## CI 752 C Carter

First name: Chris Last name: Carter

Q1:

Developing a new framework.

Ω2

To give people a guideline of what to expect in certain content. NOT to censor it because a panel has decided it is objectionable.

Q3:

No, all platforms should be treated equally.

Ω4

Yes, I believe this should apply to a majority of content

Q5:

Yes, content specifically designed for children, and not simply expected to be used by children because of its genre should be classified across all media.

Q6:

Classification should be 'opt-in' with no forcing of classification pushed by the government. This will allow smaller publishers to opt out of the legal challenges in gaining classification so that they can get their work to the public.

Q7:

No. Access to artworks or speech should NEVER be restricted by the government

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

See my above comments about 'opt in' classification

Q10:

No

Q11:

opt in

Q12:

Do not ever filter the internet. This is censorship and against the very foundation of democracy.

Q13:

This option should be solely at the discretion of parents.

Q14:

Q15:

None, content warnings should be opt in

Q16:

The role of government agency is to provide a classification service that people can opt in to. It is NOT the role of government to ban or restrict content

Q17:

unsure

The proposal blocks a secret list of websites with no public input or oversight. This is censorship at its most insidious. While at first this may be used exclusively for the worst of objectional content, with no oversight, mistakes will be made, and temptations to block political speech may be to great for the government to resist.

As I have iterated many times throughout the 29 questions, I do not believe it is the governments place to block content online.