




Speech By  
**Jessica Pugh**

**MEMBER FOR MOUNT OMMANEY**

---

Record of Proceedings, 12 May 2022

**POLICE SERVICE ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT  
BILL**

 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (12.51 pm): I rise in support of the Police Service Administration and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2021. As the member for Mount Ommaney, I am very lucky because my electorate is just a stone's throw from the Oxley training facility where a lot of the training for protective services officers and police officers takes place. When the new facility in Wacol is fully operational it will be a stone's throw from my electorate. The upshot of that is that I am often invited to graduation ceremonies. I get to see these wonderful men and women graduate. The ages of these people range from as young as 20 to—in the last intake of protective services officers—in their 60s. It is fantastic to see that depth and breadth of experience coming into those roles. This speaks volumes for the people coming into these protective services officer and police officer roles.

At the most recent ceremony I sat listening to some of the newly engaged officers talking about why they were doing the job. One of them was from a Vietnamese background. He said that he became a protective services officer because he knows that having a second language is important and he is going to be able to better engage with the community. That was lovely to hear.

This bill is about ensuring clarity and consistency in these roles. While it may seem straightforward to introduce such changes, it is crucial that this is done properly so there is no ambiguity and the public and those specifically concerned—the police and protective services officers—clearly understand the respective roles. This necessitates discussing a number of specific areas, including: the amalgamation of roles; the penalties for impersonating a protective security officer; the safeguards in this bill; the repealed sections of previous acts; the powers that will be held by protective services officers; and the changes specifically confined to the Department of Environment and Science and more.

As other members have noted in their contributions, human rights are significant when discussing this bill as it is crucial that the security of persons employed within or attending state buildings or state facilities is maintained. Members of this House may or may not be aware that protective services officers work in facilities right across Queensland—facilities such as the one at Wellcamp. I understand that the parliament's security officers are employed by a different organisation. People who work in these state facilities deserve protection. That is why we have these very important roles.

I am sure we are all well aware that we live in troubling times internationally—we have war in Europe and increasing threats of terrorism—and in the last few years we have seen public figures such as politicians, police and security officers threatened. These people are in front-facing roles. I know that members of this House are out and about in their communities. In this role we pride ourselves on being out and about in our communities and engaging with our community. Unfortunately, in other countries it is quite dangerous for people to do that. People in public-facing roles need an additional layer of protection. Whether a threat is significant or credible or even if we are not sure whether the threat is

real or has been verified, the means to protect against that threat need to be in place pre-emptively. This means that our public buildings need to be afforded extra security. One way we can do that is through this bill.

Police, rightly so, are much admired and respected through this state for their diligence and selfless commitment to the community. I have spoken many times in this House about my fantastic local officers. I put on the record in this House that they do a wonderful in my community. I know that they take their job of serving and protecting against all threats incredibly seriously. Given my role, my local police got in contact with me to do an audit of my home. I am sure many members can access this service. That is part of the service they offer when it comes to protecting people in front-facing roles in our community.

Protective security officers are employed to ensure the security of not only the buildings in which they are employed but also the people working in those buildings and those who seek to enter those buildings to meet with those working in those buildings. In Queensland we already have sensible measures in place such as: screening of a person entering a public building; inspecting vehicles and their contents; seizing any questionable goods or materials; directing a person to leave the area if necessary; and removing a person who is deemed to be a threat or fails to heed directions. While there are already significant powers available to the police and protective security officers, this bill strengthens those powers.

I have heard other members mention they are concerned that this may impinge upon people's liberties. This is not Big Brother attempting to erode the rights of individuals. It is simply guaranteeing and codifying, as much as humanly possible, that everyone remains safe and comfortable in their workplace—be they doctors, nurses, politicians—and they are able to complete their roles unimpeded.

Standardised powers for protective services officers, avoiding confusion between their roles and complementing the work being done by our police officers are all facets of this bill. It seems to me that arguing against this bill, which seeks to clarify those particular roles, would be nonsensical. We need to make sure that everyone is crystal clear when it comes to their roles and responsibilities. That is why we see different training modules carried out by our protective services officers and police officers. There are different training modules that are run.

When I was at the graduation ceremony representing the Minister for Police just a few weeks ago it was great to see young people coming through.

**Mr Ryan** interjected.

**Ms PUGH:** Probably a little bit too young for the police; maybe in the future. We also had some older people coming through—people who were in their 60s. We had a spread of ages.

**Mr Boothman** interjected.

**Ms PUGH:** I said older, member for Theodore. They were older than 21. Sixty is older than 21; do the maths. It was great to see that spread of ages. It is providing a fantastic career opportunity for Queenslanders who want to step up and protect our community throughout those facilities.