

Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026

Submission No: 1569

Submission By: Queensland Chinese Forum

From:

President

Queensland Chinese Forum (QCF)

The Queensland Chinese Forum (QCF) makes this submission in support of the proposed reforms contained in the Transport Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (Qld) concerning e-mobility devices, including e-bikes, personal mobility devices (PMDs), and prohibited bikes.

QCF supports these reforms because they respond to genuine community concerns about public safety, unlawful use of e-mobility devices, the need for stronger enforcement, and the importance of improving accountability for both riders and providers.

Introduction

These reforms are necessary, timely, and strongly justified. They respond to growing community concern about the increasing misuse of e-mobility devices in Queensland, particularly in public spaces shared by pedestrians, families, school children, elderly persons, and motorists.

The reality in the community is that unsafe and unlawful use of these devices is no longer occasional or isolated. It is visible on a daily basis. Many members of the public regularly witness riders ignoring road rules, travelling at unsafe speeds, riding without helmets, carrying passengers, using unlawful modified bikes, and behaving in a way that shows little regard for the safety of others. Yet despite how common this behaviour has become, there is a widespread perception that such conduct is often not taken seriously enough and that meaningful enforcement is lacking.

This Bill should therefore be supported not only because it regulates e-mobility devices more clearly, but because it sends an important message about public safety, personal responsibility, and respect for the law.

The reforms are necessary because community safety is being undermined

The first and most important reason these reforms should be legislated is that the current situation has created an unacceptable safety risk to the community.

E-mobility devices are now widely used across Queensland. Used properly, they may provide a convenient and efficient form of transport. However, the growth in their use has also created significant risk where riders are unlicensed, underage, reckless, intoxicated, riding illegally modified devices, or using public spaces as if the road rules do not apply to them.

The community increasingly sees riders travelling at excessive speeds on footpaths, weaving through pedestrians, ignoring crossings and signals, riding on prohibited roads, or operating devices that are clearly more akin to unregistered motorbikes than ordinary bicycles. Many people, especially the elderly, parents with prams, school children, and persons with disability, feel less safe using footpaths and shared paths because of the unpredictability and speed of some riders.

Importantly, this is not merely about technical non-compliance. It is about conduct that creates real danger. A collision involving an e-bike or prohibited bike at speed can cause serious injury. A person walking lawfully on a footpath should not be exposed to that risk because another person chooses convenience, thrill, or disregard over safety and lawful conduct.

For too long, there has been a gap between what the law says and what the community sees happening every day. That gap weakens public confidence in the law. When unlawful riding becomes common and visible, and little appears to happen in response, it creates the impression that the rules do not matter. That is precisely why a stronger and more targeted legislative framework is needed.

Enforcement is critical, without real enforcement, the law will have little practical effect

The second key reason the Bill should be supported is that true police enforcement is essential.

A law without practical enforcement becomes little more than a statement of intention. The community concern is not only that dangerous riding occurs, but that it often occurs openly and repeatedly. Many people see the same kinds of unsafe behaviour every day and reasonably ask: if this conduct is so visible, why does it continue unchecked?

That is why the proposed expansion of police powers and offence regimes is so important. The introduction of fit-for-purpose police powers to seize and dispose of prohibited bikes is particularly significant. If a device is being used unlawfully and poses ongoing risk to the public, the law must give police real power to intervene in a meaningful way. Financial penalties alone will not always deter behaviour, especially where offenders treat fines as unimportant or assume they will not be enforced.

Similarly, the proposed targeted offence regime, higher penalties, extension of hooning and evasion-related offences, and stronger drink-riding laws are all necessary because they reflect the seriousness of the conduct involved. The misuse of e-mobility devices should not be trivialised simply because the vehicle is smaller than a car. If the conduct is dangerous, repeated, reckless, or deliberately unlawful, then the consequences must be serious enough to change behaviour.

True enforcement is important not only for punishment, but for deterrence. Visible enforcement educates the broader public. It signals that public spaces are governed by rules, that safety matters, and that repeated unlawful conduct will not be normalised.

QCF also considers that stronger enforcement has a broader social value. When members of the public repeatedly see unlawful riding occurring in plain sight with little apparent consequence, it undermines respect for the law more generally. It is therefore important that enforcement be real, visible, and consistent.

This is also about rehabilitation, re-education, and youth crime prevention

These reforms are important for another broader reason: this issue is not only about e-bikes. It is also about the rehabilitation and re-education of young people, and the need to address youth offending from multiple angles.

A concerning feature of this issue is that some young riders repeatedly engage in unlawful and risky conduct in full view of the community. When young people are permitted to repeatedly ignore road rules, ignore police directions, misuse unlawful devices, and endanger others without meaningful intervention, this reinforces a broader culture of disrespect for the law. That culture can extend beyond transport behaviour.

Accordingly, the Bill should be seen as part of a wider effort to re-educate youth about legal boundaries, accountability, and consequences. The law must teach young people early that public safety rules are not optional. If a young person learns that they can repeatedly break rules in public with no consequence, that lesson does not remain confined to e-mobility. It can contribute to broader antisocial attitudes and conduct, including youth crime.

This issue therefore should not be viewed narrowly as only a transport problem. It also raises questions about behavioural standards, rehabilitation, and how the community responds

From: [REDACTED]
To: [State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee](#)
Subject: Submission on the Transport Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (Qld)
Date: Wednesday, 8 April 2026 10:02:01 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To:
The Committee Secretary
Queensland Legislative Assembly

Re: Submission in Support of the *Transport Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (Qld)* – E-Mobility Reforms

Date:
8 April 2026

From:
President
Queensland Chinese Forum (QCF)

The Queensland Chinese Forum (QCF) makes this submission in support of the proposed reforms contained in the *Transport Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (Qld)* concerning e-mobility devices, including e-bikes, personal mobility devices (PMDs), and prohibited bikes.

QCF supports these reforms because they respond to genuine community concerns about public safety, unlawful use of e-mobility devices, the need for stronger enforcement, and the importance of improving accountability for both riders and providers.

Introduction

These reforms are necessary, timely, and strongly justified. They respond to growing community concern about the increasing misuse of e-mobility devices in Queensland, particularly in public spaces shared by pedestrians, families, school children, elderly persons, and motorists.

The reality in the community is that unsafe and unlawful use of these devices is no longer occasional or isolated. It is visible on a daily basis. Many members of the public regularly witness riders ignoring road rules, travelling at unsafe speeds, riding without helmets, carrying passengers, using unlawful modified bikes, and behaving in a way that shows little regard for the safety of others. Yet despite how common this behaviour has become, there is a widespread perception that such conduct is often not taken seriously enough and that meaningful enforcement is lacking.

This Bill should therefore be supported not only because it regulates e-mobility devices more clearly, but because it sends an important message about public

safety, personal responsibility, and respect for the law.

The reforms are necessary because community safety is being undermined

The first and most important reason these reforms should be legislated is that the current situation has created an unacceptable safety risk to the community.

E-mobility devices are now widely used across Queensland. Used properly, they may provide a convenient and efficient form of transport. However, the growth in their use has also created significant risk where riders are unlicensed, underage, reckless, intoxicated, riding illegally modified devices, or using public spaces as if the road rules do not apply to them.

The community increasingly sees riders travelling at excessive speeds on footpaths, weaving through pedestrians, ignoring crossings and signals, riding on prohibited roads, or operating devices that are clearly more akin to unregistered motorbikes than ordinary bicycles. Many people, especially the elderly, parents with prams, school children, and persons with disability, feel less safe using footpaths and shared paths because of the unpredictability and speed of some riders.

Importantly, this is not merely about technical non-compliance. It is about conduct that creates real danger. A collision involving an e-bike or prohibited bike at speed can cause serious injury. A person walking lawfully on a footpath should not be exposed to that risk because another person chooses convenience, thrill, or disregard over safety and lawful conduct.

For too long, there has been a gap between what the law says and what the community sees happening every day. That gap weakens public confidence in the law. When unlawful riding becomes common and visible, and little appears to happen in response, it creates the impression that the rules do not matter. That is precisely why a stronger and more targeted legislative framework is needed.

Enforcement is critical, without real enforcement, the law will have little practical effect

The second key reason the Bill should be supported is that true police enforcement is essential.

A law without practical enforcement becomes little more than a statement of intention. The community concern is not only that dangerous riding occurs, but that it often occurs openly and repeatedly. Many people see the same kinds of unsafe behaviour every day and reasonably ask: if this conduct is so visible, why does it continue unchecked?

That is why the proposed expansion of police powers and offence regimes is so important. The introduction of fit-for-purpose police powers to seize and dispose of prohibited bikes is particularly significant. If a device is being used unlawfully and poses ongoing risk to the public, the law must give police real power to intervene

in a meaningful way. Financial penalties alone will not always deter behaviour, especially where offenders treat fines as unimportant or assume they will not be enforced.

Similarly, the proposed targeted offence regime, higher penalties, extension of hooning and evasion-related offences, and stronger drink-riding laws are all necessary because they reflect the seriousness of the conduct involved. The misuse of e-mobility devices should not be trivialised simply because the vehicle is smaller than a car. If the conduct is dangerous, repeated, reckless, or deliberately unlawful, then the consequences must be serious enough to change behaviour.

True enforcement is important not only for punishment, but for deterrence. Visible enforcement educates the broader public. It signals that public spaces are governed by rules, that safety matters, and that repeated unlawful conduct will not be normalised.

QCF also considers that stronger enforcement has a broader social value. When members of the public repeatedly see unlawful riding occurring in plain sight with little apparent consequence, it undermines respect for the law more generally. It is therefore important that enforcement be real, visible, and consistent.

This is also about rehabilitation, re-education, and youth crime prevention

These reforms are important for another broader reason: this issue is not only about e-bikes. It is also about the rehabilitation and re-education of young people, and the need to address youth offending from multiple angles.

A concerning feature of this issue is that some young riders repeatedly engage in unlawful and risky conduct in full view of the community. When young people are permitted to repeatedly ignore road rules, ignore police directions, misuse unlawful devices, and endanger others without meaningful intervention, this reinforces a broader culture of disrespect for the law. That culture can extend beyond transport behaviour.

Accordingly, the Bill should be seen as part of a wider effort to re-educate youth about legal boundaries, accountability, and consequences. The law must teach young people early that public safety rules are not optional. If a young person learns that they can repeatedly break rules in public with no consequence, that lesson does not remain confined to e-mobility. It can contribute to broader antisocial attitudes and conduct, including youth crime.

This issue therefore should not be viewed narrowly as only a transport problem. It also raises questions about behavioural standards, rehabilitation, and how the community responds early to repeated unlawful conduct. A stronger framework helps reinforce that the law applies in public spaces and that disregard for the safety of others will not simply be ignored.

This is why the minimum age requirements, licence requirements, and enforcement of unpaid infringement notices for 16 and 17 year olds are important. These measures reinforce that operating an e-mobility device carries

responsibility. Requiring at least a learner licence standard is especially sensible because it ensures riders have at least basic knowledge of road rules and shared-space responsibilities.

At the same time, responsibility should not be placed only on youth. The explanatory material correctly recognises that adults are also misusing e-mobility devices. That is an important point. The problem is cultural and behavioural, not confined to one age group. Adults who ride unlawfully, drink ride, speed, fail to wear helmets, or use prohibited bikes are equally contributing to danger and poor community norms. The law must therefore set a clear standard for everyone.

Shared responsibility is essential

Another strength of the Bill is that it recognises that safety outcomes require contribution from all parties, not only riders after the fact.

Parental responsibility provisions are justified. If a child under 16 is unlawfully riding an e-bike, PMD or prohibited bike, there should be legal consequences unless the parent can demonstrate lack of knowledge or that reasonable steps were taken to prevent the conduct. This is appropriate because supervision, access to devices, and behavioural guidance often begin at home.

Likewise, shared e-mobility providers should be required to verify that users satisfy age and licensing requirements. Commercial operators who profit from these devices should not be exempt from responsibility for public safety.

Prohibiting the sale of unregistrable motorbikes and unlawful e-mobility devices to children under 16 is also an important preventative measure. It addresses the issue earlier in the chain, rather than waiting until dangerous conduct occurs on the street.

QCF supports the Bill's recognition that improving safety requires a coordinated approach. Riders, parents, providers, retailers, and enforcement authorities all have a role to play. If responsibility is left only with police after incidents occur, the law will not go far enough. Prevention must also be built into the system.

The committee should also consider mandatory third-party insurance for e-mobility devices

In addition to the reforms proposed in the Bill, the legislative committee should also give serious consideration to whether a form of mandatory third-party insurance, similar in principle to Compulsory Third Party (CTP) insurance, should be introduced for certain categories of e-mobility devices, particularly higher-risk devices such as e-bikes, shared e-mobility devices, and any device capable of causing significant injury to pedestrians or other road and path users.

At present, one of the major gaps in the e-mobility framework is that where a rider causes injury to another person, there may be no clear or adequate insurance pathway for the injured person to recover compensation. This is a serious

concern. A pedestrian, cyclist, child, elderly person, or other lawful road user who is injured by a negligent or unlawful e-mobility rider may suffer real physical, psychological, and financial loss, yet may face difficulty obtaining compensation if the rider is uninsured, unidentified, underage, or lacks the financial means to meet a claim.

A further concern arises in relation to shared e-mobility providers, such as e-scooter hire companies. At present, these companies commonly impose policies and app-based terms stating that renters must not engage in certain conduct, such as drink riding, carrying passengers, riding unlawfully, or using the device contrary to road rules. While such conditions may regulate user behaviour, they should not be capable of being used as a practical mechanism to shift insurance responsibility away from the provider and onto the individual rider in a way that leaves innocent third parties exposed. In substance, the provider places the device into public circulation, profits from its use, and benefits commercially from the activity, yet may attempt to avoid responsibility by saying that the rider acted contrary to its policies. That is a loophole which should be resolved.

A person injured by a hire scooter or similar device should not be forced into uncertainty about compensation simply because the rider breached a user agreement or rental condition. Private contractual arrangements between the provider and rider should not displace the public need for a reliable compensation pathway. Any mandatory insurance scheme should therefore be structured so that app-based waivers, policy breaches, or private rental terms cannot defeat or diminish the rights of an innocent injured third party.

That situation is unsatisfactory from a public policy perspective. As the use of e-mobility devices becomes more widespread, the risk of collisions and injury correspondingly increases. If the law permits and regulates the increased use of such devices in public spaces, then it is reasonable for the law to also consider whether an accompanying insurance framework is necessary to protect innocent victims.

This is especially important because many e-mobility devices are used in close proximity to vulnerable members of the public, including pedestrians, children, the elderly, and persons with disability. Unlike many other recreational risks, this is not merely a private activity occurring in isolation. These devices are used on footpaths, shared paths, roads, crossings, and other public places where members of the community have little ability to protect themselves from negligent riders. Where injury occurs in those settings, the law should not leave the innocent victim without a practical avenue for redress.

Further, mandatory insurance would also strengthen the overall regulatory framework by reinforcing the message that operating an e-mobility device is not a casual activity free from legal consequence. It would recognise that these devices, while smaller than cars or motorbikes, can still cause substantial harm and should carry corresponding responsibilities. Insurance reform would therefore complement the Bill's broader objectives of accountability, safety, and lawful use.

It is acknowledged that the exact model would require careful consideration. For

example, the committee may wish to examine whether mandatory insurance should apply to all e-mobility devices, or only higher-powered or higher-risk categories, and whether it should operate through private insurance, registration-linked insurance, shared provider schemes, or some combination of these.

At the very least, shared e-mobility operators should be required to maintain sufficient third-party insurance coverage for injuries caused by users of their fleets, regardless of whether the rider complied with every contractual condition of hire. More broadly, the committee should consider whether Queensland should move toward a compulsory insurance model for privately operated e-mobility devices as the sector grows.

If the legislative framework is to truly respond to community concern, it should not only focus on rider qualifications, offences, and police powers, but also on what happens after harm is caused. Prevention is essential, but compensation and protection for innocent victims are equally important. A mandatory third-party insurance scheme would help close that gap and create a more complete, fair, and responsible safety framework for Queensland.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposed reforms should be legislated because they address a real and growing community problem. The unsafe use of e-mobility devices is affecting public safety, undermining confidence in the law, and contributing to a broader culture in which some youth and adults openly disregard legal rules and the safety of others.

The Bill is justified because it does more than create offences. It establishes clearer standards, improves device definitions, increases accountability, supports education through licensing and age requirements, places responsibility on parents and providers, and gives police the enforcement tools necessary to make the law meaningful in practice. The committee should also consider whether mandatory third-party insurance is needed to ensure that innocent persons injured by e-mobility riders are not left without protection or compensation. Together, these reforms would create a more complete and responsible framework for public safety in Queensland.

Most importantly, strong police enforcement must accompany these reforms. Without visible, practical, and consistent enforcement, dangerous behaviour will continue and the community will rightly feel that the law does not protect them. Enforcement is therefore not an optional extra — it is central to restoring order, promoting rehabilitation and re-education, and ensuring shared public spaces are safe for everyone.

The committee should also address the current loophole whereby shared e-mobility providers may seek to rely on user policy breaches to shift practical insurance responsibility away from themselves, leaving injured third parties in uncertainty.

For those reasons, this Bill is an important and necessary step for Queensland,

and it should be supported.

Yours faithfully,

Queensland Chinese Forum (QCF)

Mr Jason Chua

President

Queensland Chinese Forum

