

The Senate

---

Select Committee on  
Cyber Safety

---

Options for addressing the issue of sexting  
by minors

August 2013

© Commonwealth of Australia 2013

ISBN 978-1-74229-907-5

Senate Select Committee on Cyber Safety Secretariat:

Ms Christine McDonald (Secretary)

Ms Jackie Morris (Secretary)

Mr CJ Sautelle (Senior Research Officer)

Ms Marina Katic (Administrative Officer)

The Senate  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600

Phone: 02 6277 3530

Fax: 02 6277 5809

E-mail: [cybersafety.sen@aph.gov.au](mailto:cybersafety.sen@aph.gov.au)

Internet: [www.aph.gov.au/senate\\_cybersafety](http://www.aph.gov.au/senate_cybersafety)

This document was produced by the Senate Select Committee on Cyber Safety Secretariat and printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Parliament House, Canberra.

# MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

## 43<sup>rd</sup> Parliament

### Members

|                                 |                        |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| Senator Catryna Bilyk, Chair    | ALP, Tasmania          |
| Senator David Bushby            | LP, Tasmania           |
| Senator Stephen Parry           | LP, Tasmania           |
| Senator Louise Pratt            | ALP, Western Australia |
| Senator the Hon Ursula Stephens | ALP, New South Wales   |



# Table of Contents

|                                                                              |            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE .....</b>                                     | <b>iii</b> |
| <b>CHAPTER 1.....</b>                                                        | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Introduction and background .....</b>                                     | <b>1</b>   |
| Introduction .....                                                           | 1          |
| Context of the inquiry .....                                                 | 1          |
| What is sexting? .....                                                       | 2          |
| Issues specific to sexting among minors .....                                | 4          |
| Current legal framework in respect of sexting by minors .....                | 6          |
| <b>CHAPTER 2 .....</b>                                                       | <b>11</b>  |
| <b>Key issues.....</b>                                                       | <b>11</b>  |
| Introduction .....                                                           | 11         |
| Options for legislative reform .....                                         | 11         |
| Educational initiatives .....                                                | 19         |
| Other issues .....                                                           | 22         |
| Conclusion .....                                                             | 23         |
| <b>APPENDIX 1 .....</b>                                                      | <b>25</b>  |
| <b>Submissions and Additional Information received by the Committee.....</b> | <b>25</b>  |
| <b>APPENDIX 2 .....</b>                                                      | <b>27</b>  |
| <b>Witnesses who appeared before the Committee .....</b>                     | <b>27</b>  |



# CHAPTER 1

## Introduction and background

### Introduction

1.1 On 27 June 2013, the Senate appointed the Select Committee on Cyber Safety to inquire into and report, by 30 August 2013, on options for addressing the issue of sexting by minors.<sup>1</sup>

### *Conduct of the inquiry*

1.2 The committee's inquiry was advertised on its website and government agencies and interested stakeholders were invited to make a submission. The committee received 25 submissions. A list of submissions authorised for publication by the committee is provided in Appendix 1.

1.3 The committee held a private briefing in Melbourne on 1 August 2013. The committee agreed to make public the *Hansard* transcript of the briefing, which is available on the committee's website. A list of witnesses who gave evidence at the briefing is provided in Appendix 2.

### *Acknowledgments*

1.4 The committee thanks all those who contributed to the inquiry by making submissions, providing additional information or appearing before it to give evidence. In particular, the committee thanks the chair of the Victorian Parliamentary Law Reform Committee, Mr Clem Newton-Brown, MP, for briefing the committee on the work undertaken by the Law Reform Committee for its inquiry into sexting.

### Context of the inquiry

1.5 The issue of cyber safety has received close scrutiny as the use of new technologies has brought not only great benefits but also risks particularly for young people. The Parliament recognised the need to explore issues of cyber safety and established the Joint Select Committee on Cyber-Safety (Joint Select Committee) in March 2010. The Joint Select Committee was reappointed in the 43<sup>rd</sup> Parliament in September 2010.<sup>2</sup> In June 2011, the Joint Select Committee tabled its interim report *High-Wire Act: Cyber-Safety and the Young*. The report included an examination of the issue of sexting by minors in the context of cyber bullying among young people.

1.6 The report highlighted that sexting can pose significant risks for young people, and that further research is needed to understand the motives behind this behaviour and develop effective intervention strategies.<sup>3</sup> While the Joint Select

---

1 *Journals of the Senate*, No. 154, 27 June 2013, p. 4245.

2 *House of Representatives Votes and Proceedings*, No. 2, 29 September 2010, pp 47–49; *Journals of the Senate*, No. 3, 30 September 2010, pp 126–127 and 143.

3 Joint Select Committee on Cyber-Safety, Interim Report, *High-Wire Act: Cyber-Safety and the Young*, June 2011, pp 136–145.

Committee made recommendations relating to cyber bullying and cyber safety generally, including enforcement and educational strategies, no recommendations were made specifically in relation to sexting.

1.7 In May 2013, the Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee tabled the final report for its *Inquiry into Sexting* (Victorian Parliament Report).<sup>4</sup> The report noted that sexting, particularly by young people, has become an issue of national, and international, interest and concern. In addition, media reports in Victoria in 2011 had highlighted the prevalence of sexting in high schools in Victoria and the serious potential consequences both for young persons photographed, and for those who receive or disseminate such photographs.<sup>5</sup>

1.8 The report examined the incidence, prevalence and nature of sexting in Victoria, the extent and effectiveness of existing awareness and education campaigns in relation to sexting, and the appropriateness of existing laws that may apply to the practice of sexting.

1.9 The Victorian Parliament Report made 14 recommendations in relation to the legal and policy framework around sexting in Victoria.<sup>6</sup> In particular, the report recommended (Recommendation 6) that the *Crimes Act 1958* (Vic) and the *Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) (Enforcement) Act 1995* (Vic) be amended to provide defences for child pornography offences in those Acts to cover age-appropriate sexting.<sup>7</sup> It was also recommended (Recommendation 7) that once amending legislation was introduced in the Victorian Parliament to give effect to Recommendation 6, that the Victorian Government advocate to the Standing Council on Law and Justice that the Commonwealth, states and territories amend their criminal legislation to provide similar defences to child pornography offences.<sup>8</sup>

1.10 In addition, the Law Reform Committee recommended that a specific non-consensual sexting offence be introduced into the *Summary Offences Act 1966* (Vic) (Recommendation 9).<sup>9</sup>

## **What is sexting?**

1.11 The term 'sexting' refers to a range of behaviours involving the creation and transmission of sexual content through electronic media. There is no single accepted definition of sexting, and various definitions have been proposed in recent times. The Attorney-General's Department (AGD) and the Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy (DBCDE) adopted a definition used by the

---

4 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, <http://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/lawreform/article/944> (accessed 29 July 2013).

5 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 2.

6 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, pp xxiii-xxiv.

7 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, pp 142–43.

8 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 146.

9 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 152.



Victorian Parliament Report, which defined sexting as 'the creating, sharing, sending or posting of sexually explicit messages or images via the internet, mobile phones or other electronic devices by people, especially young people'.<sup>10</sup>

1.12 The Australia Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) articulated a simpler understanding of sexting to mean 'the sending of sexual messages, photos or videos, online or using a mobile phone'.<sup>11</sup>

### ***Types of sexting behaviour***

1.13 Sexting can occur in a variety of contexts and through a variety of media, ranging from relatively benign, consensual behaviours to situations in which sexting is coerced or exploitative. The Victorian Parliament Report noted that sexting could include behaviours as diverse as:

- a 15 year-old girl taking a topless photograph of herself and sending it via mobile phone to her 16 year-old boyfriend;
- the boyfriend showing the photograph to his friends on the screen of his mobile phone;
- romantic partners engaging in a webchat where they 'flash' one another;
- a person posting a sexually explicit image on someone else's Facebook page;
- a person recording a sexual assault using their mobile phone camera;
- a person installing a hidden camera in a swimming pool changing room to record people getting changed; and
- a person sending an 11 year-old child explicitly-worded text messages as part of 'grooming' the child.<sup>12</sup>

1.14 The Australian Psychological Society noted that there are a number of dimensions to different behaviours broadly categorised as sexting, which need to be considered when examining a specific behaviour. These dimensions are:

- the content of the communication (including whether the communication includes text, images or video, and the degree of sexualisation present in the content);
- the use of the communication (including the number of people depicted in the content, and the number of people with whom the content is shared);
- the role of participants (including the producer, sender(s) and receiver(s) of the material);

---

10 Attorney-General's Department, *Submission 5*, p. 2; Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, *Submission 13*, [p. 2]; Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 1.

11 Australia Communications and Media Authority, *Submission 9*, p. 2.

12 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 19.

- the intent of the communication (whether benign or harmful, and with or without the consent of the subject); and
- the age of the participants.<sup>13</sup>

### *Stages of peer-to-peer sexting*

1.15 The Law Council of Australia (Law Council) noted that there are a number of aspects to sexting. These are:

- requesting an image or video;
- creating an image (often a self-portrait);
- sharing an image with an intended recipient (consensually); and
- sharing an image with others (often without the subject's permission).<sup>14</sup>

1.16 While harm may be possible at each stage of this process, submitters highlighted that the most serious potential harm arising from sexting behaviour often occurs only at the final stage, when sexting content is shared beyond its initial intended recipient(s). This is sometimes referred to as non-consensual sexting, to differentiate it from behaviour in which the subject of sexual content willingly shares that content with others.

1.17 A common scenario cited in this type of sexting could occur where intimate images are consensually created and shared between an individual and his/her partner, only for these images to be circulated more widely by one party after the relationship breaks down, in an attempt to harm the reputation of the individual depicted.<sup>15</sup>

### **Issues specific to sexting among minors**

1.18 Although sexting can equally occur between two adults, the terms of reference for this inquiry focus on the issue of sexting by minors. Sexting by minors raises some specific concerns that do not apply in the context of peer-to-peer sexting between adults. This is because sexual content depicting minors can often constitute child pornography under existing Commonwealth, state and territory laws, leading to potentially severe consequences for minors involved in the creation, possession or communication of such content.<sup>16</sup>

1.19 In addition to legal concerns relating to child pornography offences, the ACMA noted that young people may be subject to heightened levels of peer pressure to create or forward sexual images, and that the impact of the subject's loss of

---

13 Australian Psychological Society, *Submission 16*, pp 8–9.

14 Law Council of Australia, *Submission 19*, p. 5.

15 Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, *Submission 13*, [p. 3].

16 See for example, BoysTown, *Submission 14*, p. 14; National Children's and Youth Law Centre, *Submission 20*, p. 3.

control over private images may be more serious and lasting for young people than adults.<sup>17</sup> The Australian Psychological Society observed:

Given that children and young people are still in the process of developing the ability to assess risk and manage the consequences of their decisions, they are particularly vulnerable to the risks of cyber threats and associated technologies. The instantaneous nature of such technologies only heightens such risks.<sup>18</sup>

1.20 The Alannah and Madeline Foundation highlighted that the issue of sexting among minors should be viewed in its proper cultural context:

It is easy to think of sexting as aberrant, even abhorrent and commentators from a number of discourses depict it in this way. However, commentators closer to the age of the doers tend to view this behaviour as more benign and part of an image-sharing culture in a sexually permissive society, one in which young people see sexualised images virtually everywhere they look. It is not surprising that they create their own sexual imagery, and perhaps unrealistic to expect that they live up to a higher standard than we set for the rest of society.<sup>19</sup>

### ***Prevalence of sexting behaviour by minors in Australia***

1.21 It is unclear exactly how prevalent sexting behaviours are among Australian young people. However, the Law Council noted:

Notwithstanding the absence of large scale data about the prevalence of sexting amongst young people in Australia, a number of commentators and youth organisations have found sexting by young people to be taking place with some frequency.<sup>20</sup>

1.22 Several recent studies provide additional information on this issue. In a survey conducted in 2012 by the ACMA, 13 per cent of respondents aged 16–17 years reported that either they or someone within their group of friends has sent sexually suggestive nude or nearly nude photos or videos of themselves to someone else, while 18 per cent of respondents aged 16–17 years reported that they or someone in their group of friends had received such images or videos of someone else.<sup>21</sup>

1.23 Other surveys conducted in Australia over the past several years have reported varying results in relation to the percentage of Australian teenagers engaging in sexting behaviour, with findings ranging between seven and 20 per cent.<sup>22</sup>

---

17 Australian Communications and Media Authority, *Submission 9*, p. 2.

18 Australian Psychological Society, *Submission 16*, p. 10.

19 The Alannah and Madeline Foundation, *Submission 7*, p. 5.

20 Law Council of Australia, *Submission 19*, p. 7.

21 Australian Communications and Media Authority, *Submission 9*, pp 3–4. The sample size for these survey questions was 241 individuals aged 16–17 years.

22 See Joint Select Committee on Cyber-Safety, Interim Report, *High-Wire Act: Cyber-Safety and the Young*, June 2011, pp 137–41.

1.24 The committee notes that a study is currently being conducted by researchers from the Sydney Institute of Criminology, the University of NSW and the University of Western Sydney about the sexting experiences of young people aged between 13 and 18 years of age. Once completed this study may provide more rigorous prevalence data and insights into sexting activities.<sup>23</sup>

***Possible negative consequences of sexting behaviour by minors***

1.25 In addition to possible legal consequences of sexting by minors (discussed below), the social impacts of sexting, particularly non-consensual sexting, can be serious and long-lasting. BoysTown commented:

When 'sext' images become public, the impacts can be multi-faceted and significant. Young people can find themselves the victims of humiliation, bullying, harassment, threat, punishment (from school and/or parents) and criminalisation. The flow on from these events can also be severe, impacting on young people's wellbeing, health, school, employment, family and peer relationships.<sup>24</sup>

1.26 The permanence of digital content is a pressing concern in relation to sexting. Once digital images are shared, and particularly if they are posted on the internet, it can be almost impossible to retrieve and destroy that content. The potential for content posted online to be widely circulated in a very short period of time compounds this problem.<sup>25</sup>

**Current legal framework in respect of sexting by minors**

1.27 The Law Council noted that there are currently no legislative provisions at the Commonwealth and state and territory levels that specifically deal with an offence of sexting.<sup>26</sup> However, several criminal and civil laws may apply to sexting behaviours, depending on the circumstances. The committee notes that these laws were designed to deal with activities associated with child pornography.

***Child pornography offences***

1.28 AGD noted that responsibility for combating child sexual exploitation is shared between the Commonwealth, states and territories, and all jurisdictions have enacted offences relating to child pornography. It is possible that sexting behaviour could be captured within the scope of these offences, at both the Commonwealth and state and territory level.<sup>27</sup>

1.29 Commonwealth offences in relation to child pornography are found in the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Criminal Code). AGD noted that while these offences do not directly criminalise sexting, the practice may be captured by offences contained in

---

23 Law Council of Australia, *Submission 19*, p. 7.

24 BoysTown, *Submission 14*, p. 12.

25 Australian Psychological Society, *Submission 16*, p. 10.

26 Law Council of Australia, *Submission 19*, p. 7.

27 Attorney-General's Department, *Submission 5*, p. 2.

Subdivision D of Division 474 of the Criminal Code, which criminalise a range of conduct relating to the use of a 'carriage service' such as the internet or mobile telephone for child pornography.<sup>28</sup>

1.30 Section 474.19 of the Criminal Code provides that it is an offence to use a carriage service for child pornography material (by accessing, transmitting, publishing, distributing, advertising, promoting or soliciting such material). Section 474.20 of the Criminal Code provides that it is an offence to possess, control, produce, supply or obtain child pornography material for use through a carriage service.

1.31 For the purposes of the Criminal Code, child pornography is material that depicts a person under 18 engaged in a sexual pose or sexual activity, or that has as its dominant characteristic the depiction for a sexual purpose of a sexual organ of a person under 18, and which reasonable persons would regard as being, in all the circumstances, offensive.<sup>29</sup> The offences in sections 474.19–20 of the Criminal Code carry maximum penalties of 15 years imprisonment.<sup>30</sup>

1.32 AGD stated that while these offences may be applicable to some sexting behaviours between minors, they are rarely used in such cases:

...the offences are subject to a range of protections to ensure that behaviour such as sexting, which is not exploitative of or harmful to children, is not inappropriately captured by the Criminal Code. There is scope for law enforcement to take the circumstances of the particular case into account before proceeding to investigate or prosecute such offences. Similarly, prosecution agencies are required to consider whether the prosecution of a young person is, in all the circumstances, in the public interest, before proceeding with the case.

As an additional safeguard, under section 474.24C of the Criminal Code, the consent of the Attorney-General is required prior to the commencement of proceedings for an offence against Subdivision D of Part 10.6 of the Code (which includes Commonwealth online child pornography offences) if the person was under 18 years of age at the time he or she allegedly engaged in the conduct constituting the offence.

To date, the Attorney-General's consent has only been sought in circumstances where a young person's conduct was clearly malicious or exploitative.<sup>31</sup>

1.33 Each state and territory has separate criminal legislation that may be used to regulate sexting, with the Victorian Parliament Report noting that 'since 2005, no two jurisdictions in Australia have had the same child pornography laws'. As a

---

28 Attorney-General's Department, *Submission 5*, p. 3.

29 Attorney-General's Department, *Submission 5*, p. 3. See section 473.1, *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth).

30 Australian Federal Police, *Submission 4*, p. 7.

31 Attorney-General's Department, *Submission 5*, p. 3.

consequence, there are significant differences in relation to the definitions, interpretations, elements of the offences and age of the relevant child contained in each jurisdiction's legislation.<sup>32</sup>

1.34 The committee has not examined the relevant legislation of each state and territory in relation to sexting. However, submissions provided by the Law Council of Australia and the National Children's and Youth Law Centre contain information on the current law in the states and territories.<sup>33</sup> The Victorian Parliamentary Report also provides a list of the relevant legislation in all jurisdictions.<sup>34</sup>

### *Sex Offender Registration*

1.35 Each state and territory jurisdiction in Australia has legislation providing for the establishment and maintenance of a register for child sex offenders, based on national model legislation agreed to by the Australasian Police Ministers Council in 2004.<sup>35</sup> A national database of information about offenders registered under each of the state and territory schemes, the Australian National Child Offender Register, is managed at a Commonwealth level by CrimTrac, and is accessible by the registrars of the sex offender registries in each jurisdiction.<sup>36</sup>

1.36 In almost all Australian jurisdictions, individuals over 18 years of age who are convicted of specified offences, including child pornography offences, must automatically be registered on the relevant sex offender registry, while the registration of offenders who are under 18 years of age is generally at the discretion of the courts. Registration on a sex offenders registry requires the individual to undertake mandatory reporting for a period of up to eight years (depending on the jurisdiction), as well as limiting the individual's ability to take up employment in areas involving young people.

### ***Other Commonwealth offences which may be applicable***

1.37 Section 474.17 of the Criminal Code provides that it is an offence for an individual to use a carriage service to menace, harass or cause offence. This offence carries a maximum sentence of three years imprisonment. Tasmania Police indicated in its submission that, in circumstances where sexting images (whether of adults or children) are maliciously forwarded to others by an individual without the consent of the subject, Tasmania Police may seek prosecution under this offence.<sup>37</sup>

32 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 86.

33 Law Council of Australia, *Submission 19*, pp 11–13; National Children's and Youth Law Centre, *Submission 20*, Attachment.

34 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, pp 210–11.

35 Law Council of Australia, *Policy Statement on Registration and Reporting Obligations for Child Sex Offenders*, 2010, pp 1–2, <http://www1.lawcouncil.asn.au/lawcouncil/index.php/library/policies-and-guidelines> (accessed 30 July 2013).

36 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 97.

37 Tasmania Police, *Submission 3*, p. 2.

---

*Civil offences*

1.38 In addition to criminal offences, sexting behaviour may constitute breaches of civil law, depending on the circumstances.

1.39 The Australian Federal Police noted in its submission that certain sexting behaviours may constitute sexual harassment under the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth).<sup>38</sup> The Victorian Parliament Report noted that two common law torts, breach of confidence and intentional infliction of harm, may potentially apply where intimate images of an individual are distributed without consent.<sup>39</sup> Copyright and defamation laws may also be applicable in certain circumstances.<sup>40</sup>

---

38 Australian Federal Police, *Submission 4*, pp 7–8.

39 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, pp 165 and 168–69.

40 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, pp 164–65 and 170–73.





# CHAPTER 2

## Key issues

### Introduction

2.1 Stakeholders involved in the inquiry identified several key matters in relation to options for addressing the issue of sexting by minors. These centre around the need for reform to the legislative framework for dealing with the issue of sexting by minors, and effectively targeting educational initiatives to help young people, parents and school teachers deal with this issue.

2.2 A multi-faceted approach to dealing with sexting by minors was favoured by submitters. The Australian Federal Police (AFP) stated:

Of paramount importance is the prevention of the circulation of explicit images of minors, and the immediate and longer term consequences of actions associated with sexting. A multi-faceted response consisting of education, awareness raising and the application of either Commonwealth or State and Territory legislation are required to address the issue of sexting.

Any strategy to address this issue needs to ensure that youth are empowered to make informed decisions about themselves, including images of themselves, and how they want their 'brand' portrayed now and into the future.<sup>1</sup>

### Options for legislative reform

2.3 Submitters to the inquiry proposed several options for possible legislative reform to help address the issue of sexting by minors in Australia. These include introducing defences into Commonwealth child pornography offences to cover consensual sexting between minors; introducing a new criminal offence to cover the non-consensual distribution of sexting images; and introducing a new statutory tort for the invasion of privacy.

#### *Possible changes to child pornography offences*

2.4 Various stakeholders expressed the view that the scope of the existing Commonwealth child pornography offences needs to be altered in order to exclude non-harmful sexting behaviour between minors so that young people do not unwittingly commit a serious and punishable offence.<sup>2</sup>

#### *Problems with applying existing Commonwealth offences to sexting cases*

2.5 Several submitters argued that sexting behaviour should not be treated in the same way as the creation or distribution of child pornography. For example, the Australian Universities' Anti-Bullying Research Alliance noted that minors can

---

1 Australian Federal Police, *Submission 4*, p. 9.

2 See for example, Law Council of Australia, *Submission 19*, p. 18.

currently be charged under child pornography offences with 'little recognition...of the inherent differences between their image sharing, and either those of paedophiles sharing and distributing images or adults sharing intimate images of partners'.<sup>3</sup> Telstra commented that that young people under the age of 18 'who have *consensually* produced or circulated images of themselves cannot be viewed through the same lens as the *non-consensual* production or circulation of sexual imagery, or child pornography'.<sup>4</sup>

2.6 In relation to the adequacy of legislation covering these issues, the Australian Universities' Anti-Bullying Research Alliance argued:

...the laws which we currently have are being outstripped at a rapid rate. They have been written for a previous era, by adults who have never experienced being adolescents surrounded by this avalanche of technology which is changing the ways they think, operate and relate.<sup>5</sup>

2.7 The Law Council of Australia (Law Council) contended:

Whilst sexting may not always be innocuous or victimless, nor something to be encouraged or condoned...sexting by young people (that is, those aged under 18 years) is not necessarily the type of predatory and exploitative behaviour sought to be targeted by laws that are designed to criminalise child pornography activity.<sup>6</sup>

2.8 The Law Council advocated for the introduction of a 'more comprehensive and satisfactory legislative solution' to distinguish between the different types of conduct which could currently be captured by the child pornography provisions, such as sexting, and behaviour that could be described as 'genuine child pornography'.<sup>7</sup>

2.9 These submitters argued that the potential penalties associated with child pornography offences are disproportionate to the level of harm caused in sexting cases. For example, Youth Off The Streets argued that it is 'absurd that two consenting teens can text each other and end up on the registered sex offenders list for the rest of their lives' as a result of conviction under child pornography offences.<sup>8</sup>

2.10 A representative from the Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy informed the committee that the potential liability of victims of non-consensual sexting under child pornography offences can act as a disincentive to reporting harmful incidents to the relevant authorities:

The research that has been done shows that people are not really sure who to report to. But it also shows that, when a child becomes aware that they

---

3 Australian Universities' Anti-Bullying Research Alliance, *Submission 18*, p. 10.

4 Telstra, *Submission 22*, p. 2.

5 Australian Universities' Anti-Bullying Research Alliance, *Submission 18*, p. 20.

6 Law Council of Australia, *Submission 19*, p. 4; see also Youth Law Centre ACT, *Submission 24*, p. 5.

7 Law Council of Australia, *Submission 19*, p. 11.

8 Youth Off the Streets, *Submission 6*, [p. 4].

may, by taking such an image and sending it consensually to their boyfriend or girlfriend, have committed an offence, that acts as a disincentive for them to report. So there is the normal embarrassment and difficulty most children would experience when dealing with the police. On top of that, if they know that they might actually be liable to be prosecuted themselves if they want to take action in relation to the non-consensual on-sending of their images, that is a disincentive.<sup>9</sup>

*Reliance on the discretion of law enforcement agencies in charging minors*

2.11 Submitters noted that law enforcement agencies, at both Commonwealth and state and territory levels, can exercise discretion in deciding not to charge minors with Commonwealth child pornography offences.<sup>10</sup> Some submitters questioned whether this represents an adequate safeguard against disproportionate penalties being applied in sexting cases. The Law Council argued:

...police appear to have used discretion in not charging any person under 18 years of age with sexting type offences under the [Commonwealth] Criminal Code to date. Notwithstanding this, the Law Council remains concerned that as long as the child pornography offences remain the only option for dealing with sexting, there is the possibility that young people may be convicted of these serious offences in circumstances where the behaviour may not be of an exploitative nature, which these offences are primarily aimed at addressing.<sup>11</sup>

2.12 Sexting cases do not appear to be treated uniformly by the AFP and the other state and territory police agencies.<sup>12</sup> The AFP informed the committee that it has not charged any persons under the age of 18 years with 'sexting' type offences under the Criminal Code, and noted:

Current agreements within the justice system focus upon intervention (diversion), interview and education as opposed to formal criminal proceedings unless the behaviour is deemed as exceedingly predatory or malicious (such as in instances of 'sextortion').

In practice, the application of criminal law to sexting type offences is decided on a case-by-case basis and referred to State police for their discretion.<sup>13</sup>

2.13 Tasmania Police noted that it has adopted a policy position that consensual activity between children generally should not be dealt with as a criminal matter, and that it would only consider the use of child exploitation material offences against a

---

9 Ms Angela Flannery, General Counsel, Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, *Committee Hansard*, 1 August 2013, p. 6.

10 See for example, Australian Federal Police, *Submission 4*, p. 8; Attorney-General's Department, *Submission 5*, pp 3–4.

11 Law Council of Australia, *Submission 19*, p. 10.

12 See for example, National Children's and Youth Law Centre, *Submission 20*, pp 2–3.

13 Australian Federal Police, *Submission 4*, p. 8.

young person in circumstances where the conduct is clearly exploitative.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, NSW Police have indicated that they will typically not press charges in cases of sexting between minors unless the behaviour is malicious.<sup>15</sup> In contrast to this approach, it has recently been reported that in Queensland, 240 children were charged with child pornography offences between January and May 2013 for sexting-related behaviour.<sup>16</sup>

2.14 The National Children's and Youth Law Centre (NCYLC) argued that the different approaches taken by law enforcement agencies create uncertainty as to the repercussions of sexting for young people.<sup>17</sup>

*Recommendations from a Victorian Parliamentary Committee*

2.15 In its *Inquiry into Sexting* report, the Parliament of Victorian Law Reform Committee recommended that Victorian child pornography laws be amended, to create a defence against prosecution to cover most forms of consensual sexting by young people. The Victorian Parliament Report recommended that this defence should operate where:

- (a) The film or photograph depicts only the accused person; or
- (b) That, at the time of making, taking or being given the film or photograph, the accused was not more than 2 years older than the minor was or appeared to be; and
  - (i) The film or photograph depicts the accused person engaged in lawful sexual activity; or
  - (ii) The film or photograph depicts the accused person and another person or persons with whom the accused could engage in lawful sexual activity; or
  - (iii) The film or photograph depicts a person with whom the accused could engage in lawful sexual activity, or more than one person, all of whom the accused could engage in lawful sexual activity with.<sup>18</sup>

2.16 This proposed defence would cover instances of sexting where a minor takes a self-portrait, or other instances where the sexual acts depicted are lawful, or the

---

14 Tasmania Police, *Submission 3*, p. 1.

15 Ministry for Police & Emergency Services NSW, *Submission 25*, p. 1; see also National Children's and Youth Law Centre, *New Voices / New Laws: School-age people in New South Wales speak out about the criminal laws that apply to their online behaviour*, November 2012, p. 19.

16 Katherine Feeney, 'Sexting children charged with porn offences', *Brisbane Times*, 25 June 2013 <http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/queensland/sexting-children-charged-with-porn-offences-20130625-2oub3.html> (accessed 8 August 2013).

17 National Children's and Youth Law Centre, *Submission 20*, p. 2.

18 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 145 (Recommendation 6).

accused could lawfully engage in sexual activity with other persons depicted in the sexting material.

2.17 Further, the Victorian Parliament Report recommended that the Victorian Government advocate to the Standing Council on Law and Justice that the Commonwealth, states and territories amend their criminal legislation to provide defences to child pornography offences, consistent with the new Victorian defences.<sup>19</sup>

2.18 Several submitters to this inquiry expressed support for the approach recommended in the Victorian Parliament Report, and suggested that this approach be adopted in relation to Commonwealth child pornography offences.<sup>20</sup>

### ***Possibilities for a new offence for non-consensual sexting***

2.19 The Victorian Parliament Report further recommended that, in addition to removing most sexting cases from prosecution under child pornography laws, a new offence relating to non-consensual sexting be introduced in Victoria. The Report stated:

...Victorian child pornography offences were created to apply to people who engage in predatory and sexually exploitative conduct involving children. It is not appropriate that a person who is not behaving in a sexually exploitative way could face child pornography charges. Nevertheless, a person who acts maliciously, or even carelessly, in sexting conduct, while not being exploitative, can still cause serious harm to the victim depicted in the image or footage. Given the harm that can result from non-consensual sexting, and general community recognition that this is not appropriate behaviour, it is strongly arguable that non-consensual sexting should be considered criminal behaviour.<sup>21</sup>

2.20 This proposed offence would cover instances where a person intentionally distributes, or threatens to distribute, an intimate image of another person or persons, without the subject(s) of that image consenting to the distribution.<sup>22</sup> This offence would carry less severe penalties than child pornography offences, with penalties of up to two years imprisonment.

2.21 Some submitters expressed support for the creation of this type of summary offence, and argued that such an offence should be introduced across Commonwealth and state and territory jurisdictions.<sup>23</sup>

---

19 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 146 (Recommendation 7).

20 See for example, Civil Liberties Australia, *Submission 1*, p. 2; The Alannah and Madeline Foundation, *Submission 7*, p. 3; National Children's and Youth Law Centre, *Submission 20*, p. 3; Youth Law Centre ACT, *Submission 24*, p. 6.

21 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 150.

22 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 152 (Recommendation 9).

23 See for example, Youth Law Centre ACT, *Submission 24*, p. 6.

### ***The need for national consistency***

2.22 Several submitters argued that the lack of consistency in relation to the laws that could apply to sexting in different Australian jurisdictions creates confusion and uncertainty for young people. For example, BoysTown stated:

...the confusion created by the Australian legislative environment regarding sexting makes the delivery of consistent, uncomplicated messages about sexting a challenge. Definitions of child pornography in a legal context differ between the states in Australia which leads to complications and ambiguity. One reason for the ambiguity is that the legal definition of a 'child' varies between, and even within jurisdictions.<sup>24</sup>

2.23 The NCYLC commented:

Under the current framework, a young person can be charged both under the Commonwealth and their State's legislation. In many situations the State's legislation differs greatly from the related Commonwealth offences, where the relevant cut off age for child exploitation and child pornography material is lower than it is for the Commonwealth offences.

Furthermore, the inconsistency in laws dealing with sexual behaviour (i.e. sexting and sexually intimate behaviour) can cause confusion among young people. This confusion further renders the child pornography laws incapable of deterring young people from committing offences. It also leaves victims of sexting related harm without certain options for recourse and resolution.<sup>25</sup>

### ***A statutory tort for invasion of privacy***

2.24 Some submitters argued that the issue of non-consensual distribution of sexting images could be dealt with through the introduction of a statutory tort for invasion of privacy, rather than a new criminal offence relating to sexting.<sup>26</sup> The introduction of a statutory tort for invasion of privacy has variously been recommended by the Australian Law Reform Commission, the New South Wales Law Reform Commission and the Victorian Law Reform Commission (in their relevant jurisdictions) over the last several years.<sup>27</sup> The Victorian Parliament Report into sexting also recommended that the Victorian Government consider introducing a statutory tort for invasion of privacy in that jurisdiction.<sup>28</sup>

---

24 BoysTown, *Submission 14*, p. 14.

25 National Children's and Youth Law Centre, *Submission 20*, p. 2.

26 Civil Liberties Australia, *Submission 1*, p. 1; Assistant Professor Bruce Arnold and Mr Benjamin Smith, *Submission 11*, pp 6–7.

27 Assistant Professor Bruce Arnold and Mr Benjamin Smith, *Submission 11*, p. 7.

28 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 188 (Recommendation 12).

2.25 Assistant Professor Bruce Arnold and Mr Benjamin Smith argued that a privacy tort would be preferable to criminal offences for sexting:

It is axiomatic – and should be recognised in Australian law – that the dissemination of intimate images that have either been taken without consent, or published to a third party without consent is a serious invasion of privacy...

Remedies under such a tort for unauthorised making and/or dissemination of sexting images would include compensation and apology. Such an apology would we believe be welcomed by many victims of disregard of their privacy, people who are interested in vindication – in an acknowledgment that they were wronged and that the offender (the person inappropriately making the image or disseminating the image) is contrite.

We do not believe that every victim of sexting would seek to use the tort. In practice they do not need to; it will be sufficient if a handful of people (adults and minors) successfully take action and thereby indicate to the community that particular behaviour is condemned by both ordinary Australians and the law.<sup>29</sup>

2.26 While noting that the first national symposium on Bullying, Young People and the Law supported the adoption of the Victorian Parliament Report's recommendations, including that in relation to the introduction of a privacy tort, The Alannah and Madeline Foundation commented that young people's concept of privacy may differ from that of other groups:

It is...debatable whether all people subscribe to fundamentally similar notions of privacy; that is that one controls information about oneself and shares it only to certain individuals. Young people have grown up in an environment where sharing sometimes quite intimate thoughts – and images – are seen as the norm. Private and public selves are entwined in ways it's difficult for older generations to understand.<sup>30</sup>

### ***Attorney-General's Department's view on existing Commonwealth legal framework***

2.27 The Attorney-General's Department (AGD) expressed the view that the current Commonwealth legislative regime is adequate at the present time. AGD noted that recent reforms introduced by the *Crimes Legislation Amendment (Sexual Offences Against Children) Act 2010* were 'designed to ensure that child sex-related offences in areas of Commonwealth responsibility remain comprehensive and able to deal with contemporary forms of offending'.<sup>31</sup>

---

29 Assistant Professor Bruce Arnold and Mr Benjamin Smith, *Submission 11*, pp 6 and 7.

30 The Alannah and Madeline Foundation, *Submission 7*, pp 4, 5 and 8.

31 Attorney-General's Department, *Submission 5*, p. 2.

2.28 AGD went on to comment that the offences under the Criminal Code are subject to a range of protections to ensure that behaviour such as sexting, which is not exploitative of or harmful to children, is not inappropriately captured. These protections include:

- scope for law enforcement to take the circumstances of the particular case into account before proceeding to investigate or prosecute such offences;
- prosecution agencies are required to consider whether the prosecution of a young person is, in all the circumstances, in the public interest, before proceeding with the case;
- under section 474.24C of the Criminal Code, the consent of the Attorney-General is required prior to the commencement of proceedings for an offence against Subdivision D of Part 10.6 of the Code (which includes Commonwealth online child pornography offences) if the person was under 18 years of age at the time he or she allegedly engaged in the conduct constituting the offence;<sup>32</sup>
- under the Commonwealth *Crimes Act 1914* (Crimes Act) and the Criminal Code, a child under the age of 10 years cannot be held criminally responsible for an offence; and
- under the Commonwealth Crimes Act and the Criminal Code, there is a presumption that a child aged between 10 and 14 years cannot be held criminally responsible, with the prosecution bearing the onus of proving that the child knew that their conduct was wrong.<sup>33</sup>

2.29 AGD concluded:

The Commonwealth child sex-related offence regime has been comprehensively reviewed and updated to ensure it is adapted to suit modern forms of offending, including sexting. The Commonwealth approach upholds community interest in preventing the circulation of sexually explicit images of minors by young people and avoids problematic legislative distinctions between legal and illegal forms of sexting-related behaviour.

The provisions of the Criminal Code allow the specific circumstances of each incident to be taken into account in determining whether to investigate or prosecute a young person for online child pornography offences, thereby ensuring that such offences can be dealt with appropriately...the offences strike an appropriate balance between preventing inappropriate prosecutions for sexting and ensuring children and young people are adequately protected from online sexual exploitation.<sup>34</sup>

---

32 Attorney-General's Department, *Submission 5*, pp 3–4.

33 Mr Anthony Coles, Assistant Secretary, Attorney-General's Department, *Committee Hansard*, 1 August 2013, p. 41.

34 Attorney-General's Department, *Submission 5*, p. 4.



2.30 In relation to existing Commonwealth child pornography charges, AGD argued that persons under 18 years of age should not automatically be excluded:

[These offences] are not designed to target young people engaged in sexting and similar behaviours. However, persons under 18 years of age are not excluded from the operation of the provisions...such an exclusion would potentially reduce protections for children and young people against online child pornography offences in circumstances where the incident involved malicious or exploitative behaviour.<sup>35</sup>

### **Educational initiatives**

2.31 Submitters to the inquiry emphasised the importance of creating appropriate educational strategies to help young people, parents and teachers as being the primary driver of positive behavioural change in relation to sexting.<sup>36</sup> In the view of many stakeholders, the legal framework for dealing with sexting should only operate as a 'last resort' where education and awareness raising has been unsuccessful.<sup>37</sup> For example, the Australian Psychological Society stated:

...the legal implications surrounding sexting by children and young people should not lead to a solely legal solution to the issue. Informed parenting, school-based practices and educational approaches offer the most productive way forward.<sup>38</sup>

### **Successful approaches to educational initiatives**

2.32 Submitters raised several issues in relation to the best way to formulate and target educational and awareness raising initiatives in this area. The Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) stated that educational programs relating to cyber safety:

- must be effectively targeted to the audience;
- should use a variety of delivery mechanisms to maximise engagement;
- must be evidence based, and evaluated to ensure they are driving behavioural change; and
- should incorporate a partnership approach between industry, government and non-government stakeholders.<sup>39</sup>

---

35 Attorney-General's Department, *Submission 5*, p. 3.

36 See for example, Australian Universities' Anti-Bullying Research Alliance, *Submission 18*, p. 12.

37 See for example, St John Ambulance Australia, *Submission 8*, pp 1–2; Australian Communications and Media Authority, *Submission 9*, p. 5; Assistant Professor Bruce Arnold and Mr Benjamin Smith, *Submission 11*, pp 3 and 5.

38 Australian Psychological Society, *Submission 16*, p. 5.

39 Australian Communications and Media Authority, *Submission 9*, pp 5–8.

2.33 BoysTown noted the success of approaches which are age-appropriate and presented in the media with which young people regularly engage. BoysTown argued that campaigns targeting young people should include:

- user interactivity;
- less formal, more conversational tone;
- youth-focused concepts;
- empowering messages; and
- opportunity for peer-based learning and support.<sup>40</sup>

2.34 Several submitters emphasised the importance of including parents and carers as well as young people in targeted education strategies. Youth Off The Streets argued that parents need to be given appropriate tools to be able to discuss online behaviour with their children.<sup>41</sup> BoysTown agreed, advocating further support for 'adequately-funded initiatives to increase the knowledge, understanding, skills and confidence of parents and carers in fostering a safe digital communications culture among children and young people'.<sup>42</sup>

#### *Strategies for responding to sexting incidents*

2.35 The NCYLC argued that there needs to be a greater focus on providing guidance in how to respond to sexting incidents:

...there is a preponderance of cyber safety programs and initiatives with a major focus on prevention and education but there is a dearth of resources directed to advocating for quick and effective solutions once an incident has occurred.<sup>43</sup>

2.36 The NCYLC articulated three key principles it believed should inform strategies to respond to sexting incidents:

- every party involved in sexting incidents (including victims, alleged perpetrators, schools and in particular, police) must have access to accurate legal information and advice about sexting and appropriate referral pathways to ensure there is a holistic response;
- responses to sexting should provide the young people involved with the opportunity to participate in the resolution of the incident, which will in turn facilitate informed decision making by all parties; and
- this participation should be guided by principles of procedural fairness.<sup>44</sup>

---

40 BoysTown, *Submission 14*, p. 16.

41 Youth Off the Streets, *Submission 6*, [p. 4].

42 BoysTown, *Submission 14*, p. 3; see also Australian Psychological Society, *Submission 16*, p. 18.

43 National Children's and Youth Law Centre, *Submission 20*, p. 5.

44 National Children's and Youth Law Centre, *Submission 20*, p. 5.

---

### ***Existing educational and awareness raising initiatives***

2.37 Several existing educational initiatives relating to cyber safety and sexting that are currently operating in Australia were mentioned by submitters.

#### *ACMA's Cybersmart Program*

2.38 The ACMA informed the committee that it operates a suite of educational initiatives in this area, through its Cybersmart Program. This incorporates a number of elements, including:

- the Cybersmart Outreach program, delivering face-to-face presentations for young people, parents and teachers alongside full day or half day Professional Development modules for teachers, and tailored sessions for Pre-Service teachers;
- the Cybersmart website, which offers general information, education programs and lesson plans, as well as specific information on sexting including content to help young people who have sent a sext and subsequently regretted it, advising them of practical steps they can take to help remedy the situation;
- the Cybersmart Online Helpline, a free, confidential counselling service for young people impacted by sexting and other cyber issues offered in partnership with Kids Helpline;
- *Tagged*, a short film and education package for teens dealing with the issues of cyberbullying, sexting, and digital reputation management; and
- Cybersmart's Facebook campaign for teens, 'The Cloud', which provides engaging content in a humorous, teen-friendly format, with opportunity for user comment and feedback.<sup>45</sup>

2.39 The AMCA noted that its Cybersafety programs are evidence based and targeted to reach not just persons directly involved in sexting, but peers, parents and teachers.<sup>46</sup>

#### *Other government initiatives*

2.40 The AFP stated that it operates several educational initiatives in relation to online safety, including:

- cyber safety educational presentations, delivered to school aged children on online safety risks including sexting; and
- the 'ThinkUKnow' cyber safety program, delivering awareness-raising sessions to parents, carers and teachers on issues including cyber bullying, sexting and online grooming.<sup>47</sup>

---

45 Australian Communications and Media Authority, *Submission 9*, pp 6–7.

46 Australian Communications and Media Authority, *Submission 9*, pp 5 and 7.

47 Australian Federal Police, *Submission 4*, pp 4–5.

2.41 The Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy noted that it runs a Budd:e program to teach school aged children about the risks of providing personal information and images to others.<sup>48</sup>

#### *Non-government sector programs*

2.42 Several industry and non-government organisations also informed the committee about educational programs and awareness raising initiatives currently being implemented.

2.43 The Alannah and Madeline Foundation runs the eSmart Schools and eSmart Libraries programs. eSmart Schools is designed to help schools manage cyber safety and deal with cyber bullying and bullying. It is available to all schools across Australia with more than 1,700 schools participating. The eSmart Libraries is a behaviour change system for libraries to improve cyber safety and wellbeing and deal with cyber bullying. It is being piloted in 21 library services.<sup>49</sup>

2.44 BoysTown operates Kids Helpline, a national telephone and online information support and counselling service for young people, which includes information and resources relating to sexting and cyber bullying.<sup>50</sup>

#### **Other issues**

2.45 In addition to the strong focus on the legislative and educational framework surrounding the issue of sexting, it was also suggested in evidence to the committee that a national digital communications tribunal be established.

#### ***A national digital communications tribunal***

2.46 Further to any possible legislative changes, the Victorian Parliament Report recommended that the Victorian Government advocate that the Standing Council on Law and Justice consider issues surrounding the creation of a national Digital Communications Tribunal to deal with and resolve complaints about harmful digital communications.<sup>51</sup>

2.47 Currently, the ACMA has a role in investigating complaints about prohibited and potentially prohibited material posted online. The ACMA is only able to request that material be removed where it is prohibited under the Australian National Classification Scheme, and can only issue take-down notices in relation to material that is hosted in Australia.<sup>52</sup> In certain circumstances individuals may also be able to

---

48 Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, *Submission 13*, [p. 4].

49 The Alannah and Madeline Foundation, *Submission 7*, pp 5–6.

50 BoysTown, *Submission 14*, pp 6 and 8–9.

51 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 202 (Recommendation 14).

52 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, pp 196–197.

take complaints in relation to material posted online to the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission or the Australian Federal Police.<sup>53</sup>

2.48 In relation to material posted to online social media or other sites, most major social media services require users to comply with terms of use that prohibit unlawful or offensive content, with mechanisms for users to report inappropriate content for removal by the service provider.<sup>54</sup>

## **Conclusion**

2.49 The evidence provided to the committee during this inquiry indicates that sexting has become a regular activity for many minors (young people aged under 18 years). The emergence of new technologies has facilitated the creation and transmission of sexual content through electronic media.

2.50 Much of this activity takes place between consenting young people and is therefore relatively benign. However, in some instances, sexting activities are coercive, exploitative or undertaken with malicious intent. It was argued by many submitters that the current legislative framework requires review to ensure that consensual sexting is not captured by those laws targeting child pornography. Evidence was also received which supported the introduction of changes to effectively address non-consensual sexting.

2.51 The committee considers that the evidence it received demonstrated the serious and complex nature of sexting by minors. However, given the short timeframe in which it has had to undertake this inquiry, the committee was unable to fully explore all the issues raised in the evidence. In particular, the committee considers that the suggestions made in relation to changes to Commonwealth laws including amendments to the child pornography laws and the introduction of a new offence for non-consensual sexting require further, in-depth consideration.

2.52 In addition, some submitters called for the creation of a national digital communications tribunal. The committee considers that further work is necessary to determine whether such a body could effectively provide access to remedies other than those that are already available under the current regulatory framework.

2.53 The committee therefore considers that an inquiry into options for addressing the issue of sexting by minors be re-referred by the Senate in the 44<sup>th</sup> Parliament in order to investigate and deliberate further on the matters raised in evidence.

Senator Catryna Bilyk  
**Chair**

---

53 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, p. 198.

54 Victorian Parliament Law Reform Committee, *Inquiry into Sexting*, 29 May 2013, pp 191-93.



# **APPENDIX 1**

## **Submissions and Additional Information received by the Committee**

- 1 Civil Liberties Australia
- 2 Australian Privacy Foundation
- 3 Tasmania Police
- 4 Australian Federal Police
- 5 Attorney-General's Department
- 6 Youth Off The Streets Limited
- 7 The Alannah and Madeline Foundation
- 8 St John Ambulance Australia
- 9 Australian Communications and Media Authority
- 10 The Australian Family Association
- 11 Assistant Professor Bruce Arnold and Mr Benjamin Smith
- 12 Optus
- 13 Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy
- 14 BoysTown
- 15 Northern Territory Police
- 16 The Australian Psychological Society
- 17 Commissioner for Children and Young People Western Australia
- 18 The Australian Universities' Anti-Bullying Research Alliance
- 19 Law Council of Australia
- 20 National Children's and Youth Law Centre
- 21 Northern Territory Attorney-General Minister for Justice
- 22 Telstra Corporation Limited
- 23 Home Loan Experts
- 24 Youth Law Centre ACT
- 25 Ministry for Police and Emergency Services (NSW Government)

**Answers to Questions on Notice**

- 1 Answer to Question on Notice, Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, 1 August 2013, received 5 August 2013
- 2 Answer to Question on Notice, Attorney-General's Department, 1 August 2013, received 9 August 2013

**Additional Information**

- 1 Youth Affairs Council of Victoria, Additional Information, received 1 August 2013
- 2 The Alannah and Madeline Foundation, Additional Information, received 1 August 2013



## **APPENDIX 2**

### **Witnesses who appeared before the Committee**

*Thursday, 1 August 2013*

*Committee Room G3, Parliament of Victoria Committee Rooms, 55 St Andrews Place, Melbourne*

#### **Witnesses**

##### **Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy**

Mr Brian Kelleher, Acting First Assistant Secretary, Digital Economy  
Ms Lucy Kobier, Acting Director, Cybersafety Policy and Coordination  
Ms Angela Flannery, General Counsel

##### **Australian Communications and Media Authority**

Ms Sharon Trotter, Cybersmart Program Manager  
Ms Andree Wright, Executive Manager, Security, Safety and Education

##### **The Alannah and Madeline Foundation**

Dr Judith Slocombe, Chief Executive Officer  
The Hon. Alastair Nicholson, AO, QC, RFD, Chair, National Centre Against Bullying  
Ms Sandra Craig, Manager, National Centre Against Bullying

##### **Youth Affairs Council of Victoria**

Ms Georgie Ferrari, Chief Executive Officer

**Mr Clem Newton-Brown MP**, former Chair, Law Reform Committee, Victorian Parliament

**Dr Vaughn Koops**, former Executive Officer, Law Reform Committee, Victorian Parliament

##### **Attorney-General's Department (*via teleconference*)**

Mr Anthony Coles, Assistant Secretary, Criminal Law and Law Enforcement Branch  
Ms Brooke Hartigan, Principal Legal Officer, Criminal Law Reform Section  
Ms Jenna Priestly, Legal Officer, Criminal Law Reform Section