

CI 100 M Tivey

First name: Mick

Last name: Tivey

Q1:

Q2: To inform, and ONLY to inform. NEVER to censor or in ANY way restrict access.

Q3: Yes, computer and video games are NOT reality, OR real-life. It is not acceptable that they be classified as such. They should be treated much more leniently than, say, a movie.

Q4: Yes

Q5: Potential, no. It's too subjective to arbitrarily judge. Only actual, and then with broad discretion.

Q6:

Q7: Certainly not.

Q8: No, they are fine as they are.

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12: Education. NEVER blocking, censorship or any other restriction. Education so people know HOW the net works, WHY it works the way it does, and how to keep themselves safe and un-offended online. It is NOT the job for a filter.

Q13: Education. Oh, and did I mention EDUCATION.

Q14: Education again, and END-USER filters. NEVER an ISP or Government-controlled filter. I will decide what my kids can and can't see, thanks anyway.

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19: If the Govt expects them to BE classified, then certainly.

Q20: I believe so, except for the incomprehensible lack of an R18+ games rating.

Q21: A genuine R18+ rating for games. NOT just different numbers beside the current MA15 rating, but a proper 'higher' rating. And remove the 'RC' category altogether, NOTHING but child-porn should EVER be 'refused' classification.

Q22:

Q23:

Q24: Apart from child-porn (and I mean REAL porn, NOT 'Simpsons' cartoons or over-18s in school uniforms. That is NOT CP and never will be), NOTHING should EVER be totally prohibited online. Nothing.

Q25: No. Unrealistic, and WAY too 'conservative'. Get rid of RC altogether.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29: Forget and reject, once and for all, ANY notions of filtering or censoring the internet. It won't achieve the claimed effect, and there is NO good reasons apart from that to implement it. Unless it is to enable censorship further into the future, in which case it is doubly unacceptable.

Other comments: