

CI 1882 M Rees

First name: Mark

Last name: Rees

Q1:

improve the existing to allow for classification of R18 or possibly introduce new framework to allow people to chose whatever they wish to interact with given we are supposed to be a free society.

Q2:

To provide clear guidelines on material and classifications that leave the choice to consumers

Q3:

yes, the internet is a largely free domain, it is not there for governments to take away such a freedom

Q4:

yes, som content does not need to be classified. But any complaints could possibly be of a frivolous nature, most likely by some form of Christian lobby wasting the time of all involved and still still avoid classification despite complaint.

Q5:

the potential impact should not affect classification as it is a rather stupid concept and comes down to individual perception. content designed for children should be classified.

Q6:

No, this would provide some bias would it not?

Q7:

No, just because any ignorant or religious nutter perceives something the way it was probably not intended does not mean this should happen

Q8:

Isn't it already? It has warnings of explicit material if there is swearing. Outside of this you are moving into murky territory judging what may be suitable etc. Is that not what parenting is about?

Q9:

yes, as in Q5 if it destined for children.

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Q13:

by software, when a child logs on to a computer with their password, it should limit certain sites.... the parents could set the types of content off limits. should not be governments job to do PARENTING!!!!

Q14:

Do they need to be better controlled, last time I looked they were wrapped in plastic at the servo and covered. What more do you need to do?

Q15:

Q16:

The government should only provide guidelines and classification and should not be removing choice from any individual who is capable of making informed decision. Parents are there to ensure their kids

are educated properly. No one wishes to take responsibility for their actions but this should not force, violent video games to be banned, it is ludicrous when the rest of the world doesn't have this issue.

Q17:

yes, it would reduce the costs and keep things manageable, it is a fantastic idea, people who didn't comply would quickly learn after being fined and possibly prosecuted.

Q18:

video games are a bit of a no-brainer, they just need the R18 classification

Q19:

yes, the government should focus on helping people at the bottom end producing content with these things be it film, video game or whatever

Q20:

no, the refused classification is a joke for some things

Q21:

R18 should be introduced for games as there is a clear need for it. Such a high percentage of gamers are adults being discriminated against because some people can't control their children, it is ridiculous.

Q22:

it should be pretty straightforward like with film

Q23:

R18 should be introduced for games as there is a clear need for it. Such a high percentage of gamers are adults being discriminated against because some people can't control their children, it is ridiculous.

Q24:

anyhow to guides involving murder, disposal of bodies etc, anything showing you how to do seriously illegal stuff to do with murder as it would only fuel some mentally deranged person's desire. That being said, this can be overused by the government where it may not need to be, as evident with the blacklist previously being leaked

Q25:

Q26:

it should be unified

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

allowing an R18 classification for adults who wish to play the games they should have a choice too

Other comments: