.