First name: Damien
Last name: Bushby

Q1:
Yes, I think the framework needs to be changed to remove media distributors self-classification, which regularly shows advertisements and programs that contain content which should only be shown after my children are in bed.

Q2:
To ensure children do not watch material that will influence them negatively, such as violence, sexuality and drugs.

Q3:
No, I think all content should be classified. This would also help my web filter prevent my children accessing content I do not wish them to watch.

Q4:
No, all content should be classified, though if there has been a complaint the classification of that content should be reviewed.

Q5:
Yes, content appropriate for children should be classified as such so I know it is safe for my children.

Q6:
Yes, but if the market is small then the costs would be relatively excessive. Thus unclassified content should be treated as X rated content unless the provider is willing to go through the time and/or expense of classification.

Q7:
Yes. I am insulted that artwork which denigrates the Islamic faith is not publically shown like the artwork that denigrates the Christian faith. If the authorities won't allow a 'piss Mohammad' then neither should they allow a 'piss Christ'. Adults have the right to see whatever they deem fit and restrict their children accordingly. In a secular state there should be no discrimination against faiths, but a classification would be good to allow parents to ensure their children do not see what they deem as inappropriate.

Q8:
Yes, though if the audio book is word-for-word the same as the printed books then it would seem logical to save the expense and give the audio book the same classification as the printed book.

Q9:
Yes, but if the market is small then the costs would be relatively excessive. Thus unclassified content should be treated as X rated content unless the provider is willing to go through the time and/or expense of classification. Composition of the audience should be an influencing factor.

Q10:
No, the public content should have the same classification as the home content. Children should not see nudity and violence in public when parents have banned this as home. A PG rating of publically viewable content is a contradiction as Parents may be unavailable to Guide the child.

Q11:

The likely ramifications of the content. Showing how people successfully commit suicide is not beneficial for depressed people. However not showing a pregnant mother the visual conseqences of a decision to terminate also causes long term problems. Classification would help restrict this content and make it available under strict conditions.

Q12:

I use the iboss webfilter to limit this content. Unfortunately webcontent can be encrypted to bypass controls. It would be nice to have some sort of code encrypted throughout the content such that when it passes through the filter in either normal or encrypted form it would be picked up and blocked. I am also concerned at people hacking my computer and leaving pornographic material. I would like some sort of program that actively block, seeks and destroys all criminal material.

Q13:

By providing a good optional web-filter. Web-filters on the children's computer can be easily hacked. The iboss is hidden in my room so stops the inapproprate content before it gets to their computer. With the national broadband network this should become easier and lessen the speed impact of filtering.

Q14:

A program should be made available to stop children accessing this material. Something like the DRM written into the computer that cannot be hacked. Physical magazines should require ID for purchase.

Q15:

PG+

Q16:

Government agencies should provide classification and restrict publically accessible content. Users should have resources to be able to restrict material to their children by utilising tools and classification schemes. Industry should be required to submit content for classification, pay for the cost, else have an X rating.

Q17:

No, industry cannot be trusted, unless hefty fines are imposed for not following classification rules and these are applied whenever a clear breach has been found. There should be no course to higher courts or access to public support for legal cases.

Q18:

Industry could classify anything a G, with the understanding of substantial fines for misclassification. Government should have services available to classify content at the expense of the content provider.

Q19:

Government should only subsidise the classification of content for educational purposes (not Government propoganda campaigns). Small independent films should be given an X rating, this will not stop adults watching them.

Q20:

Yes, though many of the PG films seem to have material of an adult nature such as sex scenes, drug use, and violence.

I think the content I watch from the 1980s or earlier has a better rating than current material which would get an R rating under the old system.

Q21:

I would like to go back to the classification system of the 1980s where the content and society in general was less perverse.

Q22:

There should only be one set of markings, criteria and guidelines for all content across all media formats. Practically audio warnings on video tracks may be required, though icons containing the classification symbol may be sufficient.

Q23:

Yes, there should be consolidation into one system.

Q24:

None, the classification system should give people a choice what to filter. Unclassified material should be X rated.

Q25:

Q26:

Yes, there should be one classification system. ACT should not be the porn producer of Australia.

Q27:

The states and territories should hand over their power to the Commonwealth. Australia would be better off without state and territory governments which are a remnant of colonialisation.

Q28:

YES

Q29:

Content could be made available as X rated for review by any adult who wishes to contribute to its eventual classification.

Other comments: