

CI 604 S McKenzie

First name: Scott

Last name: McKenzie

Q1:

I think the the current framework for classification mostly works, key elements, ie. those pertaining to 'the internet' and 'video games' are lacking and not consistent with other forms of media. Improvement in those aspects should allow for the current framework to keep up with the current needs/wants of society.

Q2:

A fair system that treats all forms of media in the same manner (where possible, see next question).

Q3:

Yes, certain technologies/platforms cannot be considered static in the classic sense, (ie 'the internet') and as such content is often in a state of flux. Attempting to classify content in this state would be impossible and any level of blanket suppression could be considered as unnecessary censorship.

Q4:

All content that is for sale and readily available to the public at large should be considered for classification.

Q5:

Yes, we as a society have deemed certain types of content to be inappropriate, content that will very likely be exposed to minors should be classified. But there should never be any outright banning of content for those mature enough to understand it and consume it in it's appropriate context.

Q6:

Q7:

Yes, but only for providing advice, not for restricting access to anyone other than minors. (ie how cigarettes or alcohol are currently prohibited from being sold to minors).

Q8:

Yes, there is no reason for this category of content to be exempt.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

Anything that can be accessed in the public forum 'unsolicited' should be subject to classification.

Q11:

Q12:

Parental supervision, it is not the government's responsibility to ensure that parents raise their children right (except in extreme cases such as those involving abuse for example).

Blanket controls that allow the government to selectively block certain content leave the door open to corruption and the ability to block any content that they do not agree with.

Q13:

Parents need to take responsibility for what their children do online. Where this is not possible, 'opt in' technology is appropriate, ie content filtering software installed on a minor's laptop can be an effective control that parents could employ. This way, they can control what content their children see, without forcing the rest of society to bear the burden of their fears of what their children could be exposed to.

Q14:

The current controls are effective enough.

Q15:

Where there is easy access by minors to this content, and the content is rated for mature audiences only.

Q16:

In the case of traditional content :-

The primary role of the government should be of providing information, so that society can make their own decisions about consuming content before they are exposed to it.

That said, certain content should be restricted from minors, and the current controls employed in physical products like cigarettes, adult magazines etc, are effective, ie 'not for sale to children'.

In the case of the internet, the government's role again comes down to providing information, and specifically 'opt in' tools that allow parents to control what their children are exposed to.

Q17:

I have no opinion on this subject.

Q18:

I have no opinion on this subject.

Q19:

Yes, or the classification process would need to be more streamlined and costs brought down to a minimum without undermining its effectiveness.

Q20:

I believe that the current classification categories are fairly well understood.

The "M and MA" classifications, and the "R and X" classifications are too similar.

(See answer to next question).

Q21:

Keep the existing classifications, but:

I would combine the M and MA classifications.

Similarly, the R and X ratings could also be combined.

Q22:

I have no opinion on this.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

There should be no mandatory prohibition of any online content. Given that most of the 'RC' content on the internet is obfuscated in the deluge of other content, it is generally not possible to be accidentally or easily exposed to 'RC' content unless you specifically go looking for it.

Q25:

It is probably a little too broad, but yes, if you 'have' to ban anything, then then content currently classified in the 'RC' category would be mostly appropriate.

Q26:

Yes it is important, we live in one unified country, not independent city states. Classification laws should be apply across the whole country regardless of location. There is no need to promotion of this idea, the federal government should be the central point of control for all classification of all media.

Q27:

A scheme that represents all Australians and does not allow for small self interest groups to dictate to the majority. Allowing 1 governor the ability to deny a classification level to an entire industry, and therefore certain content from being consumed by the entire country is ridiculous.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments: