




Speech By
Corrine McMillan

MEMBER FOR MANSFIELD

Record of Proceedings, 27 August 2025

**DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION
AMENDMENT BILL**

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (8.22 pm): The Queensland Labor opposition remains committed to ending all forms of domestic, family and sexual violence in our state. Domestic and family violence continues to cause deep and lasting harm in our communities. It is pervasive, often hidden and happens far too often. We acknowledge the hard work of the Queensland Police Service, who work day in and day out to keep our communities safe from violence. We have heard from police that they are under increasing pressure when it comes to managing their workload and that responding to domestic and family violence constitutes a significant part of this workload.

The Queensland Labor opposition supports measures that address pressure on our frontline police. We want to ensure they can effectively respond to domestic and family violence. However, any new measures must prioritise, first and foremost, the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors. Reforms must be evidence-based and they must be backed by experts. The LNP promised this. They said that they would listen to the experts. They said that they would be open and transparent. They said that they would put victims first. This bill breaks those promises.

Through consultation, the committee process and the estimates process we heard from the domestic violence sector and victim-survivors that elements of the bill have the potential to risk victim-survivors' safety. At estimates, when asked if the domestic and family violence sector did not support the bill's introduction of PPDs, the director-general responded, 'I understand that is true ...'. This shows the LNP is refusing to listen to the experts, ignoring the domestic and family violence sector and their concerns. We share these concerns. We are concerned this bill will increase the risk of misidentification. We are concerned that this bill will have unintended consequences for victim-survivors due to the removal of court oversight and we, as a Labor opposition, are concerned that this bill will misrepresent data surrounding the victims of domestic and family violence, skewing victim numbers to suit the government's agenda.

I now turn to a number of issues with the bill, firstly PPDs and misidentification. The Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 outlines a framework for police protection directions, PPDs. They are intended to be issued on the spot by police responding to domestic violence incidents and will be in place for 12 months. Unlike a domestic violence order, the issuing of a PPD will not require court oversight. In practice, this will place police officers in the position of making significant legal decisions without judicial input.

The Queensland Police Union called for the introduction of PPDs to address workforce impacts of responding to increased numbers of domestic and family violence incidents, to better manage police workload and to increase police efficiency. The Miles Labor government listened to police and considered progressing reforms to address these issues; however, we included increased safeguards and planned for a trial of police issued directions prior to a statewide commencement. This was to ensure reforms did not result in any unintended consequences that would impact a victim-survivor's

pathway to safety. It put domestic violence victim-survivors' safety at the centre of any reform. Many victim-survivors do not support the bill as currently drafted. I was contacted by a domestic violence stakeholder who shared the voices of victim-survivors of non-fatal strangulation. They said—

We spoke with a number of victim-survivors ... they unanimously opposed the introduction of the framework in its current form ... those women do not feel listened to nor heard.

We agree with the sector that PPDs as currently drafted increase the risk to victim-survivors. The peak organisation QCOSS stated that they strongly oppose PPDs because they are an efficiency measure that does not prioritise the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors. We share the sector's concerns of misidentification of the person most in need of protection. We know that domestic and family violence is incredibly complex and that the individual in most need of protection might not be the one identified, due to the circumstances at the time.

I have heard from the domestic and family violence sector across the state who repeatedly raise concerns surrounding the misidentification of the person most in need of protection. The Queensland Police Union stated that the acceptable level of female respondents in domestic violence cases is between seven and eight per cent. However, recently the opposition uncovered that the current level of respondents who are female is 31.1 per cent in Queensland. For reference, that relates to question on notice No. 490 of 2025. More work needs to be done to reduce misidentification and, unfortunately, this bill will only increase the potential for misidentification to occur and the severity of consequences. QCOSS stated in its submission to the committee—

... PPDs are likely to significantly increase the risk of misidentification occurring, placing some victim-survivors at greater risk and without protection.

We also know that certain communities and vulnerable cohorts are more likely to experience misidentification. For First Nations communities, those with a disability, those afflicted with poor mental health or those from culturally and linguistically diverse communities, the risk of misidentification is already increased. An example we heard from the stakeholders during the public hearing of the committee is that language barriers and visa conditions place refugee and migrant women at increased risk of misidentification. Under the current system, misidentification would be addressed when a PPN progresses to court for consideration of making a domestic violence order. The new PPD framework removes this oversight. If misidentification occurs, the consequences would be solidified as an order becomes permanent for 12 months. The Women's Legal Service raised this during the committee process, saying—

... misidentification often happens due to a lack of information and a need to respond in the moment ... that will be crystallised even more when that response in the moment then becomes a 12-month order.

Under this bill, misidentified victim-survivors will be left without protections that they need, placing them at increased risk of further violence and severe consequences. They may be subject to criminalisation, housing instability and homelessness, loss of employment, custody issues and loss of access to children. They may face social stigma and isolation. The most severe consequence of misidentification is leaving victim-survivors exposed to further violence, and this could be fatal. Almost half of women murdered in domestic violence related homicides were misidentified as the person using violence. Let me repeat: almost half of women murdered in domestic violence related homicides were misidentified as the person using violence. During the committee process, QCOSS shared with the committee—

The consequences of misidentification can be severe and potentially fatal.

They further stated—

Where a person is misidentified, that means they will be left without protection at that incident. They can then become criminalised. They can have their reputation ruined. We know that the consequences for their safety and wellbeing can be severe.

The bill lacks the necessary safeguards against misidentification and has unintended consequences. That is why the Labor opposition will move amendments and I table those amendments, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights for the benefit of the House and all Queenslanders so that all Queenslanders know that safeguards should be in place before moving forward.

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, amendments to be moved by Ms Corrine McMillan [1140](#).

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, explanatory notes to Ms Corrine McMillan's amendments [1141](#).

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Ms Corrine McMillan's amendments [1142](#).

I now turn to the lack of court oversight. Further to the risks of misidentification, we are concerned that this bill may result in a number of unintended consequences because PPDs remove the requirement that a domestic violence matter be heard in court. Stakeholders raised concerns about missed opportunities from the removal of the court's involvement.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Can we have quiet in the chamber. If you want to have a conversation, please take it outside.

Ms McMILLAN: In their submission the Women's Legal Service stated that 'the removal of the court process removes the oversight and additional time and space to identify and address complex issues' and they stated—

... attending court is a way that many victim survivors get support. Many victim-survivors are connected with support services at court that they may not otherwise contact, and receive free legal advice to help them better understand their rights and options.

The Queensland Law Society shared—

... the fact respondents will not come before the court presents additional problems, including the loss of opportunity for the court to link parties with other services, including behaviour change programs.

They also observed that there were significant impacts on victim-survivors with respect to having agency and their views considered when making an order. The Queensland Law Society said that the court process improves this as—

The court can then balance the views and wishes of the aggrieved in considering whether to make an order and with what conditions.

Going to court allows for the view of victim-survivors to be adequately considered. It provides an avenue for victim-survivors to receive support and legal advice so they can fully consider the order that is being made. There are certain provisions associated with court orders. Information sharing exists between the courts and other bodies to provide support and keep victim-survivors safe. Importantly, data is captured by Queensland courts for domestic and family violence orders and breaches. It is critical we have public information surrounding the number of victim-survivors of domestic violence to continue to inform our approach and response to domestic and family violence and for services to understand, adapt and advocate for sufficient resourcing and funding to support victim-survivors and persons who choose to use violence.

Without going to court, PPDs risk opportunities for victim-survivors to access support, for information sharing and for victim-survivors to be counted in reported data. PPDs present an increased risk to victim-survivors' safety. This bill lacks the necessary safeguards against misidentification and has unintended consequences. That is why the Labor opposition will seek to move amendments to address this matter.

I now turn to the review process of PPDs. With the introduction of a 12-month protection direction, the consequences of misidentification will be solidified with the potential for severe repercussions to the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors. While the bill provides methods for a PPD to be revoked or become a DVO through a police review process and a court review process, the onus is on either the aggrieved or the respondent to initiate this process if they believe there was a mistake or the review requires police to become aware of circumstances that could impact the issuing of a PPD.

The severe trauma victim-survivors have faced and the fear of repercussions and further violence are huge barriers for misidentified victim-survivors seeking a review. That is why we will move an amendment to automatically trigger a police review for women identified as persons using violence. Our amendment will provide necessary safeguards to ensure that if misidentification was to happen then it is quickly identified and addressed. Further, we will ensure that the views and advice of experts are considered by requiring all police reviews of PPDs to seek advice from a domestic and family violence specialist. This will provide oversight and enhance the police review process to ensure PPDs and the conditions imposed keep victim-survivors safe.

I now turn to consent. It may be necessary for police to issue a police protection notice against the wishes of the victim-survivor to ensure their safety. However, currently when a matter is heard in court there is the opportunity for a victim-survivor to have their voice heard and reflected within the protection order and the conditions it imposes. There is the opportunity for victim-survivors to obtain legal advice and understand the implications of a protection order. They may have time to consider what conditions might be necessary to ensure their safety and wellbeing and the safety and wellbeing of any children. The current drafting does not require victim-survivors to consent to a PPD. The Queensland Law Society shared why this lack of consent is problematic. They stated—

It is just taking away their right to be heard and their right to have their wishes and views heard in terms of their lives.

As PPDs can impose conditions further than the standard conditions of a PPN, there could be a number of negative impacts on victim-survivors if consent is not provided, whether it be care of their children, relationships, financial stability, housing or further implications. It is vital that victim-survivors have agency in a protection direction that will be in place for 12 months. That is why we will move an amendment to require that police gain the consent of victim-survivors for issuing a PPD.

Several stakeholders support consent being required to issue a PPD. Settlement Services International said—

On the option of not having informed consent, there is a huge risk ... SSI would definitely support the idea of having a consent process embedded into this.

The government promised to put victim-survivors first and that means ensuring victim-survivors are heard. This amendment does exactly that. Without consent, we risk silencing victim-survivors and damaging trust in the system.

I now turn to support services. There are ramifications with the removal of court oversight over a protection direction. As I explained earlier, a key one of those is that the courts are a way for many victim-survivors to gain access to support including counselling and legal advice. This is important for their safety, healing, recovery and moving forward after domestic violence. We are concerned that PPDs will remove this opportunity for victim-survivors. That is why our amendments will require police to provide information about support services as outlined by the current act. Without this amendment, there is a significant missed opportunity for victim-survivors to be supported during their recovery from the trauma of violence and as they rebuild their lives.

I wish now to turn to information sharing. The Labor opposition believes that the police should have the ability to share information with the Family Responsibilities Commission just as there is that ability through the DVO process currently. This will ensure that appropriate supports are available when needed in certain situations. I note that the government amendments address this issue of information sharing, which is an issue that was raised very clearly throughout the consultation process by First Nations communities and also by the opposition and is very clearly described in the statement of reservations provided by the Queensland Labor opposition.

Every victim-survivor of domestic violence deserves to be counted and I now wish to speak about publicly reported data. We have heard in this House and across Queensland, through the media, that the Premier has staked his leadership on driving down victim numbers. However, that means he needs to make meaningful change to reduce violence through early intervention, support and behaviour change programs, not by manipulating data on how victims are counted.

Currently, Queensland courts publish information regarding DVOs and breaches of DVOs. With the introduction of a new protection order—PPDs—there will be an impact on the number of DVOs issued, yet this bill as drafted has no reporting requirements on PPDs, allowing the LNP to manipulate victim data to suit their own agenda. We will not let this slide. We are, therefore, seeking to move an amendment to require that the number of PPDs, contraventions of PPDs and cases of misidentification be captured by the Police Commissioner and published monthly. The LNP Crisafulli government promised to increase transparency and accountability. They might want to try to muddy the waters, but our amendments ensure there will be clear, transparent and up-to-date victims data that counts every victim-survivor.

In relation to the independent review of PPDs, the bill requires that the effectiveness and impacts of PPDs be reviewed two years after commencement. This is a good thing. We welcome that review provision; however, we believe that this review should be completed independently and consider the key issue raised by stakeholders, experts and victim-survivors of misidentification. We will move amendments to ensure this and recommend that the review be undertaken by a university, for example.

In summary, the Labor opposition cannot support the introduction of PPDs without sufficient safeguards against misidentification. Our amendments provide for this through an enhanced review process that includes advice from domestic violence specialists. Our amendments also require that the aggrieved or victim-survivors consent to a PPD, provide victim-survivors the opportunity to access information and support, ensure similar information sharing of PPDs to DVOs occurs and ensure every victim-survivor is counted. Without these amendments, this bill removes opportunities to better support victim-survivors, to disrupt cycles of violence and to prevent it from happening again. We believe that with these additional safeguards the bill should proceed, because it will support our hardworking police to do the job they signed up to do: protect our community.

We have heard from the sector and from victim-survivors. They do not support the introduction of PPDs as currently drafted. A victim-survivor shared with me their letter to the minister. They said that, while the bill may be well intentioned, 'it has been designed, reviewed and advanced with very little input from the people who live with the consequences of these decisions, the survivors'. They said—

Too many of us were silenced by our abusers for years—made to feel small, irrelevant and voiceless. And now to watch decisions being made about us without us feels painfully familiar. It mirrors that same powerlessness, the same erasure, only this time it is being done by a system that claims to be on our side.

We want protection that works.

We want justice that doesn't harm us again.

And we want a seat at the table when our lives are on the line.

The Crisafulli LNP government promised to put victims first. They promised to listen. They promised to listen to victims and to the experts. This bill breaks those promises. We acknowledge that more needs to be done to support police in responding to domestic and family violence, but we cannot accept these measures that risk the safety of victim-survivors.

As I stated at the beginning, we support our hardworking police, and I take this opportunity, once again, to thank them for the work they do each and every day on the front line to keep Queenslanders safe. I urge all members to review the opposition's amendments and support them to ensure adequate safeguards are in place for all.