From:

Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

Subject:

Submission of John O"Leary re Child Abuse Amendment.

Date:

Friday, 30 November 2018 11:18:16 AM

Submission of John O'Leary to the Queensland Government, on the proposed amendments to the

Limitation of Actions (Child Sexual Abuse) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2016.

Committee Secretary

Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

Parliament House

George Street

Brisbane Qld 4000

To whom it may concern,

My name is John O'Leary. I attended in the years 1970, '71, and '72. I attended in 1973.

Whilst at these institutions, I was severely physically, psychologically, and sexually assaulted. The common term is "child abuse," but it is criminal assault, by an adult, on a child, in anyone's language.

I was 12 and 13 years of age when the worst assaults occurred. That we are even having this debate, when there is no statute of limitations on criminal activity, is a sad reflection of our laws, and our society as a whole, where children can be horrendously beaten, and sexually assaulted by adults, but can't get compensatory justice when the injuries manifested upon their lives are unwrapped, typically many years and in most cases, many decades later.

During the entire year of 1972, I was systematically beaten, denigrated, and belittled by the headmaster of the

I was rendered unconscious on at least one occasion, and suffered concussions on

numerous other occasions. I lived in constant terror daily, waiting for the next attack, and being a boarder at the school, I had nowhere to hide. I was not able to stop these assaults.

I was sexually assaulted twice the following year by the sexual of the sexual of two occasions, early in the year, I was anally penetrated. I was able to stop these assaults from continuing.

In my opinion, the assaults I endured at the hands of the two isolated sexual assaults,) pale in order of severity to the ongoing terror campaign of the previous year, where I was "only" subjected to severe physical and psychological assaults, for the entire year. I believe my subsequent life outcomes, including substance abuse, and the inability to hold a job for any length of time, stem mainly from the physical assaults I endured as a 12 year old. I was already severely broken by the time the sexual assaults took place.

I have settled with the after a very protracted series of processes. I was only able to use the sexual assaults as a legal yardstick, and even then, only after the government changed the limitation statute, for child sexual assault, in 2016. The used every legal avenue available to them, to draw out the process, even after that amendment. On one occasion, it took a court order which cost fifteen thousand dollars, to get their lawyers to return calls, or answer emails, on no less than 23 occasions, which had been ignored over a period of 8 months. And this was in relation to a matter which was not statute barred.

The unconscionable behaviour of these institutions, in relation to patently provable cases of ALL types of child assault, must be reined in, for the good of all children in the future. The only way for this to happen, is to hit them legally, as hard as possible, to give them a big enough incentive to weed out their rotten apples. The

process of trying to get historical assault compensation is hard enough, without outdated, and institutionally manipulated, laws. The statute time-limiting ANY type of child assault must be abolished, for the good of all future generations of children.

Various institutions, but in particular the have been throwing smokescreens and spurious arguments at any changes in the law regarding historical child assault for decades, as was patently obvious at the last round of this particular amendment in Queensland. Who was involved in the splitting of the last bill in this matter, into two separate bills? That deserves a Royal Commission, on its own. For the good of all the assaulted children of the past, and potentially saving countless children from criminal assault in the future, see through the smokescreens, and see that there can be NO morally salient argument against this amendment.

Yours faithfully,



John O'Leary

Contact phone:

[please note: I am currently travelling via boat offshore and have included an electronic signature; I am available on mobile while in range]