

First name: Justin
Last name: Santos

Q1:

Q2: The scheme should not restrict the ability of people to access information

Q3: Yes, pragmatically attempting to classify and censor information on the internet is not going to achieve much. There is no reason to ever censor content which is legal to produce. If it is illegal to produce the effort should be made at the production end rather than the consumption end as this is where the effort will have the greatest impact.

Q4: Some content shouldn't require classification regardless

Q5:

Q6:

Q7: For the purpose of providing consumer advice yes

Q8: No

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12: Access to on-line content should not be restricted, if illegal content (by which I mean the production of such content required an illegal act) is found then the people, who created the content, the people hosting the content and potentially the consumers of the content should be prosecuted, attempting to block access will result in the content "going underground" resulting in it becoming more difficult for the creators to be found and prosecuted. It is the effective prosecution and removal from society of those who perform the illegal acts that should be the goal.

Q13:

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

Q21: Refused Classification should be removed

Q22:

Q23:

Q24: The question is backwards. Prohibiting access to content on-line won't work. Content such as child pornography is abhorrent prohibiting access is like putting a band-aid on a gunshot wound, we need to go after the people who created the content and collect intelligence and prosecute those who view it. One potential downside of trying to prohibit access to it may be that we would be unable to identify those who wish to view it and as a result are unable to track their other on-line habits which could lead us to other places and people where the content exists allowing us to more effectively go after the sources of content.

Q25: There should be no refused classification, if it's legal to create it should be legal to view by adults, no matter how individuals feel about the content morally.

Q26: state laws should not exist, they are irrelevant and I see no reason why NSW and Victoria would have need to classify things differently.

Q27:

Q28: yes

Q29:

Other comments: