

CI 1122 S Burton

First name: Steven

Last name: Burton

Q1:

Improving elements of the existing framework, i.e Adding an 18+ classification for games.

Q2:

See above.

Q3:

No, it's not the medium that is the issue, or realistically even the content of the medium, it's the lack of access to the content through a refusal of classification as a result of short-sightedness in the current system.

Q4:

No, guidelines should always be in place, classification is fine, so long as there is access to it.

Q5:

Of course, the impact of the content is not the issue in this debate, nor is whether or not classifications should exist it's that in certain instances media is effectively censored because it's unable to be classified in the current frame-work.

Q6:

No, whether it is designed to reach one hundred or one million it should be classified, but ultimately available.

Q7:

Some, not all.

Q8:

Yes, within reason, again classification is fine so long as it's accessible by those of age.

Q9:

No, see above.

Q10:

In certain circumstances, but that would obviously depend on what the content is and what medium it's designed to be used in.

Q11:

Classification is fine, so long as content is accessible. Simply put classification should be a guideline as to what should or shouldn't be consumed and what to expect if consuming the media, it should not be a system that prevents the potential audience from viewing it altogether.

Q12:

Access shouldn't be restricted, instead parents should act like parents and properly supervise impressionable children on the internet the same way you would with books or television. The government isn't elected to tell people what they can and cannot read or view and millions shouldn't be punished because of the failings of the very small minority.

Q13:

Proper parenting. Protection of children is not an appropriate argument for restricting what adults can view.

Q14:

Proper Parenting.

Q15:

When it is deemed to be outside of the "all ages" classification.

Q16:

Advisory in all cases, investigative if it's believed a business is in violation i.e. distributing 18+ content to minors etc.

Q17:

Yes

Q18:

Pornography

Q19:

Yes, paid for by fines for violations of classification,i.e. distributing 18+ content to minors etc.

Q20:

To an extent. Parents need to be better educated on the difference between M and MA.

Q21:

18+ categories for video games. It's ridiculous nigh orwellian that content cannot be sold because a classification level doesn't exist for no practical reason.

Q22:

bottom left corner, bottom right, top left, top right, pick one that fits with locations of bar codes, pricing stickers etc and make it standard.

Q23:

It would make sense

Q24:

Based on what has been refused classification in the past by government bodies... Nothing.

Q25:

Based on what has been refused classification in the past by government bodies... No.

Q26:

Yes, they should be more uniform.

Q27:

Federal guidelines implemented by the states and territories.

Q28:

Depends if Stephen Conroy is involved, more than once in public statements he's shown a complete lack of understanding in regards to how the internet and media content in general works.

Q29:

Stop trying to tell australian adults what they can and cannot view. No one elects a government because they want tighter restrictions on personal liberties.

Other comments:

Australia is in danger of becoming a ridiculously tight-fisted nanny state attempting an internet censoring program is ridiculous in and of itself. Clarity, education and advise for parents is what's

needed, not restriction of liberties.

Also, bring in an 18+ classification of video-games they're an art-form like television, movies, paintings or books, they should be classified similarly and available to adults if we wish to purchase them. It's 2011, we vote, we pay taxes and we're educated, treat us like it.