

Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025

Submission No: 185
Submitted by: Grace Harrison
Publication: Making the submission and your name public
Attachments: No attachment

Submitter Comments:

We understand that people are complex, not black and white. Most people who do 'bad' things have also smiled at a baby, kissed their mum, and thrown some coins into a donate bin.

However.

Good acts do not erase harmful ones. Good acts do not mean that someone should not be considered dangerous, harmful, and a risk to society. And good acts do not bring justice for acts that have ruined someone else's life. Good character references are irrelevant when the harm has already been caused. Rapists still have best friends. And when should the character references stop? Should we not also be gathering references for the people who would write in defence of child molesters?

Good character is subjective, and dependant on your experience of a person. We must erase the idea in our minds of sexual predators being two dimensional; they have the capacity to be good just like we all have the capacity to be harmful. What matters is what we choose to act on. Choosing to be good to some people some times does not make it impossible for someone to choose harm. It makes them human.

Good character references tell us nothing about perpetrators and they do nothing to aid justice. They tell us that a perpetrator is human. They tell us they can hide the harmful parts of themselves if they want to. In some cases they highlight effective grooming. Sexual crimes are not crimes of 'passion' or 'love gone wrong.' They are crimes centred in control and power. Asking for someone to 'defend' a perpetrators capacity to be loving is like asking them to state their favourite ice-cream flavour. Completely irrelevant and ignorant to driving forces of sexual crimes.