

CI 534 M Bottroff

First name: Michael

Last name: Bottroff

Q1:

New framework

Q2:

Freedom of choice. Legal restriction for age groups. Responsibility of parents to choose what their child accesses. Introduce an R18+ classification for video games for adults.

Q3:

No.

Q4:

No.

Q5:

No & Yes.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

Do not bother trying. Focus your efforts on what is obtainable. You can not police the internet without infringing on basic civil rights and freedoms, do not try.

Q13:

Parents. It is the parents responsibility. It is not the governments responsibility to parent every child.

Q14:

Q15:

Always.

Q16:

Police and enforce the sale of classified content to the age groups allowed to access it. (Legal offence to sell R18+ content to minors, etc). Punishable by fines, etc.

Q17:

Yes, but only if an R18+ classification for video games is introduced. Ban (refuse classification) for only the worst and morally objectionable content. Then industry will classify their content correctly and without ulterior motive.

Q18:

Q19:

Subsidise? It costs money to have something classified? That is ridiculous.

Q20:

No R18+ classification for video games causes constant confusion and problems in Australia.

Q21:

Introduce an R18+ classification for video games.

Q22:

Q23:

I don't know what you mean. All content, whether computer games, film, music, or otherwise should all be classified equally and under the same guidelines.

Q24:

Q25:

No. It is too strict. Some of the content should be allowed under the R18+ category.

Q26:

Consistency is VERY IMPORTANT. Every state should be the same. We are ONE country, its about time we started acting like one.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments: