

CI 485 S Gubbins

First name: Steven

Last name: Gubbins

Q1:

Yes, definitely.

Q2:

To introduce an R18+ classification for video games.

Q3:

No. It would be like censoring TVs or DVDs.

Q4:

No. All content needs to be classified.

Q5:

Yes.

Q6:

No. It should be classified regardless.

Q7:

No. As long as it falls within the guidelines.

Q8:

Yes,

Q9:

No. It should be classified regardless.

Q10:

If it's available commercially then it should be censored.

Q11:

As in Q10, if the content is available commercially then it should be censored.

Q12:

Accessing online content requires the use of a credit card, so the user will be over 18 regardless.  
Education for parents should also be a goal.

Q13:

Education for parents and the fact that online sales require credit cards, plus a voluntary internet filter

scheme to restrict torrent sites.

Q14:

Tougher regulations aimed at shops and businesses.

Q15:

Classifications should always be displayed, but not necessarily on the front. Warnings or consumer advice should be displayed in the absence of classifications where appropriate.

Q16:

As they are now in regard to TV and movies.

Q17:

Yes, but not necessary.

Q18:

Content that currently fits existing classifications for TV and movie. e.g. that contains swearing, violence, drug use, etc.

Q19:

When it reaches a certain level of exposure to the public.

Q20:

Yes, they are clear.

Q21:

Yes, 18+ desperately needs to be added. M15+ and MA15+ should be kept and NOT merged.

Q22:

Making all markings standard across formats would be ideal, but as long as the markings are easily visible it would suffice.

Q23:

Not necessarily, but if practical then yes.

Q24:

Only content which are illegal. Content which is refused classification should NOT be prohibited.

Q25:

NO, absolutely not.

Q26:

Yes. Utilise a central federal regulatory body.

Q27:

A federal level scheme that controls all states.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Only by introducing an 18+ classification.

Other comments: