

CI 1291 P Keogh

First name: Patrick

Last name: Keogh

Q1:

How it is done is not my concern. What is done is more important.

Q2:

To provide guidance to adults as to the nature of materials and to provide controlled access for minors where this is practicable without impacting on freedom of expression.

Q3:

No.

Q4:

No.

Q5:

Well obviously yes to the first question. What would the point be in classifying content with no impact? The classification scheme should be media-agnostic.

Q6:

Yes, this is part of "potential impact".

Q7:

Yes for providing consumer advice, no for restricting access.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

Yes, this is part of "potential impact".

Q10:

Yes, this is part of "potential impact". If it is accessed at home then the concept of parental responsibility should be presumed to reduce the risk, so long as parental guidance is provided.

Q11:

The current scheme is far more tolerant of violence, risk taking, aggression than it is of sexual content. This is unnatural and unhealthy and does not tie in with any definition of "potential impact" that I can perceive.

Q12:

I do not believe that there are any effective methods of controlling.

Q13:

Teach parental responsibility.

Q14:

Seems adequate right now. Teaching parental responsibility will enhance this.

Q15:

Always at point of purchase/display/acquisition.

Q16:

Industry bodies have a vested interest and cannot be trusted. The role of government agencies is to understand the will of the people in the context of the constitution and to provide classification. Users need to take a stronger role in (self) regulation.

Q17:

Probably less effective. Why not make it possible to self classify, with penalties for getting it wrong and/or something like a "three strikes" rule? Look at the rules for serving alcohol in licensed premises. The establishment "self classifies" whether the patron is drunk/under age but pays the price if they get it wrong. Creators/importers should have the option of asking for a classification but it shouldn't be compulsory.

Q18:

See answer to 17.

Q19:

Never, although the level of scrutiny should be based on the "potential impact", so for small independent films with limited distribution the level of scrutiny may be reduced to a simple questionnaire rather than having to view the movie. It is all about risk.

Q20:

Yes.

Q21:

Not that I can see. More focus on violence/risk taking/aggression required.

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Don't make a law against it if you can't police it. Prohibition did not work, does not work, cannot work.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Yes. Abolish the states. Just joking.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments: