

CI 59 M Bartlett

First name: Maureen

Last name: Bartlett

Q1: Greatly improve key elements of existing framework

Q2:

Classifications should reflect community values.

Parents should be able to rely on classifications and these classifications should be specific.

Children should be protected at all costs even when they are unaware of this need.

Harmful material should not be distributed within a community. This violates community and family standards

Q3: Let's not use state of the art technology to be the carrier of unsuitable material, particularly to children. One reason is that children often have access to state of the art mobile phones to ensure their safety and to be in touch with parents or an adult. Unsolicited and unsuitable material should not be allowed to be distributed via this media.

Q4: It's pretty much too late when the complaint arrives. Many people object vehemently but few report/complain officially.

Q5: Potential impact of content should always be considered. Our children are our most valuable resource and should be protected. Mess with their developing minds and the whole community pays the price.

Q6: What is said at a family barbecue and what is said on the world-wide stage are two different things. However the world-wide stage can often be reflected at the family barbecue so we need to be consistent in classification.

Q7: There is no room for exploitation or possibility of exploitation with regard to children. We have beautiful bodies, nobody would deny this. However to exploit such beauty, particularly child beauty should neither be encouraged nor allowed. Classification should be refused regardless of how the artist interprets such beauty.

Q8: We see, we hear. The words are absorbed in both cases. Therefore audio books and music lyrics should be classified with the same integrity as all other media. At present many lyrics go to air against community and family standards. This continually lowers standards, embarrasses people and pours obscenities into the youth of Australia.

Q9: This has been covered in Question 6 - bottom line is to be consistent in classification

Q10: Refer Q6 and Q9 - be consistent in classification

Q11: The moral decline in Australia and the increased out in the open street warfare amongst youth, together with disrespect and disregard for age or race should put pressure on those who are in the business of classification to take

their position seriously and with due responsibility. As standards of material drops, please don't drop the standards of classification.

Q12: Computer online mandatory filtering would exclude material classified RC, X18+ or R18+. An access to R18+ opt-in could further assist if there is age verification.

Q13:

Q12's mandatory filtering would assist at the point of computer viewing, say in the family home. Education of busy parents as to the consequences of not supervising children/youth, even when digging up 'assignment' information. Locate computers in places where parents can observe. Keep the bedroom door open.

Q14:

Education of parents. Make purpose of classification of sexually explicit magazines known to teachers, parents, children/youth. Encourage parents to educate their own children in sexual matters and to be more open with them. If the classification is Restricted (R), these publications should only be allowed to be sold in an 'adult area'. We have measures to prevent children buying cigarettes and alcohol - be consistent.

Q15: Always. Just as nutrition details are printed across the board, so we need to know what we are viewing, reading, listening to.

Q16: In a perfect world all the players should take their role seriously. If one body lets the team down this is no reason for the others to slacken off. We need responsible classification to be preserved in government, industry and the media, and for users to be more savvy with classifications. When users/community can trust accurate classification they will be more likely to take notice and put to use the tremendous spend that such classifications cost our Country.

Q17:

Keep it simple, keep it consistent.

As in Q1 - improve key elements of existing framework

Q18: Keep it simple, keep it consistent.

Q19: Keep it simple, keep it consistent. Small businesses have to organise the declaration of their nutrition or other contents, so too should small independent films.

Q20: The classification categories are generally understood but they are not always consistent. There is room for tightening up in the PG area. The blasphemy that is allowed in the PG rating is very upsetting. Blasphemy and coarse language should be treated more seriously. This needs to be passed on to film makers.

Q21:

A. Existing classifications should remain with the exception of X18+ for films. These should be abolished. Explicit sexual acts should be Refused Classification as these exploit and demean women. They encourage sexual abuse and premature sexualisation of children.

B. With acceptance of gay/lesbian marriage/relationships surging in Australia, I think this content needs to be classified and not just pushed through as 'sexual content'.

C. R18+ computer games should NOT be classified because the violence is associated with increased violent attitudes and behaviour.

Q22: State the classification up front. Make it easily visible. In films, videos and audio clips, make the classification vocal. Note classifications on billboards, on advertisements, over the radio - wherever the content is advertised. Just like government advertisements bear ownership of the messenger - note the classification whenever an advertisement goes to air or press.

Q23: Yes

Q24:

Child pornography

Grooming of children

Gay/lesbian 'how to' content

Access to RC, X18+ or R18+ should be prohibited to the general user. Opt-in access to R18+ could be provided with strict age verification.

Q25: No - you can access anything online

Q26: Yes I believe this is important, but if one is more liberal I don't think this is reason to 'open the flood-gates'. Just as one family or community may differ from another, if one state believes strongly in upholding some moral principle, then that state should not be ridiculed.

Q27:

Why replace? Build on what we already have.

Keep it simple, keep it consistent. Listen to the people of Australia.

As in Q1 - improve key elements of existing framework

Q28: Same as for Q27. Unless Classifiers miserably fall down on their duty across the states, why establish a new framework. My answer in Q26 allows for a particular state to uphold a moral principle that others have let slip. States have their own voice and only in a shambles situation would there be need for the Commonwealth to introduce legislation establishing a new framework.

Q29: Tighten up the classifications and make them consistent in all types of Australian media.

Other comments: