

CI 569 J O'Regan

First name: John

Last name: O'Regan

Q1:

A new framework that is clear to the public and accurately reflects the content standard of the media

Q2:

An accurate system that the public readily understands and protects the community from objectionable, perverse, extreme violence, devaluation of females and children, incites hatred of races and religions or is unpatriotic (not restricting criticism or comedy).

Q3:

No, the harmful effects can occur from any type of media.

Q4:

No, generally people don't complain as they don't know how or the objectionable media takes place at a time when it is not convenient to complain.

Q5:

Yes, it is always going to be potential impacts. Yes the impact can be across all media.

Q6:

No. The size should have no relevance. In other words, the amount of money in the business should not dictate whether it is controlled or not.

Q7:

Yes, because we have seen artists who have displayed objectionable art in the past.

Q8:

Yes, all media should be treated the same.

Q9:

No. The size and generally the amount of money involved in the business should not have any impact on the material being classified.

Q10:

No, it has the same potential effects.

Q11:

All media should be classified by the same system, no matter what factors.

Q12:

I am not qualified to comment on the most effective methods. Online content is probably harder to

regulate. However, that does not mean it should not be classified. Even if some aspects are generally unlikely to be successfully enforced, it would at least provide direction and intent.

Q13:

By stopping, as much as possible, objectionable material in the first place, rather than trying to steer them away from it.

Q14:

Clear government regulation, preferably Commonwealth legislation to provide uniform rules throughout Australia.

Q15:

At the start of any media and on the packaging of all media.

Q16:

Government should regulate with industry bodies working together to assist the media industry to meet the regulations as cheaply and efficiently as possible

Q17:

No. There is too much money at stake to allow industry to regulate itself. There will always be sectors that want the profits at any expense.

Q18:

Industry should be encouraged to recommend media classification to a government committee for endorsement.

Q19:

Government should develop a classification process that is relatively inexpensive and prompt that it is not expensive per media item. The bigger businesses with more media items would pay more than small businesses with few media items.

Q20:

G is the only clear classification. PG seems to have too much sex aspects etc for the next level of children. The other classifications seem to have varying levels of sex, violence, women abuse etc that makes the classifications unclear.

Q21:

There is a need for a revamp of the classifications as they are unclear to the public (see question 20)

Q22:

There is a need for more accurate wording rather than the current symbols.

Q23:

Yes, the classification should be consistent across all media.

Q24:

Extreme violence, abuse of women and children, unnatural sex, unpatriotic (not being confused with criticism or comedy), inciting race or religious hatred (not stopping criticism or comedy) media should be prohibited.

Q25:

No. See question 24.

Q26:

Regulations must be consistent across Australia. Hence, Commonwealth regulation is the best method.

Q27:

Commonwealth legislation.

Q28:

Yes, it is the best, cheapest and most effective method.

Q29:

Inviting representatives from various organisations, business, religions, races etc for input when a classification is particularly difficult and of a significant public issue.

Other comments: