JUSTICE, INTEGRITY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

Members present:
Mr MA Hunt MP—Chair
Mr MC Berkman MP
Mr RD Field MP
Ms ND Marr MP
Ms MAJ Scanlon MP
Mr CG Whiting MP

Staff present:
Ms M Westcott—Committee Secretary
Ms E Lewis—Assistant Committee Secretary

PUBLIC BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE TRUSTS BILL 2025

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Monday, 3 March 2025

Brisbane

MONDAY, 3 MARCH 2025

The committee met at 2.00 pm.

CHAIR: Good afternoon. I declare open this public briefing for the committee's inquiry into the Trusts Bill 2025. My name is Marty Hunt. I am the member for Nicklin and chair of the committee. I would like to respectfully acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet today. With me here today are: Chris Whiting MP, member for Bancroft and acting deputy chair, who is substituting for Peter Russo MP, member for Toohey; Russell Field MP, member for Capalaba; Natalie Marr MP, member for Thuringowa; Michael Berkman MP, member for Maiwar; and Meaghan Scanlon MP, member for Gaven, who is substituting for Melissa McMahon MP, member for Macalister.

This briefing is a proceeding of the Queensland parliament and is subject to the parliament's standing rules and orders. Only the committee and invited witnesses may participate in the proceedings. Witnesses are not required to give evidence under oath or affirmation, but I remind witnesses that intentionally misleading the committee is a serious offence. I also remind members of the public that they may be excluded from the briefing at the discretion of the committee.

These proceedings are being recorded and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Media may be present and are subject to the committee's media rules and the chair's direction at all times. You may have filmed or photographed during the proceedings and images may also appear on the parliament's website or social media pages. I remind members that representatives from the department can provide factual and technical information, but the defence of government policy rests with the responsible minister. Everyone, please remember to press your microphones on when you start speaking and off when you are finished. Please turn mobile phones off or to silent mode.

KRAA, Mr Leighton, Director, Strategic Policy and Legislation, Justice Policy and Reform, Department of Justice

RIVERA, Mr Riccardo, Principal Legal Officer, Strategic Policy and Legislation, Justice Policy and Reform, Department of Justice

ROBERTSON, Mrs Leanne, Assistant Director-General, Strategic Policy and Legislation, Justice Policy and Reform, Department of Justice

CHAIR: I invite you to make an opening statement before we start our questions.

Mrs Robertson: Thank you, Chair, and thank you for the opportunity to brief the committee about the Trusts Bill 2025. I, too, would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging. I would particularly like to extend this respect to the elders and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who are joining us here today either in the room or remotely.

I will provide a bit of background to this bill. In 2012 and 2013, the Queensland Law Reform Commission, the QLRC, conducted a comprehensive review of the Trusts Act 1973. It produced a discussion paper, an interim report and a final report, which recommended replacing that act with new legislation drafted in accordance with the QLRC recommendations to modernise, clarify and update trust law in Queensland. The department undertook significant consultation during the drafting of the bill to give effect to the QLRC recommendations. This included extensive public and targeted consultation with key government and non-government stakeholders across a range of sectors on discussion papers and draft legislation. In May 2024, the Trusts Bill 2024 was introduced into the Legislative Assembly. That bill lapsed when the 57th Parliament was dissolved. I will refer to that bill as the 'lapsed bill'.

In order to give effect to the QLRC recommendations and ensure the results of consultation on these important trust law provisions were preserved, the bill was drafted to align with the lapsed bill; however, there are several important variations to the lapsed bill which respond to the stakeholder feedback provided to the former Housing, Big Build and Manufacturing Committee's inquiry into the lapsed bill. I will first give an overview of some of the key features of the bill and then I will highlight several differences between the bill and the lapsed bill.

The bill will replace the current Trusts Act 1973 with a new act drafted in line with modern practice and using plain English. Unlike the current act, the bill does not attempt to codify the law of trust but instead supplements the general law. It facilitates the efficient administration of trusts by conferring powers on trustees that might otherwise be lacking under the trust instrument and by ensuring the court has appropriately wide powers to supervise the administration of trusts. The bill repeals provisions of the act that are now obsolete, are no longer appropriate in modern trust legislation or are no longer needed in light of new provisions in the bill itself.

The bill deals with the following key areas: restrictions on the appointment of trustees and related matters; the appointment, discharge and removal of trustees and the devolution of trusts; custodian trustees; trustees' duties; investments; trustees' general powers; using trust property to provide for the maintenance, education and advancement of beneficiaries; indemnities and protection of trustees and other persons; the remuneration of trustees; court powers in relation to trusts; dealing with charitable trusts; gifts by particular trustees to charity-like government entities or other entities; statutory trustees; and other miscellaneous issues such as transitional and validation provisions and consequential amendments to other acts, which often happens with a new act.

I will now turn to the differences between the lapsed bill and this bill. As noted by the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity during the introductory speech for the bill, there are several key differences between the provisions in this bill and the provisions of the lapsed bill. Turning to the issue of persons who cannot be trustee, clause 13(5) of this bill clarifies that restrictions which prevent particular people from being appointed as a trustee—including children, an individual who is insolvent under administration and a corporation that is insolvent—do not limit a court's power to declare that those persons hold property as a trustee. This ensures a court's power to declare that property is held under a remedial, constructive or resulting trust is not affected and responds to recommendation 2 of the former committee's report which, in turn, addresses an issue raised by the Society of Trust and Estate Practitioners in Queensland, STEP, with the former committee in relation to the lapsed bill.

Turning to the issue of renunciation of other trusts, part 3, division 8 of this bill deals with a person's renunciation or failure to apply for probate of a will. Clause 44 provides that a person's renunciation of probate of the will, or failure to apply for probate of the will after being properly cited or summoned to apply, does not affect any express trust established under the will itself. This ensures a disclaimer of the bare trust that is the estate by renunciation or failure to apply for probate does not automatically result in renunciation of a further testamentary trust that is established at the conclusion of the estate administration when the bare estate ends. This responds to an issue that was raised by the Queensland Law Society with the former committee in relation to the lapsed bill. I note that the QLS in its submission to this committee has raised some additional drafting changes and has suggested these to clarify that a person can renounce both probate and any express trusts in one single document. As outlined in the department's response to submissions to the committee, the department will give further consideration to that particular submission.

I turn to the issue of trust property when the last continuing trustee has incapacity. The bill does not include provisions from the lapsed bill that would vest trust property in the Public Trustee of Queensland in the event that an administrator is appointed for all financial matters for the last continuing trustee of a trust, or if particular courts or tribunals decided that the last continuing trustee for a trust has impaired capacity for all financial matters or for administering the trust. The provisions in the lapsed bill were based on similar provisions in the current act that provide for trust property to automatically vest in the Public Trustee if the last continuing trustee has died. These provisions are intended to prevent a situation arising where there is no trustee capable of administering the trust. However, as set out in the former committee's report, the Public Trustee submitted that it was not clear what should occur if the person with impaired capacity regains capacity to act as a trustee. The lapsed bill did not address the fact that impaired capacity may be temporary and did not provide a mechanism to revest the trust property in the trustee if the incapacity were only temporary. Other issues, such as whether the last continuing trustee's powers would be suspended for the period of the incapacity and how the trustee might be discharged if replaced, were also raised.

Ultimately, as set out in the former committee's report, the Public Trustee stated that it would prefer not to be involved unnecessarily in the private affairs of Queenslanders, and the government has made the decision not to include the provisions in the bill. The result of not including the provisions in this bill is that the current law will continue to apply. That is, if the last continuing trustee for the trust has impaired capacity for administering the trust, an application to the court will be required to appoint a replacement trustee unless there is a mechanism under the trust instrument for the appointment of a

new trustee or clause 22 of the bill can be utilised. That clause allows an administrator, or an attorney for a last continuing trustee with impaired capacity, to appoint a replacement trustee in particular limited circumstances.

I will now speak to an amendment to deal with concerns raised by the United Grand Lodge of Queensland. The bill ensures consequential amendments to the United Grand Lodge of Antient Free and Accepted Masons of Queensland Trustees Act 1942 do not change the requirement for the Board of Benevolence to obtain Grand Lodge approval prior to making particular investments. This responds to a submission by the United Grand Lodge of Queensland to the former committee. I note that the United Grand Lodge has provided a submission to this committee supporting the drafting of the bill.

I turn now to the issue of ancillary funds. The bill responds to an issue raised by the Queensland Law Society in submissions to the former committee about provisions that ensure ancillary funds can distribute money, property or benefits to deductible gift recipients, known as DGRs, without compromising their charitable status under state law. As noted in the Attorney-General's introductory speech—

… changes to Commonwealth charities and taxation law in both 2013 and 2021 have necessitated changes to how the current Trusts Act deals with ancillary funds.

To be consistent with these changes to Commonwealth law, the bill does two things in relation to ancillary funds. Firstly, the requirement for a trustee to make a declaration to opt in to make distributions to DGRs where there is not an express power in the trust instrument has been removed, given that this is no longer required under Commonwealth law. Secondly, the bill clarifies that any distributions from ancillary funds to charity-like government entities will be deemed to be distributions for a charitable purpose so that the tax-exempt status of the donor is preserved.

Government has noted the former submissions of the Queensland Law Society that the bill should preserve the position of certain ancillary funds under Commonwealth law to make distributions to non-charitable DGRs as permitted by the trust deeds. Therefore, the bill also includes a regulation-making power to ensure certain ancillary funds can continue to distribute to certain DGRs under Commonwealth charities and taxation law. Those additional DGRs are not currently captured by paragraph (a) of the definition of 'eligible recipient' in the bill. Those additional DGRs can be prescribed under paragraph (b) of the definition of 'eligible entity' and brought within the scope of the provision, if needed, to ensure consistency with Commonwealth law.

I note that the Queensland Law Society has submitted to the committee that that process—that is, the regulation—is complicated and may raise some practical issues. As outlined in the department's response to the submissions, the department will consider those issues identified; however it is considered that it is necessary to provide a mechanism that can capture additional DGRs as eligible recipients if needed while still ensuring consistency with Commonwealth law. Again, I thank you for the opportunity to brief the committee on the bill. My colleagues and I are happy to take questions.

CHAIR: Thank you for appearing today. As the Attorney-General made clear in her speech to parliament, it is not the government's intention to redo a lot of the work that has been done in this space. Given the timeline of one week, it was the intention to deal with mainly the changes as outlined by you. I want to get my head around clause 44, because the Law Society have made some further submissions around that. In your opening address you said that if somebody renounces the executor part it does not affect the trustee portion of that. From their submission to us, I thought it did. Can you unpack that a bit better for us in terms of what the Queensland Law Society is submitting is the problem with it and how it has been addressed? Perhaps you could give an example to help us, such as 'person A and person B', 'Mum and Dad' and that sort of thing so we can get our heads around the effects of this legislation.

Mr Rivera: I am happy to run you through that. I will start by going through what clause 44 does. Clause 44 of the bill applies if a person is appointed as both executor and trustee of a will and then that person renounces the probate of the will or fails to apply for the will. Clause 44(2) provides that the renunciation or failure to apply is taken to be a disclaimer by the person of the will. In response to some submissions made by the Queensland Law Society in the lapsed bill, there was a change added where a new subsection was added. Clause 44(3) was inserted to clarify that a disclaimer in these circumstances does not affect any express trust established under the will. This means that a person's disclaimer of probate will not automatically result in the renunciation of that further testamentary trust that is established at the conclusion of the estate administration. It keeps those two things separate. As I said, that responds to their submission on the lapsed bill.

My understanding of what the QLS has said in its submission to this bill is that drafting could be clearer. They suggest that that additional subsection should be amended to state that subsection (2) of clause 44 is not taken to be a disclaimer of any separate testamentary trust established under the will unless specifically stated in the renunciation or citation. My understanding is that they want to ensure that, unless the person is intending to renounce both the executorship and being a trustee, if they just fail to apply for probate that only renounces probate and then they have to specifically renounce being a trustee. They want to change that so that it is able to be done in one document—so it is the opposite—whereas before they were saying that if you disclaim the will you disclaim everything, and we have said if you just disclaim the will you do not necessarily disclaim everything. My understanding of what the QLS wants is to say that when you just disclaim the will, unless you want to you do not disclaim everything. It would just be allowing one single document to disclaim both, being the executor and the trustee.

As we said in the response to that submission, it is something that we will look at and consider from a drafting perspective. There does not seem to be anything in that clause that would prevent a single document from doing both of those things. For administrative purposes or for ease of doing something, if a person wanted to disclaim both of those things in a single document, it seems that is a reasonable type of outcome. We will consider whether the drafting would restrict that and whether there may need to be changes to the wording to ensure that outcome can be obtained.

CHAIR: They are really both aiming for the same outcome, that flexibility.

Mrs Robertson: I think that is fair to say. It is just a question of whether, as drafted, we have covered off or not—

CHAIR: I read that and heard your submission and I thought, 'What were they complaining about?,' but now I understand that they want it to be specific. It is complex. I think we are very close to where we need to be in terms of what they were submitting on.

Mr Rivera: I think we want to achieve the same thing as them. We do not want to cause somebody to go through an administrative burden and do things two separate ways when they can do it one way. We are just looking at whether what we have in the bill now has the effect that they said it has.

Ms SCANLON: Thank you to the department for the considerable amount of work that has been put into both the lapsed bill and the bill before the House. Obviously, this is intended to try to improve the law. I want to ask a question specifically around the removal of a section that was in the original bill. The original bill allowed trust property to be vested in the Public Trustee if the last continuing trustee had an impaired capacity for administering the trust. There have been some concerns raised by the Public Advocate this morning and the Queensland Law Society around that trust being unprotected for a period of time and family members and beneficiaries having to spend money and go to court because of the removal of that provision. Can you talk through the reasons the department removed that? I note that the Public Trustee had also put in some submissions, so it is a balancing act. I am keen to make sure we understand why the bill is the way it is, because we are keen to be constructive.

Mr Rivera: I am happy to answer that question. The point to make first off is that by not including that clause in this bill the status quo is being maintained. The lapsed bill proposed to change something and this bill is not changing it. The status quo is going to remain. That is, if there is a trust and the last trustee for that trust loses capacity and no longer has capacity to administer the trust then an application to the court will be necessary to replace that trustee. While that may be a burden on the beneficiaries of the trust, that is the effect of the current law at the moment. The lapsed bill had provisions in there that said that when you have this situation—the last continuing trustee and they lose capacity—the property would automatically vest in the Public Trustee and that would mean the Public Trustee could deal with that property if needed. Those provisions were based on some other provisions—they are in the current act and are retained in the bill—about when the last continuing trustee dies. In that situation the property vests in the Public Trustee and the personal representative has some powers to appoint a replacement trustee.

As was noted by the Public Trustee in their submission to the previous committee, losing capacity and death are different. One of the issues they raised was: what happens if capacity returns to that trustee? When we were developing the policy on this bill and on that provision, we looked at that and what would happen. This is my understanding about what might happen in practice. Say you have a person who loses capacity and they have an administrator appointed for all financial matters. What might happen down the road when they get capacity back is they get a limited type of financial capacity back. So instead of having an attorney for all financial matters, they have a sort of day-to-day

spending account and they can pay for their out-of-pocket expenses that way. However, in terms of their major expenses—where they live, medical expenses and those types of things—they may not have capacity to administer those and those may still be under administration.

The question was: if we had that provision in the bill and the property vested in the Public Trustee, at what point does it divest from the Public Trustee and back in that last trustee? If they have limited capacity, is that enough and how would you determine that? Do you say, 'Okay, they don't have a financial administrator for all financial matters anymore and they have some limited capacity'? Again, is that enough and do you start running into tests? How do we define if somebody has capacity, and what if capacity comes and goes? Are you vesting and divesting repeatedly? That could create some uncertainty for people dealing with the trust or with the property.

In any type of legislative reform it is important that the solution is not worse than the problem that is trying to be solved. As we started really digging into how you would divest the property, what it would mean and issues of suspending the trustee's powers—because until the trustee is replaced they are still the trustee. So you might have the Public Trustee out here wanting to deal with the property, but they technically need the consent of that trustee, who does not have capacity to give consent. So can the Public Trustee deal with that property on their own? It would mean suspending those powers, and then how do you put them back in order to suspend it for a little while and then they come back? All of these types of things create what seem like a lot of administrative hurdles and a lot of complex drafting to try to solve that problem and it seemed that the solution was becoming more of an issue than the problem it was trying to solve.

Ms MARR: That was my question as well. You have explained that very well. From what I understand, when we say it was removed from the bill it was removed from the lapsed bill?

Mr Rivera: It was not included in this bill.

Ms MARR: The other question they had on that was that it was causing a delay of time. By going back to the status quo, that delay of time is no longer an issue because we have removed that from this bill this time; is that correct?

Mr Rivera: I am not familiar with comments on the delay of time, but, if it was a problem from having those provisions in the bill, because they are no longer in the bill then that problem would be gone. As I said, it is a leaving of the status quo in effect.

Ms MARR: You have answered that well. Thank you.

Mr WHITING: I have a quick question on the issue of dealing with proposed part 13. It has been suggested that the simplest solution is to adopt section 53 from the Western Australian act instead of what is being proposed here. I think what you are proposing here are some additional regulations to sort out that issue. Wouldn't it be more efficient or better to cleanly adopt that part of the Western Australian bill?

Mr Kraa: One thing I would note at the outset is that the provisions in this bill around ancillary funds were modelled on those provisions in the Western Australian act. They were carefully considered and obviously adapted in a form of words for this bill and for a Queensland context, but that was the model that was used. One difference is a specific subsection in section 53 of the Western Australian act. On its face it is not entirely clear—and it was not entirely clear through the drafting process—what that specific provision would entail. QLS have made submissions that it preserved certain powers and statuses into the future. However, in formulating a bill for Queensland's context it was important that we were ensuring consistency with Commonwealth requirements and not providing powers that are broader than what is allowed under the Commonwealth law.

Ultimately, what has been adopted in this bill is a regulation-making power so that if it is identified there are certain funds or DGRs that are not already captured in these provisions they could be prescribed and brought into scope. It is not the automatic effect which QLS have submitted is the effect of that Western Australian provision, but it is a mechanism that ensures the bill does not result in a situation that automatically goes beyond what is allowed under Commonwealth law but still allows for a mechanism to bring people into the provisions if it is necessary.

Mr WHITING: You are saying there is a potential conflict with Commonwealth law that sits with the Western Australian act?

Mr Kraa: I would not go as far to say that. It is more the effect of that subsection than the Western Australian legislation achieves. It is rather technical, but there are references to express powers and powers that come from this declaration to opt in. There is a provision as well that says: if you use one of these prescribed powers, what effect does that have on the entity in terms of it retaining its status as a charitable trust? The Western Australian provision in question links back to the status. One

reading, for example, might be that simply having one of these powers that is referred to does not affect your status as a charitable trust going into the future. That might be one reading compared to saying the trustees hold the power to do something going into the future. Ultimately, what I am saying is not that Western Australia may be inconsistent; it is that it was not clear on its face what the intent of that Western Australian drafting was. The approach taken in this bill is to have a clear mechanism through a regulation power, so it is clear what powers or entities could be brought within scope if necessary.

CHAIR: Member for Capalaba, do you have a question?

Mr FIELD: No further questions at the moment. Most of them have been answered, but give me a couple of minutes and I will have something for you. Thank you.

CHAIR: There was a submission from the Freemasons, and that issue was addressed in the lapsed bill. I did read through it and it was a little bit complex. Can you unpack that and give us an example of what the mischief was and how it has been overcome? That would be helpful.

Mr Rivera: Under the current Trusts Act there is what is called a prescribed investment. It is a bit of a remnant historically, because it used to be that the types of things trustees could invest in in a trust were an enumerated list of things like bank securities and different types of really stable investments. Back in 1999 the Trusts Act was amended and those investment powers were changed quite significantly. They put in what is basically known as the 'prudent person' rule, so a trustee can invest in something that a prudent person would invest in, but it still had this concept of authorised investments.

There were a couple of different pieces of legislation that referred to that definition. One was the Retirement Villages Act and another was the Freemasons act—that is, the 1943 trustees act. In the case of the Freemasons act, it said that their Board of Benevolence cannot invest outside of that range of what is a prescribed investment without getting Grand Lodge approval. In the lapsed bill, because that idea of prescribed investment was not retained, they replaced that whole section and just put, 'The Board of Benevolence can invest in these things.' The submission from the Grand Lodge was that this actually changes the constitutional arrangements between the Board of Benevolence and the Grand Lodge. While that is one view, the issue is that the power of investment under that act is something that is maybe internal to those branches of that organisation.

In the bill that is before you today, the concept of authorised investment has been effectively retained. The section of the Freemasons act still says that the Board of Benevolence cannot invest outside of a certain range without Grand Lodge approval. It uses a new term of, I think, 'prescribed investment' and then details what that is. For the internal relationship between the board and the Grand Lodge it still says, 'Here's this box where you can invest. Anything outside of that box you need Grand Lodge approval for.' The Grand Lodge not only consulted with them in drafting that; they expressed that that resolved their concern. They wanted to make sure the legislation was not changing the relationship between the arms of their organisation internally.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Ms SCANLON: In terms of the ancillary funds, I understand there will be a regulation change coming. Do you have a timeframe for when that will be completed?

Mr Kraa: I probably cannot advise a specific timeframe. Certainly, if a regulation were needed, we would be consulting with key stakeholders such as the QLS and ensuring that was in place and effective, if necessary, before the bill commences.

Ms SCANLON: Just to loop back on the changes from the lapsed bill to the current bill around the vesting of trust property in the Public Trustee, I acknowledge the point made that we are effectively just going back to what is the status quo currently. Obviously, this came from somewhere originally. Are there particular cases that identified problems within the system? Do you know the background around why that particular provision was included in the first bill and why it is being removed and how you are dealing with that in this bill?

Mr Rivera: That particular recommendation to vest in the Public Trustee was not part of the QLRC's recommendation, so it was not in their report, in their review. When you look at the tenor of their recommendations, a lot of them are about administrative savings and court savings. One of the provisions gives jurisdiction to the District Court for matters that are within that limit, because previously these trusts would have to apply to the Supreme Court, so it is all about bringing some efficiencies, bringing a bit more modernisation and streamlining, simplifying and updating these types of provisions.

Given there was an existing provision about what happens when a last remaining trustee dies, it seems kind of a natural step and it seems to be in line with the recommendations from the QLRC. It fits the tenor of those recommendations, if you will. As I said, when you have a quote from the Public

Trustee saying, 'There are some problems here. We think they need to be addressed. We'd prefer not to be unnecessarily involved in the private affairs of Queenslanders,' it takes some looking at and what exactly are they saying? They do not want to put words in their mouth. They never said, 'We don't want these provisions,' but they said, 'Here are some issues with the provisions.' As I outlined earlier, once we started digging into those issues and really trying to pull them back and look at how we could build solutions, how we could respond to them and what we would need to do, it just came to be complex and we saw that the simpler approach is to retain those provisions.

Also, the provisions in clause 22 would allow an attorney or an administrator for a person who is the last remaining trustee to appoint a replacement trustee in those particular limited circumstances in which that clause applies. It was pointed out by the Attorney-General in her introductory speech that when the Property Law Act 2023 commences the perpetuity period, which is basically how long trusts or property can be held on trust, is changing from 80 years to 125 years. The fact is that, as people live longer and as that period is longer, there will be more situations where there are people who are losing capacity, so there needs to be some provisions to deal with that. Clause 22 does that and, because it only applies to trusts that are settled after the commencement of the act, it gives the person who is settling the trust—the settlor—the opportunity to really consider this question as to what they want to happen if they lose capacity or how they want the trustees losing capacity to be dealt with, so the settlor would consider that. The trustee then can consider that as well if they are setting up a power of attorney and deciding that they are wanting to give those powers to somebody and they really need to think about those questions. Capacity and loss of capacity is a conversation not just in the trusts space but across society more generally. It needs to be had more openly because it is going to become more common.

Mr FIELD: As I said, I do not have a trust myself but understand the concept of it. Say you have two parents: one of them is deceased and the other one is left to administer whatever the will is but they then pass away. It goes to the Public Trustee; is that right?

Mr Rivera: That would depend, because there may be a mechanism under the trust instrument to appoint a replacement trustee and then it would vest in that replacement trustee. If that parent were the last trustee and they passed away, that property would vest in the Public Trustee.

Mr FIELD: How do the beneficiaries know or are made aware that the Public Trustee will be working in their best interests for those recipients?

Mr Rivera: Sorry, but is the question: how would they become aware that the property had vested in the Public Trustee, or how would they know that the Public Trustee was acting in their best interests?

Mr FIELD: Yes, the latter.

Mr Rivera: The Public Trustee is obviously subject to obligations under the Public Trustee Act and there would be a number of things that would be relevant there. That is really outside of the scope of the bill as to what obligations would exist on the Public Trustee once trust property is vested in them.

Mr FIELD: Okay; no problem. Thanks.

CHAIR: Are there any further questions?

Ms MARR: No, but thank you very much for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you for that comprehensive briefing and in particular addressing the changes. As I said, the Attorney-General was quite clear in her introductory speech that the committee was not required to do a whole heap of work that had already been done and that we just address the changes, and you have done so very well. Thank you for clearing all of that up. As I said, people often do not put their mind to this sort of legislation until they are thrust into it and it is important work that you have done and we appreciate it very much. That concludes the public briefing. Thank you to everyone who has participated today. Thank you to our Hansard reporters. A transcript of these proceedings will be available on the committee's webpage in due course. I do not believe any questions were taken on notice, so I declare this public briefing closed.

The committee adjourned at 2.39 pm.