


Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register (Daniel's Law) Bill 2025

Submission No:	28
Submitted by:	
Publication:	Making the submission public but withholding your name
Attachments:	See attachment
Submitter Comments:	

Submission to the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee

Re: Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register (Daniel's Law) Bill 2025

To the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts on the *Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register (Daniel's Law) Bill 2025*.

I'm writing as a wife and a mother of teenage children, and also as someone whose family is directly affected by the sex offenders register. This is not an easy letter to write, and I don't take lightly the seriousness of the issues at hand. But because of how close this is to home, I feel it's important to speak up.

Our family has lived for many years with one of its members under reporting obligations. We are law-abiding, we live quietly, and we're raising our children with love and care, just like any other family. I want to be very clear from the start: I absolutely support the intention behind this bill—to protect children. We all want that. But I'm deeply concerned that the bill, as it stands, could unintentionally cause harm to other innocent children and families who aren't being considered in the broader conversation.

I kindly ask that the contents of this submission not be shared in any way that could identify me or my family. I believe we are entitled to that protection under Queensland's Human Rights Act (2019), and I trust that will be respected.

Supporting Strong Measures for High-Risk Offenders

First, I want to say that I support stronger action when it comes to high-risk, non-compliant sex offenders—especially those who have reoffended or failed to meet their legal obligations. The community deserves to be protected from people who pose a clear and continuing threat.

But the bill, as it's currently drafted, casts too wide a net. It risks drawing in people who don't pose that kind of danger—people who have served their prison time and complied fully with the law for many years and whose original offences may have happened long ago. These are often individuals who are now trying to quietly rebuild their lives and care for their families.

Why Risk-Based Assessment Matters

One of the biggest concerns I have is that the proposed three-tier system seems to rely heavily on the length of someone's reporting period, rather than an actual professional assessment of their risk to the community.

For example, someone with two charges from one occurrence in another state might be automatically placed on the register for life, even if professionally assessed as a low risk. Meanwhile, someone in Queensland who has been assessed as a higher

risk with the same number of charges might not appear in public searches under the new system at all.

It feels like the bill is trying to simplify something that's actually very complex. I understand why simplicity might be appealing—it makes the system easier to implement. But unfortunately, when it comes to public safety and human lives, simple doesn't always mean effective. In this case, it could mean overlooking real risks while unfairly punishing people who aren't dangerous.

The Impact on Families and Children

I can't begin to describe the stress and fear that come with the possibility of public exposure—not just for the person on the register, but for their entire family.

We're not just talking about the offender here. We're talking about their children, their partners, and others who live with them—people who had no part in the original offence, and who have done nothing wrong. These people, especially children, can become targets of bullying, social exclusion, and worse.

I know what it's like to lie awake at night, wondering what might happen if a neighbour finds out, or if something is said at school. Worrying about the effect this would have on my children, the isolation, the torment, the harm they might suffer and the harm they may inflict on themselves as a result. I've seen firsthand how quickly gossip spreads on social media, and how harsh the judgment can be, even from people who only know a fraction of the story.

And there are people in the community who feel it's their duty to "take action." They post online about vigilante patrols and "doing what needs to be done." These are real threats. We've seen them on our local community pages. While I know there are legal penalties in place for misusing information, I also know that laws don't stop people when emotions run high.

Employment and Stability Matter

Many of the people affected by this bill are working hard to make amends and positively contribute to society. They're employed, contributing to the community, and supporting their families. If their names and faces become public, there's a very real risk that they'll lose their jobs—and that their children and family will lose their financial security.

Not only does this create more hardship, but it also makes it harder for people to reintegrate successfully. And we know that people who are isolated and unemployed are at greater risk of reoffending. That's not good for anyone.

On a personal level, we have had to seriously consider breaking our family unit apart to ensure the safety of our children. If this amendment goes through, as it currently stands, the only way for us to guarantee our children will not be impacted is for my husband (who has been professionally assessed by multiple agencies over two states as a low risk) to move to another location, thus fracturing our family and destabilizing all of our lives.

Concerns About the Security of Shared Information

Another concern is how securely the release information will be handled. From what I've read, images and details could be provided to certain people in the community. But once an image is seen, it can be copied. And with today's technology, including AI, it's frighteningly easy to take that image and connect it to a name, address, and other personal details.

Unless this information is viewed in a secure environment—like a police station where phones and cameras aren't allowed—I honestly don't see how it can be protected. Once it's out, it's out, and there's no way to undo that damage.

Suggestions for Change

I know the goal of this bill is to protect children, and I genuinely admire that. But I believe there are two key changes that could help make it safer and fairer:

1. **Basing public disclosure on professional risk assessments**, not just the length of time someone is on the register. This ensures that the system targets the people who actually pose a risk.
2. **Allowing provision for an application for the suppression of an offender's image and details**, where the person is low-risk and compliant and lives with children under the age of 18. This would help protect innocent children and partners from harm, while still allowing the law to do its job in protecting the broader community.

Final Thoughts

This isn't easy to talk about, and I know it's not a black-and-white issue. I want children to be safe. I want families to feel secure. I want our communities to be informed and protected. But I also want to live in a society where **we don't punish innocent children** just because of who their parent is.

The current draft of this bill leaves families like mine exposed and vulnerable. I believe we can find a way to protect children without putting other children at risk in the process.

Please, don't pass this amendment as it is. Let's take the time to refine it, to build something that keeps **all** children safe—not just some.

With sincere thanks for your time and consideration,
[Name withheld for privacy]
Mother, Partner, Queensland Resident

Submission to the Parliamentary Committee Reviewing Daniel's Law

Re: Concerns Regarding Inconsistencies in Sex Offender Register Reporting and the Public Disclosure of Images

I have purposely separated this point from my previous submission to highlight the inequities and dangers related to this key issue.

I write to express my concerns regarding the proposed implementation of Daniel's Law, particularly the provisions that would allow for the public release of images of individuals listed on the Queensland sex offender register with reporting obligations for life.

While I appreciate and support the underlying objective of Daniel's Law — to enhance public safety and ensure transparency regarding individuals assessed as posing a high risk to the community — there are significant issues that arise from discrepancies in how sex offender registration and classification are applied across Australian jurisdictions.

In Queensland, where multiple offences are dealt with concurrently, the reporting period is 10 years; reoffending increases this to 20 years. Under new laws introduced in 2023, "the most serious recidivist child sex offenders will be monitored for their entire lives" (Queensland Government, 2023). In contrast, in other Australian states, a conviction for multiple offences dealt with concurrently results in mandatory lifetime registration. For example, two or more offences in Victoria will incur the penalty of lifetime registration, while in Western Australia it is three or more.

Crucially, when an individual relocates to Queensland from another jurisdiction, they bring with them the reporting obligations and classification attached to their original state of conviction. This leads to a situation where an individual may be classified as a lifelong registrant in Queensland, not because they are a "serious recidivist" offender under Queensland law, but due to the operation of another state's legislative framework.

This inconsistency undermines the intent of Daniel's Law to target the most serious and repeat offenders. Without reform, the proposed public disclosure provisions risk capturing individuals who were never intended to be publicly identified under the original spirit of the law. Individuals who have not reoffended, but are nevertheless subject to lifetime registration due to another state's standards, could be unfairly exposed to stigma, discrimination, and harm. It is not acceptable to simply rely on the lifetime reporting classification due to it being easier to implement, when the consequences of such, are so catastrophic and widespread.

To address this concern, I strongly urge the Committee to recommend that public disclosure provisions under Daniel's Law be based not solely on registration status, but on a professionally assessed risk to the community. Risk assessments are already undertaken during the processes of conviction, sentencing, incarceration, and release, and these expert evaluations provide a far more accurate indication of the threat posed by an individual than a blanket reliance on registration status alone.

By anchoring disclosure decisions in professionally determined risk — rather than inconsistent inter-jurisdictional classifications — the proposed law can more effectively target individuals who truly pose an ongoing danger, while protecting the rights and rehabilitation prospects of those who do not.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Reference

Queensland Government. (2023, April 20). *New sex offender monitoring laws reverse soft approach of LNP – Ministerial Media Statements*. Retrieved from <https://statements.qld.gov.au/statements/97662>