

CI 1757 D Williams

First name: Dany

Last name: Williams

Q1:

I would like to see an improvement to the elements in the existing framework to allow for the introduction of a R18+ classification.

Q2:

To restrict under-aged persons from obtaining, purchasing or viewing material inappropriate for their age.

Q3:

In the case of games (Console or PC) or movies, I believe that there should be restrictions placed onto these materials to stop under-aged persons gaining access to these materials. However for internet (the world wide web) access should be decided by the parents of children NOT by a government organization, we all on a daily basis make decisions on what our children view or have access to within our own homes and I believe that taking this decision from parents who are paying for a service in against our human rights.

Q4:

No, why should a greater majority of people suffer from the objections of one complaint or from a minority or hard line group. Each case should be looked at under a set series of guild lines before any decision is made.

Q5:

To a degree yes, material made for the sole purpose of children's entertainment should be classified across all media, this will allow a set series of guide lines for all organizations/developers to follow and implement.

Q6:

No I don't believe that is should, material developed for adults or children no matter the size of the producer or distributor should be assessed on the same level, regardless of size.

Q7:

No, artworks shown within art galleries or spaces be they private or public, should be accessible to all. If there is content within the exhibition notices on invitations, market media and the entrance would suffice, it is the responsibility of the adult attending these venues to make the decision whether they wish to enter or no or if they wish to take children to these venues. It is NOT the role of government organization to lace these restrictions.

Q8:

To a degree yes, if the audio has questionable content then warnings should be made available, however again this is the responsibility of the parents to enforce and restrict the material which children have access to no the the government.

Q9:

No, again it is the sole responsibility of the parent to decide whether they take their children to an event. All events are signed as being either "All ages or over 18+" when people purchase their tickets.

Q10:

No, at home it should be the parents who control which material are brought into the home and who has access to that material, be it media, movies, games or internet access. In public in is the domain of the public, it is up to the individual attending any venue to decide if they wish remain and listen/view the material or not.

Q11:

The existing guild lines are more than sufficient to assess current and future content.

Q12:

Again it is the responsibility of the parents to restrict what material children in their homes have access to. It HAS to be the right of the parent/s to make these decisions, they are ones who are paying for the service and therefore it is their responsibility. It should not be the responsibility of government organizations to decide that material to censor or restrict. The onus has to be placed with the parents.

Q13:

Again the onus is with the parents, it is their right, role and responsibility as a parent to "police" what their children are doing or accessing while online. This is also true if the child is at a friends place, it is the role of that parent to ensure that the child doesn't have access to that material.

Q14:

Material purchased from stores, news agencies etc should be controlled by store personal. To better control this these materials should be sealed to restrict viewable access in-store and store personal should also be made aware of their responsibility to prevent such material from being read or purchased by minors.

Q15:

Most items currently display these marking or warnings, those that have not should have these warnings included.

Q16:

Government agencies should set the policies as to how material should be classified and make decisions regarding that material according to those set guild lines, there should also be some further research done on how fees are calculated when material is presented for assessment or review. Industry bodies should be made ensure that staff are made aware of regulations regarding the selling of questionable or restricted content to minors, they are the face of these materials are they are the one's with the responsibility of selling this material. Users or parents have a continuing responsibility to ensure that they keep questionable content from minors.

Q17:

Yes, as long as government agencies are willing to work with industry on an even basis and not be swayed by minority community groups with specific agendas.

Q18:

this question makes no sense at all. If industry follow the guild lines set out by he classification body with the inclusion of the R18+ for games, classification of these materials will be more straightforward.

Q19:

Yes, I believe that small independent developers should be subsidised. Independent developers often work to very restricted budgets and many often don't have the resources to pay to have their material

classified, to make the process fairer to smaller companies I believe that a subsidy would be of benefit to all.

Q20:

Most are understood by the wider community. The problem arises with the MA15+ classification, this is too broad, with the introduction of a higher level of classification I believe that this confusion will cease.

Q21:

I believe that there is the need of one or possibility 2 additional categories needed, the first being a R18+ and the second being a Adult Only rating, this would allow a distinct set of classification categories to be targeted at consenting adults only and would allow a higher level of control over materials restricting them from minors.

Q22:

There should be set markings for material designated for minors and set markings for material restricted to minors. These markings should be made the same across all media, this would stop the confusion some people have over materials.

Q23:

Yes as long as the amalgamation wasn't detrimental to any one media.

Q24:

What content and who determines this content is the real problem in relation to this question. We would all like to see child pornography eradicated however at this time there is no clear way to do this online. Current police methods are working to stop the spread and access to this type of material, however the ever changing landscape that is the World Wide Web makes restricting content online almost impossible.

Q25:

I do not believe that the government has the right to classify, restrict or prohibit online material, we are not a communist state who controls what we view, hear and see, we are a free country and I believe that it is the role of the parent or adult to restrict what is accessed online.

Q26:

Consistency is important between all of states and territories and is something that is lacking within the Australian classification system. Promotion of these should be led by Canberra with a mix of TV, online and in-store advertisements.

Q27:

I don't think that there is a need to replace the existing cooperative scheme, if all of the existing classification schemes were brought under the one system there would not be a need to waste more money on a new similar system.

Q28:

Yes, there should be one overarching legislation for the classification of material within Australia, this will remove the confusion faced by industry bringing in new content and allow one body to make these decisions.

Q29:

Remove the control from the combined Commonwealth Attorney-General's and have people involved in these decisions who have a better understanding and knowledge of the material that they are assessing, this process should not be used as a political tool like it has been for the past few years.

Other comments:

I wish to share this as a example to why Australia needs a R18+ classification:

I have a friend and shop owner who was abused for selling a mother of a 10 yr old boy a copy of Grand Theft Auto 4, the shop owner informed the mother at the time she wanted to purchase the game that it was inappropriate for her son and that she should not purchase it. The mothers response was that the MA15+ rating stated that it allowed parental supervision to buy it and her son wanted it so just sell me the same game. The following day the mother stormed into the shop threw the game at the owner and proceeded to abuse her for 10 minutes for selling her the game.

We as consenting adults have raised the argument of introducing an R18+ classification for games for many years now to stop this type of confusion, if this game had a R18+ classification this mother would not have purchased the game for her child. Minority groups apposed to the introduction of an R18+ classification have been holding this process up for too long and I believe that we need to move forwards to stop anymore confusion.

In regards to censoring of the internet I DO NOT believe that Government should be involved in this process at all, it is the responsibility of the parent or guardian to restrict what a minor views and does while online in their own home or a friends home. The parents are the ones who purchase the service for the home therefore it is their role, right and responsibility to enforce this restriction. Parents need to be held accountable for their actions and the actions of their children, it is not the Australian's Governments right or mandate to intrude into this process.

I do not support the government's intention to censor the internet, I am a voting adult and I am paying for an internet service and other services which I should entitle me to view, watch and buy what I choose to do. I would hope that the government would accept this and the wishes of other people of the same view.