



Speech by

Barbara Stone

MEMBER FOR SPRINGWOOD

Hansard Wednesday, 14 March 2007

SECURITY PROVIDERS AMENDMENT BILL

Ms STONE (Springwood—ALP) (4.26 pm): I am very pleased to rise to speak in the debate on the Security Providers Amendment Bill which is before the House. I have spoken many times about the Liquor Industry Action Group, Logan Corridor, of which I am member. I just heard the member for Woodridge speak of her involvement in this group. Also included in that membership are security providers and representatives of the security industry.

One of my roles in that organisation is to bring relevant legislation to the attention of members. The LIAG Logan Corridor believe it is very important to their membership to be aware of any proposed legislation affecting the liquor industry or other stakeholders in their group. They encourage submissions on legislation and they encourage debate. I am very pleased that I received ideas, views and feedback on this legislation and on various other issues that are important to them and the liquor industry. During my speech I look forward to putting forward their views on this bill that they have given me and that they have provided during the consultation process.

In Australia we have a large number of private security personnel and they perform a wide range of duties. This number is continuing to grow. What I often hear from security providers is that they are concerned that their industry is much maligned because of those people who are not operating in a professional manner. They welcome regulation to ensure a high-quality service is performed in the sector.

This bill addresses some of the concerns they have raised with me regarding probity checks and training standards. In terms of probity checks, the department will now liaise more closely with Queensland Police with regard to unrecorded convictions and other background information. The unrecorded convictions will be limited to offences serious enough to be currently prescribed under the act as 'disqualify offence' such as theft, assault, burglary and drug offences. This bill will strengthen probity checks to ensure only appropriate people are working in the industry.

While I will probably concentrate a lot on the liquor industry security providers I know that there are so many other duties that security personnel perform. I have some figures on employment in the industry. Security officers, including those who protect public events—more recently we have seen an increase in the number of security officers at parties—represent 69 per cent of the industry while licensed premises crowd controllers are roughly 20 per cent of the industry. So, as we can see, the majority of the jobs are in those two areas.

Those at unlicensed premises, such as our shopping centres, warehouses, airports and other critical public infrastructure, and our armed guards also make up another large group in the industry. Looking at the range of duties we can see that it is very important that our security personnel are trustworthy and appropriate persons to protect not only people but also property. It should also be noted that the bill will now address the wide range of occupations that are now involved in the security industry. The bill will expand the licence categories to ensure that further industry sectors are covered including patrol dog handlers, in-house security officers, security advisers and security equipment installers.

Training of security officers has also been a topic of debate in the industry, and training proposals in this bill will ensure that applicants will need to first pass strict criminal history and character probity checks and will also ensure that professional development is undertaken in order to keep licensees' skills up to

date, particularly with regard to behaviour and situation management. The training regime will be industry based with practical training, and I know that that is something that the industry certainly agrees with.

Parents have raised concerns when their sons and daughters attend nightclubs, and that certainly has been raised with me in my electorate. Parents want to know that security personnel at these clubs are professional, well trained and the appropriate person for the job. They want to know that they are not inciting bad behaviour, nor are they rough handling patrons who could be their son or daughter. They also want to know that they are appropriately trained to handle situations that can arise in pubs and clubs. This bill will assist in addressing their concerns.

As I stated before, members of the LIAG in the Logan corridor give me a lot of feedback on many topics, and they have done so with this bill. I am always pleased to pass on to the minister any feedback they give me. Some security providers have given me comments, and I want to inform the House of what they had to say. One member of that group said—

The good stuff will be in the regulations which of course will follow after the bill is passed. I am very pro further regulation of the Industry to eradicate unscrupulous operators. We spent much time and effort at the time the Government was taking submissions and feel we have put in our 10 cents. This has been reflected in the bill. I look forward to the bill being passed.

I was very pleased to hear that. Members also suggested that I take a look at a regulatory impact statement, *Harmonisation of private security industry regulation: a regulation impact statement*, which was written in response to the COAG request for states to review their acts. What stood out in that report was the request for a national approach and for consistency of standards throughout the states in the security industry. I also note the concerns raised about the probity checks and the training, but I do want to acknowledge that this bill does go a long way to addressing those concerns. I want to thank the LIAG in the Logan corridor for participating in the consultation process on this bill and for providing me with feedback on it. I commend the bill to the House.