

CI 1925 S B

First name: S

Last name: B

Q1:

Q2:

To assist consumers to make informed decisions about what to access and to assist parents to make informed decisions about what their children can access.

Q3:

No. Differences in content or platform are superficial. It is the content that has the impact.

Q4:

Yes. Distributors are more than capable of ensuring that most content is appropriately regulated. It will save industry and taxpayers a great amount of money if some content can be distributed without classification.

Q5:

Q6:

Q7:

Q8:

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Q13:

Parental control. For example, parents can activate internet filters, discuss the risks of online activity with their children and require that their children only access the internet in a public room of the house.

A mandatory internet filter is neither sufficient nor appropriate. It creates a false sense of security for parents and breaches the right to free expression.

An opt-out filter is only marginally better. This would provide the government with a list of those who wish to access particular material, even though the material is legally accessible. If the government compiled lists of people purchased books or DVDs containing adult content, it would rightfully be considered an invasion of privacy, as well as a barrier to free expression. The same is true in relation to online material.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Industry should inform consumers of the nature of different products. Users should note the advice of industry in deciding what they wish to access and in deciding what their children are allowed to

access. Government agencies should penalise members of the industry who misinform consumers, who inappropriately distribute material and so on.

Q17:

Yes.

Q18:

Most content could be classified by industry.

Q19:

Q20:

The existing classification categories are well understood.

The Refused Classification category causes some confusion. First, the name is misleading. RC content is not refused classification - it is classified into a particular legal category. Second, it is not clear what content is classified into the RC category.

Q21:

There is a need for an R18+ category for video-games, just as there is an R18+ category for films. We don't limit adults to children's content in other mediums, nor would it be acceptable if we did. Likewise, adults should not be limited to children's content in video-games.

The scope of the RC category should be narrowed, so that only incitements to crime and depictions of actual crime are censored. This may require an expansion of the X18+ category or the introduction of a new category.

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

If it is legal to access particular content offline, it should be legal to access it online. Whether it's viewed on a computer or a television screen should not affect whether it's legal to access.

Q25:

No. The current scope of the RC category is too broad. Only incitements to crime and depictions of actual crime should be prohibited.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

When censorship is substituted for child protection, we end up with a system that does not protect children, but breaches the right that we all possess: to live in a free society. Adults must be free to decide for themselves what they wish to read, hear and see. Parents must be responsible for protecting their children from inappropriate content. This is the only way that a classification scheme can be to our benefit.