

CI 437 M Campbell

First name: Michael

Last name: Campbell

Q1:

Improving the existing framework. For example, the introduction of an R classification for video games, bringing it more in line with movies

Q2:

Making classification of media more consistent between physical media.

Q3:

Yes, some platforms should not be censored at a government level, such as the internet. Censorship of the internet is a hallmark of oppressive regimes like China, not a Western Democracy. The internet is a bastion of activism and free speech, access to it should not be dictated by governments.

More domestic media such as magazines, newspapers, movies, books and video games should be classified, as these classifications tend to operate more as guidelines, and short of a book/film being outright banned, access to it is still possible.

Q4:

Q5:

Content specifically designed for children should probably be classified to ensure its suitability.

Q6:

Q7:

Q8:

The same way as books or films.

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Access to online content should not be controlled at a Government level. It should always remain an opt-out choice at worst.

Q13:

Education of parents, education of children by parents, personal computer filter programs.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

The existing categories make sense, they shouldn't cause confusion.

Q21:

Video Games need an R18+ rating, the current situation means that any video game designed specifically for adults gets banned. This is ridiculous, as the main demographic for the purchase of video games are people in their 20s.

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

None. Most available filter systems have too many false positives, and too much scope for abuse. The introduction of a system for the government to decide what the public can and can not access on the internet is a bad idea.

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: