


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

**Submission No:** 32  
**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, I appreciate the opportunity to put forward my concerns about the current draft of this Bill (Daniel's Law).

I politely request that the contents of this submission not be shared in any way that could identify me. I believe, under Queensland human rights act (2019) I am entitled to such privacy.

I wish to express my strong concern regarding the proposal to publicly release a list of child sex offenders and make available their digital image. While protecting children and community safety is of paramount importance, I believe that a public registry of names, as it is currently designed, risks doing more harm than good.

#### **1. Risk of Harm to Families**

- Publishing a list would not only punish the offender but also place their spouse, children, and extended family at risk of harassment, discrimination, and even physical harm.
- Children of offenders, in particular, would face stigma and bullying through no fault of their own.
- The aim of our justice system should not be to inflict collateral damage on innocent family members.
- Whilst it has been stated that anyone found guilty of inciting violence or harassment against individuals on the register could be charged it will not deter people from excluding and ostracising them, their children and spouses. The social and psychological damage this could inflict on families could be catastrophic.
- If low risk offenders who now have wives and children are made known to the public, the Crissafulli government may have blood on their hands. If this bill has been designed to keep children safe it is putting the innocent spouses and children of those who are on the register at risk.

#### **2. Distinction Between High-Risk and Low-Risk Offenders**

- Not all offenders pose an ongoing danger to the community. Low-risk offenders, especially those who have completed rehabilitation programs, complied with all supervision requirements, and are working to rebuild their lives, should not be exposed to public shaming.
- A one-size-fits-all approach fails to account for risk levels and undermines the principle of rehabilitation. While high risk offenders should be reportable and monitored for public safety low risk individuals who have proven themselves to be doing the right thing should not be punished.
- Not all offenders should be tarred with the same brush. People can make poor choices in life due to extenuating circumstances. They can be charged and rightfully punished for their actions, serve their sentence and make every effort for the remainder of their life to live as good citizens. They are not all the monsters and predators that Premier Crisafulli has labelled them.
- Being on a register for life does not necessarily mean you are at risk of reoffending.
- Laws and regulations differ from state to state however they travel with the individual from one state to another. Offenders who were convicted in the State of Victoria can, depending on the initial charges, be on the register for life despite being deemed low risk. In many circumstances had these convictions taken place in Queensland after a period of time those individuals would have been removed from the register.

### **3. Undermining Rehabilitation and Reintegration**

- Public exposure can make it nearly impossible for individuals to gain employment, secure housing, or maintain family stability. These factors are proven to reduce reoffending.
- By publishing names, we may inadvertently increase the risk of recidivism, as offenders become more isolated and desperate. An individual convicted many years ago now believes he would be safer back in prison should his identity be released to the community. This individual has served his sentence without fault and has since lived an exemplary life, raising an amazing family and doing his best to contribute to society as a decent citizen.

### **4. Existing Safeguards Already Protect Children**

- Police, courts, and child protection agencies already have the power to monitor, restrict, and manage offenders who pose an ongoing risk. These systems are better equipped to make evidence-based decisions than a public list, which could lead to vigilante action rather than real protection.

## 5. Proportionality and Human Rights Considerations

- Publicly branding someone for life is a severe penalty, going beyond the sentence imposed by the courts. It raises serious questions about proportionality, privacy, and fairness.
- If the goal is community safety, resources would be better spent on prevention, rehabilitation, and targeted supervision, rather than mass public disclosure.
- It should be taken into consideration when individuals serve their sentence without fault, are deeply remorseful for their actions and do their absolute best to lead a decent and moral life beyond this. Releasing their identity to the public when they are no longer at risk and their actions and sentencing is behind them is now giving them a life sentence.

## Conclusion

For these reasons, I strongly urge that if any public register is to be considered, it should exclude low-risk offenders and prioritise protecting the families of those who are working to reintegrate into society. A balanced approach is essential—one that upholds community safety without unnecessarily destroying the lives of spouses, children, and rehabilitated individuals.

I thank you for your time and appreciate your careful consideration on this matter.

A concerned citizen

(Name withheld for privacy)

---