

CI 444 M Jones

First name: Matthew

Last name: Jones

Q1:

A "new framework". If we start with the basic, accepted principle of freedom - that adults should be free to see, hear and read what they want, but that children also have the right to be protected from harm, the only classification required by a government institution should be "suitable for children" or "not suitable for children". Content that is created through the non consensual harm of others would fit under "refused classification" as illegal content and evidence of a crime. This would include those seen as unable to give consent, such as children.

Q2:

To classify whether or not content is safe for children, for the sole purpose of informing parents. Given that we live in a society where what is "morally right" and/or "offensive" can vary from individual to individual and group to group, allow these groups to set up their own "ratings" groups that classify beyond the "suitable for children" rating based on the beliefs of their group. Individuals can then use these groups ratings to determine if content is to be offensive to them or not - but their decisions are not binding under Australian law.

Q3:

It is an IMPOSSIBILITY for a government body to classify all content on the Internet. Attempting to do so is futile and a waste of taxpayer funds that could better be spent on educating parents and children on safe Internet practices.

Q4:

No. Complaints often come from the "vocal minority" and are not representative of wider Australian thought. If someone complains about content, they have the right NOT TO VIEW IT.

Q5:

I am for classification of all content designed for children as a parental assistance tool.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

Classification needs to remain out of people's own homes. It should be a guidance tool, not a censorship one.

Q11:

Whether or not it is realistic to classify all content across a medium.

Q12:

I am against restricting and controlling access to online content. I am for educating people on safe Internet usage.

Q13:

Parental supervision and use of local software (such as filters installed on a PC). Parental supervision should take place at ALL TIMES.

Q14:

It is controlled enough at present. Additional controls are not required.

Q15:

Whenever it is classified.

Q16:

Users are the key regulators of content they see. The nature of the Internet and public communications today means that people can educate themselves via the opinions of others before purchasing a product. Voluntary industry self regulation would likely be embraced by companies as it is much cheaper than the current scheme, and companies may be seen to be doing the "right thing" by consumers by properly labelling content that might be of concern to some.

Q17:

Yes.

Q18:

Q19:

Yes. Any company considered a "small business" (or an individual creation) should be subsidised for classification expenses.

Q20:

No. MA15+ being the "top tier" for videogames creates the impression that some titles are suitable for children where they would be much better placed in an R18+ or "Not suitable for children"

Q21:

See above. "Suitable for Children" / "Not Suitable for Children". Then allow other community groups to

narrow down further if necessary.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Content that is created through the non consensual harm of others would fit under "refused classification" as illegal content and evidence of a crime. This would include those seen as unable to give consent, such as children. Such content should not be artificially blocked (as it is impossible to do so effectively), but those accessing and distributing it pursued by law enforcement agencies.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Yes. Federal guidelines for classification are desirable.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments: