

CI 1794 J Carlton

First name: James

Last name: Carlton

Q1:

A new framework, too much needs to be changed.

Q2:

To restrict access to certain materials to minors ONLY.

Q3:

No. There has not been any clear evidence that how the material is consumed has any greater effect - plus when a new technology comes in - say holographic TV, we'll be in the same place we are now. Restrict content the same regardless of platform.

Q4:

No. Access should not be restricted because of the views of some minority lobby group.

Q5:

Don't really understand the term 'impact' here. Yes I think content designed for children should be classified but it should depend on the content, not the media.

Q6:

Market position only if it infers the age of the users. Mass market implies something of a majority opinion - which I think should affect classification.

Q7:

Some artworks or galleries could be classified as adults only but otherwise I do not think art should be banned or completely restricted if it is clear no crime has been committed in its production.

Q8:

Format does not matter - only content.

Q9:

Composition - definitely. Potential size seems a bit pie in the sky.

Q10:

No - provided 'public' means those viewing it are doing so of their own intention.

Q11:

Religious beliefs should be completely discounted when it comes to classification - they have no basis on any form of scientific evidence and are often down to the particular whims and biases of the believer.

Q12:

Better education all round. More money spent on going after the operators of genuinely illegal websites than trying to filter every thing to everyone.

Q13:

Better education for parents on how to monitor their children's activities online. Opt in programs and filters to protect children from content - NOT a blanket filter.

Q14:

I don't really think they need to be better controlled. Maybe crack down on retailers who don't follow the rules.

Q15:

Classification markings only. Educate the public as to what these mean.

Q16:

Government agencies should take advice from industry bodies and then pass this on with recommendations to the users. As much as possible it should be ADVICE not RESTRICTIONS.

Q17:

In many cases yes, maybe not all.

Q18:

Computer games are a good example. There is too much content in most games these days that they are extremely difficult to classify. Having worked in the industry I don't believe anyone in it has any real desire to flaunt a ratings system.

Q19:

Yes I think art and other cultural - low profit areas should be subsidized.

Q20:

No I don't think they are in many cases. Computer games are extremely poorly understood by parents - many who think that the current system is working and that their kids are fine whatever they play.

Q21:

YES. There needs to be a new adult rating for computer games urgently. Also MA and MA15 doesn't really make any sense to me.

Q22:

Classification markings should just give ages - and then maybe some suggestion of content.

Q23:

Yes, seems like a good idea.

Q24:

Child pornography should be banned along with any other content where a criminal offense (not a misdemeanor) can be proven to have been committed in its creation (like snuff films or something.)

Q25:

No I don't think so.

Q26:

Yes it is important, this should be a federal area of responsibility so we don't have idiots in South Australia dictating to the rest of the country.

Q27:

A federal scheme taking heed of the wishes of the majority of Australians.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Educate parents and let them make most of the decisions themselves and stop pandering to vocal minority groups.

Other comments:

This whole R18+ games rating debacle has been humiliating for the entire country. Let's hope we can wrap this thing up quickly.