




Speech By  
**Hon. Shannon Fentiman**

**MEMBER FOR WATERFORD**

---

Record of Proceedings, 27 August 2025

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

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (9.25 pm): I rise today to make a contribution on this bill and to outline serious concerns I hold with the introduction of police protection directions in their current form. Labor will always welcome reform that works towards ending violence in our communities and we will always support measures that back our hardworking frontline police, allowing them to respond better to domestic and family violence. However, we will not support reforms that risk the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors of domestic and family violence.

Before I go into more detail on that, I would like to address some of the accusations raised in question time and respond at my earliest possible opportunity. After question time, I watched the video the member for Cairns shared and found many of the jokes in that video highly offensive. I say that knowing what women endure and knowing the stories they have told me—how they are robbed of opportunities because of their sex; how they are underrated, overlooked, belittled or taken for granted; how they face violence at home every day; and how they face unwanted sexual advances at work, on the street or on the way home. I have shared these views with the member for Cairns and he has apologised to me for sharing it, he has apologised to this House and he has apologised to the community. I understand that he has been counselled by the Leader of the Opposition.

Coming back to some of the concerns that we have with this bill, I would like to remind those opposite that Labor was already working closely with police and the domestic and family violence sector on how police protection directions might be used, but we were determined to ensure the safety of women was paramount. We were determined to get this right, and that meant building in significant safeguards around misidentification, requiring consent from victims—

**Ms Camm** interjected.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** I would say to the minister that women are best placed to determine what is best for them and how to keep themselves safe. The fact that these PPDs mean that police can issue orders, including ouster orders, when women victims do not consent is highly problematic. We should be empowering victims and listening to victims. In fact, that is what those opposite stand up in this place almost every sitting day—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Furner): Pause the clock. We are going to have silence like we have had for the last hour, otherwise people will start to be warned.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** If those opposite are serious about empowering victims and keeping them safe, then let us actually make sure that women and victims consent to the orders that police can make on the spot. I do not think that should be controversial. Why don't we have consent in these PPDs? We should be empowering and trusting women to make the best decisions for their safety and their kids' safety. It is highly problematic that we are introducing PPDs without victims' consent.

What we see here is a government that has completely ignored the women who work on the front line each and every day, keeping women and children safe: the domestic and family violence sector. Those counsellors and social workers who hold so much risk, who work so hard every day, are pleading with this minister and this government to put in place safeguards so that women are not misidentified as perpetrators and so that women can give consent to the orders made. Some women actually need the perpetrator, their partner, to be able to access their house for various reasons.

Under this PPD, police can make an on-the-spot PPD with an ouster order. If you are a shiftworker, you need your partner. You want the violence to stop, but you need your partner to be home to look after the kids when you are not there. How does that work if there is an ouster order in place? Why are we not including consent, and why are police not actually listening to victims?

**Mrs Gerber** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Currumbin, your interjections are not being taken.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** This is not just something that I have thought up, member for Currumbin. This is what the sector and victim-survivors are saying. If you read the submissions that were made to the committee—

**Mrs Gerber** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I hope that was not a reflection on the chair, member.

**Mrs Gerber:** Of course not.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No. You will remain silent.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** The Queensland Council of Social Services, member for Currumbin, says that PPDs are nothing more than ‘an efficiency measure that does not prioritise the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors.’ That is the peak body for community services.

**Mrs Gerber** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Currumbin, you are now warned.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** The peak body for community organisations in Queensland that is now the peak body for the domestic and family violence sector is saying this does not prioritise the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors, and those opposite, very clearly, are not inclined to listen.

When the very people who work day in and day out with victims of domestic and family violence say these laws will not keep women safe, the government should listen. The Women’s Legal Service has said that misidentification already occurs because police are required to make decisions in the moment without all the facts. So, rather than a PPN that then has to go to court where women can give evidence and a magistrate can oversee things, we are giving police more power without any evidence that issues around misidentification have improved whatsoever. The Queensland Law Society stated—

The consequences of being improperly named as the respondent to a police protection direction will be dire.

My local domestic and family violence service, the Centre for Women & Co, made it clear in their submission to this inquiry that misidentification is already a serious problem. They said—

Our service has supported numerous victim-survivors who were incorrectly identified as respondents following single incidents, while the person using violence manipulated the system to avoid accountability.

This is exactly what this bill risks entrenching—a system where perpetrators exploit gaps in process, and victim-survivors are left silenced, criminalised and unprotected.

When the frontline organisations raise concerns like this, our parliament must listen. I have sat across the table from community organisations right across the state and heard truly heartbreaking stories—stories of women who, through no fault of their own, have been misidentified as the perpetrator. They face criminalisation, housing instability, the loss of employment and the weight of social stigma. I urge the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence to sit down with these same organisations who work with women to read the DV Death Review Board reports and explain how this will make things safer for women.

Right now, a domestic violence order comes before a court. Victims have their say. They can receive legal advice. They can be referred to vital support services. Conditions can be carefully considered. Information can be shared with bodies like the Family Responsibilities Commission to ensure ongoing support.

Going to court is a weighty process. Community organisations have told me it makes perpetrators take the situation more seriously, knowing that a judge is involved and evidence is heard. PPDs strip all of that away. This is why the Labor opposition is moving amendments to strengthen the legislation

with responsible evidence-based safeguards that put victim-survivors first. Our amendments, circulated by the shadow minister, introduce a safeguard against misidentification.

We are also calling for the voices of victim-survivors to be respected through an amendment that requires their consent. I do not think in 2025 it should be controversial to get a victim-survivor's consent before issuing orders that are about their safety. Let's actually empower women. Our amendments will address the gap left by the removal of court oversight by making it mandatory for police to provide referrals to vital services such as counselling, housing support, sexual assault services and legal advice.

We also want to see information-sharing protections maintained and transparency through the public reporting of police protection directions, contraventions and misidentification cases, because every victim of domestic and family violence deserves to be seen, deserves to be counted and deserves a government that will listen to those experts on the front line who are working with women and children every day. These amendments are commonsense safeguards. They reflect what we have heard from experts, frontline workers and survivors themselves, and they are the very protections that Labor was working on when we were in government.

These PPDs, whilst I am sure well intentioned, ignore the voices of victim-survivors. They ignore the experiences of victim-survivors. They risk masking the true severity of domestic and family violence and, most dangerously, they risk putting women and children in harm's way.

I think victim-survivors' safety should always be the priority, and that is why the Labor opposition cannot support the introduction of police protection directions as they are currently drafted. We do believe better reform is possible. We believe reform can be achieved, reform that protects survivors and, at the same time, supports our hardworking police, but unfortunately this bill is not that.