

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

Submission No:	38
Submitted by:	Michael Williams
Publication:	Making the submission and your name public
Attachments:	See attachment
Submitter Comments:	

Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee
Queensland Parliament

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

To whom it may concern,

I appreciate the chance to submit a recommendation regarding the *Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register (Daniel's Law) Bill 2025*.

Are Community Notification Laws Ineffective?

Numerous academics have pointed out an absence of data supporting the efficacy of community notification laws as well as the constitutional and human rights issues they raise. Some have even suggested that community notification is pointless and ought to be repealed (Fitch, 2006). In fact the majority of women and men who commit the overwhelming majority of sexual assault are unlikely to be affected in any way by community notice, because a significant majority of criminals never come into contact with the criminal justice system. Since the regulations only apply to convicted and/or known sex offenders, community notification will merely only ever identify the tip of the iceberg regarding sex offenders. People may get obsessed with the criminals they have learned about and neglect other dangerous people and circumstances (Australian Institute of Criminology [AIC], 2007). The involvement of a young person seems to increase the likelihood that this may occur. It has been suggested that children could get a harmful message and not exercise caution, unless they are among persons who have been explicitly identified as dangerous (Johnson & Ronken, 2017).

The 'Right to Know' VS a 'Child's Right to be Safe'

According to The *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989* (CRC) under Article Three, Four, Eleven, Nine-teen, Thirty-four, and Forty-one, the apparent 'right to know' must never override a child's 'right to be safe,' since the 'right to know' contravenes a child's 'right to be safe,' the apparent 'right to know' is simply null and void, as the 'best interests' of child must outweigh one's mere curiosity putting our children at risk of harm, hence, the 'right to know' is a moral and ethical no no (Fitch, 2006).

Can Daniel's Law Empower Paedophiles to Silence their Victims?

Some people working in the child protection agencies, those in the media and government have been peddling the paedophile propaganda, disinformation and baseless statistics that support any form of public registration. The paedophiles will never give up on pushing for a public register because it effectively silences their victims as the victims do not want to be identified, because the victims are commonly bullied, assaulted and isolated by their peers, leading to anxiety, depression, loneliness and suicide - yes suicide - if you support Daniel's law you are pushing that knife ever so deeper into every victim egging them on to finish their life, a life that only just began (Lussier et al., 2020; Johnson & Ronken, 2011). Not only is the child effected but the whole community is harmed; according to the Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC) (2007) vigilantism is not monitored, with acts being under-reported and under-recorded, hence, if you think that Daniel's law will mitigate the risk of vigilantism among the community you might want to reconsider your understanding of this issue because the statistics are false and you have been fed disinformation. Vigilantism is not recorded because those people in positions of power and the State that made the decision to have a 'public harm policy' do not want to be held accountable for the damage that they have done to the community. According to The National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) you are inviting a war zone into every street of QLD; innocent children, women and men will die as a result of Daniel's law and it is their blood on your hands as you must bear full responsibility for the murder of these innocent individuals (Fitch, 2006).

Under Daniel's Law How will Paedophiles Pray on Our Communities False Sense of Security?

Thanks to Daniel's law they can act out their deviant desires under the radar because people are only focused on the tiny fraction who are on the register, as opposed to the hundreds of thousands of paedophiles who are not on the register and unknown to police (AIC, 2007; Lussier et al., 2020; Johnson & Ronken, 2017), a child is 20 times more likely to be sexually assaulted by a non-registrant, so having any form of public notification puts our children in 20 times more danger, as opposed, to the current police register which is non-public. It should also be noted that those on the police register have the lowest re-offending rate bar murder (Sandler et al., 2008), but if placed on a register with public notification registrants' are much more likely to reoffend according to the head of the Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science at Swinburne University (Ogloff, 2018).

Would Daniel's Law Provide a Distraction, Enabling Paedophiles to Commit Crimes?

According to the Child Abuse Central Index (CACI) there is no proven connection between where child abuse occurs and the residence of the abuser, indicating that abuse can happen in various environments regardless of the abuser's location. This highlights the complexity of child abuse cases and the need for comprehensive prevention and intervention strategies; so what is the point of being publicly notified in your own area, it tells us nothing, and only serves to harm children by distracting our attention essentially allowing the paedophiles do what ever they want to our children when we are looking elsewhere (CACI), hence, notifying one small community area does not prevent an offender from visiting a community further away which has not been 'notified' (Johnson & Ronken, 2017). Likewise our police are also distracted with a heavy workload of irrelevant and wasteful information nullifying the ability of the police to protect the community, for example, in "2023, there were 30,556 calls and online reports of suspected child abuse and neglect made to the Child Welfare Division's intake unit, 92 percent of which did not result in findings (Main Child Welfare Action Network, 2025)."

Does Daniel's Law Promote Paedophile Rings?

Effectively Daniel's law does not act in the 'best interests' of children and acts only in the interests of paedophiles as both the public and police are completely distracted allowing the paedophiles to set the scene for the perfect crime risk free, all thanks to their partner in crime (Daniel's law); so let me ask you this, what are you going to do to stop the paedophiles sexually abusing our children, as Daniel's law is offering our children to the paedophiles on a silver platter? A powerful incentive for paedophiles pushing for Daniel's law is that they will be offered the opportunity to build close relationships with the most dangerous and notorious paedophiles that have been identified by the public register to assist paedophiles to commit crimes together, however, under the current police register this is not an issue because the community is in the safe hands of the professionals and police already notify on a case by case bases. So what is the point of a Daniel's law when the police already do a better job at protecting the community than leaving it in the hands of the public to fend for themselves (Lussier et al., 2020).

Would Daniel's Law Protect Paedophiles From Prosecution?

If we want to protect our children a good place to start, would be to focus on what works, as

opposed, to what doesn't work. For instance, The National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children which has used research and facts to conclusively show that public registration is ineffective. It is a failure because it fails to deliver on its promise and continues to fail to do so. That is, to keep the kids safe, hence, it only serves to harm children and protects paedophiles from having to face justice (Fitch, 2006). Likewise, whilst Daniel's law would not deter an offence, it would deter a person to take a guilty plea, this is a significant point being raised by the QLD Law Society (2025), because this would likely lead to a significant fall in conviction rates, where the accused will not be monitored by Daniel's law, however, under the current system the accused would be convicted, identified and monitored by the police. This further supports that Daniel's law let's the paedophiles off the hook by allowing them to escape justice, this is totally unacceptable, in contrast, under the police register they are monitored but under Daniel's law they are not, who knows where they are, and what they are about to do next. It is clear that those advocating for a public register have no interest in the safety of children, all they care about is protecting the paedophiles. Children have a right to be safe, but Daniel's law is threatening to away this right (QLD Law Society, 2025).

Supporters of Daniel's Law may be Ignorant of the Evidence or a Paedophile in Disguise

Stop protecting the paedophiles and *start* protecting our children with evidenced based policy, if it is not evidenced based policy, it will only cause child harm. Daniel's law is a paedophile protection racket, it does not protect children and there is not one shred of evidence that would support Daniel's law as it is a tried and failed method that has only lead to child harm (Fitch, 2006). Furthermore, So we need to ask ourselves why would a person support Daniel's law when there is no evidence to suggest that it would protect children, and what are these people getting out of it by constantly dressing up a paedophile protection register (Daniel's law) as a child protection register, what is the ulterior motive here? Hence, evidence supports that any person claiming that Daniel's law is about protecting children is either ignorant of the evidence or is in fact a paedophile in disguise, as it is only paedophiles who would support the disinformation and propaganda of a public register.

Would a True Child Advocate Support Daniel's Law?

No true child advocate would ever support a public register because it harms children more than protects them, it is not evidenced based and goes against both Bravehearts 'Mission' and 'Vision' statements (Johnson & Ronken, 2017). Daniel's law can only be considered a dangerous and

emotional based policy that puts the protection of paedophiles over the protection of children, this is unacceptable (Fitch, 2006). It prevents them from being accused and when they are accused they get let off, all thanks to the paedophiles best friend Daniel's law (AIC, 2007; QLD Law Society, 2025) .

The QLD Law Society (2025) argues that there is *no* empirical studies that demonstrate making child sex offender details available to the public protects children or the community, on the contrary, there is only evidence of significant child and community harm. This has been understood for almost 30 years so it would be good if our politicians could step into the 21st century as a number appear to be stuck in the 1900s. But in 2025 there is no reason to support a public register, such as, Daniel's law - unless you're a paedophile. You need to ask your self, what legacy do you want to leave and how do you want to be remembered, because if you want to take the risk by going down the path of supporting the 'paedophile protection register' known as Daniel's law, it will significantly effect your future in the years to come, because the community is waking up to this understanding and does not appreciate those with a pro-paedophile agenda. What ever you think that your going to get out of it, ask yourself, is it worth it? It is recommended that the Government act in the 'best interests' of children and say *no* to Daniel's law to save the lives of countless children in QLD (Lussier et al., 2020).

A better and more accurate name for 'the 'Bill' which is supported by evidence and gaining in popularity online is to rename the *(Daniel's Law) Bill 2025* as the ***Community Harm and Paedophile Protection Register Bill 2025***.

References

- Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC). (2007). *Is notification of sex offenders in local communities effective?* AIC.
- Fitch, K. (2006). *Megan's Law: Does it Protect Children?(2): an Updated Review of Evidence on the Impact of Community Notification as Legislated for by Megan's Law in the United States*. National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC).
- Johnson, H. , & Ronken, C. (2011). *Position paper: Silence, Shame, Secrecy and Child Sexual Assault*. Bravehearts.
- Johnson, H. , & Ronken, C. (2017). *Position paper: Community Notification of Sex Offenders*. Bravehearts.
- Lussier, P., McCuish, E. C., & Cale, J. (2020). A Scarlet Letter in the Digital Age: Sex Offender Registration and Public Notification. In *Understanding Sexual Offending: An evidence-based response to myths and misconceptions* (pp. 313-356). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Main Child Welfare Action Network. (2025). *HHS Committee Presentation*. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Ogloff, J. (2018). *Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science*. Swinburne University.
- QLD Law Society. (2025). *Submission: community protection and public child sex offender register (Daniel's law) bill*. QLD Law Society. (2025)
- Sandler, J. C., Freeman, N. J., & Socia, K. M. (2008). Does a watched pot boil? A time-series analysis of New York State's sex offender registration and notification law. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 14(4), 284.
- United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989*.