

CI 683 M Mason

First name: michael

Last name: mason

Q1:

Completely new framework. The current one is incredibly outdated, some forms of media did not even exist when the original framework was made.

Q2:

To provide the Australian public with the knowledge to make informed decisions about the types of content they view. It should not try to be a police force, merely a depository of knowledge.

Q3:

Yes, some online or even mobile app markets have such large international markets that to seriously classify them all would require more time than would be able to be given by a government department.

Q4:

This is defiantly a promising solution for the mediums that have extremely large amounts of content.

Q5:

Most modern day content mediums are so new that proper studies into their impact on people have not had enough time to be done. So the potential impact cannot readily be measured. If you want to look into any statistics, look at how crime rates are down to levels not seen since the 1960's. Children's media should be looked at differently, but you mustn't confuse children's and adult media. Some content, even if it may be in a predominately children's medium is not designed for them and should not be classified in the same way.

Q6:

Most defiantly. If the industry is too small or even too large, self regulation is the most prudent situation. For small markets, the relevant bodies would have a greater understanding of their content than any government agency would. For larger industries, they would have the resources to conduct their own classification self regulation.

Q7:

Art is something that I think should always be free. Artists should be free to express their own ideas and thoughts otherwise great modern art will move away from Australia. Consumer advice is a possible option, to let people know exactly the kinds of content they might be viewing, but it should never be banned or taken down.

Q8:

I think they should be subject to self regulation. They can contain the same times of adult content as other mediums so the information certainly needs to be out there for people to know.

Q9:

No, some mediums, even if they are one of the largest in Australia, have stereotypes associated with them that are completely not true and many people argue baseless facts against them. This is just one example of how protocolar industries might become partially under scrutiny unjustly. The opposite might also occur where a medium that should perhaps get special attention, is ignored because lobby

groups have not latched their claws onto it yet. For this reason I believe that the size and composition should not affect whether content should be classified.

Q10:

No, people should be free to express themselves through content in their own homes just as much as they should be free to set up their own methods of blocking this content. The government should leave this for the individuals to handle, we are all grown adults here, we can make our own decisions.

Q11:

I believe that religious paraphernalia should be classified as a lot of it serves to just indoctrinate the youth of tomorrow.

Q12:

Proper education as well as supervision from a parent or guardian if your underage. Optional OPT IN filters for parents would provide them with all the tools they need.

Q13:

Proper education of the children as well as the parents as well as supervision on their actives online.

Q14:

Keeping them either under the counter during restricted trading hours or in slip covers would prevent unwanted exposure to minors.

Q15:

Yes, people should be able to access information to help inform them of the contents.

Q16:

Government agencies should be there to provide information for the public about the possible content available in respective classifications. Industry bodies should have a greater role in setting their own classification for their products and users should be responsible for taking the information from the government, matching it against the industry bodies advice and making an informed decision on their own.

Q17:

Much more effective, many industries are so large these days that they have too much content for the government to possibly classify, but at the same time they have the resources to help self regulate their own content. It works in the US, where crime rates are down.

Q18:

Anything that is specifically made for adults as long as it is still legal.

Q19:

Independent Games/Movies/Music should be able to get classification subsidies to help sponsor the industry to provide new job opportunities in Australia.

Q20:

No. People have no idea about the difference between M and MA15+. There also seems to be a very large misconception about what RC is and what is entailed within.

Q21:

Yes. I believe we need a classification between G and PG, M needs to be removed. MA should be 16+ as in most states children do not have access to a proper form of photo id until then.

Q22:

All media should be completely consistent. The more it splinters off, the more information people have to know. If we have one scheme for all media, people only need to be informed about one scheme no matter what content they are after.

Q23:

Yes, there are too many clauses already that make up a fairly complicated classification system.

Q24:

Anything that is illegal. RC content is not technically illegal so that should not be included.

Q25:

Its too hard to judge as the current scope of RC is too broad for anyone to make a proper informed decision.

Q26:

All states and territories should be consistent. Through a national advertising campaign through all media.

Q27:

A scheme where not all decisions have to be unanimous. The scheme needs to be able to change with the times, and in its current form, change moves much too slowly.

Q28:

The states have proven to be completely ineffective at facilitating change, so I believe it is in the public's best interest for the commonwealth to step in.

Q29:

Self regulation of major industries. Consistent ratings across more media, less confusing differences between classifications and a better definition of RC.

Other comments:

Lobby groups that post copy and paste responses to these submissions do not represent the majority of Australia and should not receive any special treatment. Especially when the leader of said lobby group is a known Xenophobe.