

## CI 1886 D Hand

First name: Douglas

Last name: Hand

Q1:

Yes, they certainly should. I believe it has been neglected and is now long overdue.

Q2:

Creating a fairer, more accurate classification scheme which empowers parents and retailers to make better decisions about the content children are exposed to.

Q3:

No, some content is more accessible than others. There is too great a disproportion to place restrictions on all content based on that on that alone.

Q4:

No. If someone sees content they deem inappropriate they have the right and ability not to watch it. It would not be fair to restrict that content for everyone based on a complaint.

Q5:

No. A uniform classification across the board. 'Potential impact' screams of ambiguity and subjectivity. Yes, content designed for children should be labelled as such under the one classification system used for all content.

Q6:

No

Q7:

Definitely not. Art should not be up for debate. The galleries should decide whether or not they believe a particular piece of art should be displayed. Classifying art would commercialise it and destroy the very foundations of freedom of expression.

Anyone viewing an exhibition should be informed enough to be aware of the content or theme.

Q8:

Music is a form of art and freedom of expression, however it differs from visual art as it is mass reproduced and sold. I don't think it should be restricted but I do think a basic content rating guide should be use to help inform consumers.

All sound recording should use the same content guides.

Q9:

No, all media should be classified equally based on their content alone.

Q10:

No, all media should be classified equally based on their content alone.

Q11:

None that I can think of at the moment.

Q12:

I think it should be up to the computer or device owner to control access to online content, not the government.

There are numerous ways to go about it. The most common way is to use content filter software.

Q13:

- \* Better, easier to use parental filters.
- \* More information and education offered to parents about the nature of the internet and how to restrict access.
- \* Better education in school of the negative impacts of certain material on younger minds.
- \* Better morals and ethics taught at school (this is a whole other can of worms)
- \* Less advertising or promotion of negative content in the media.

Q14:

Sell them behind the counter requiring proof of age. Adults have the right to look at pornography if they want. Human sexuality should not be a taboo. I think that's what causes a lot of problems to begin with. The way it's portrayed is the issue.

It is the responsibility of the parents to supervise and/or restrict access to this material from their children.

Q15:

When it contains content that could potentially be deemed socially unacceptable, negative, harmful or offensive in nature.

Content such as sex scenes, excessive nudity, excessive vulgar language, horror and gore, violence, racism or the taking of harmful drugs.

Q16:

Government and industry bodies should better inform consumers and enthusiastically promote healthy ideologies. They should not deny access to content.

Parents should be the only ones to restrict certain content and only until their children reach the legal age of 18, but which they should be well informed enough to make decisions for themselves.

Q17:

Yes, that sounds like a good first step. Although I would be happier if there were more parties involved, such as consumers, retailers, human rights representatives, drug rehabilitation representatives etc.

Q18:

All content should be classified so long as the system is fair and accurate.

Q19:

Independent films should be subsidised, as well as Australian game developers. The government should be promoting and helping these industries.

Q20:

Classification for video games is currently out of date, unfair and inaccurate.

Q21:

Yes, R18+.

Q22:

Use the current ratings symbols, criteria and guidelines across the entire spectrum.

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

Consistency is the key word here. The classification system put in place should cover all forms of content online as well.

Basically, nothing should be specifically prohibited that isn't already prohibited in other forms of media under the same classification scheme.

Q25:

No

Q26:

It certainly is important. Why should one state be restricted while it's neighbour isn't? It seems ridiculous. This country needs to unify it's laws for all states.

Q27:

The National Classification Scheme.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Consistency and fairness. Add the R18+ rating and remove the 'refused classification' category.

Other comments: