CI 794 H Harvey

First name: Harold
Last name: Harvey
Q1:
Improve key elements of the existing framework
Q2:
To protect minors from unsuitable material, i.e. content which is highly sexualised or violent.
Q3:
You cannot proscribe what technology minors may not have access to. Therefore, the content of films
and games etc. need appropriate classification and it be suitably policed to enforce adherance by
retailers.
Q4:
Too much damage can be done by the time a complaint is lodged. A panel of censors should have
the nouse to know what parents who want their children protected would expect of them.
Q5:
Yes. Yes.
Q6:
No.
Q7:
Yes.
Q8:
Yes.
Q9:
All content should be classified, regardless.
Q10:
No.
Q11:
Q12:
Removal of sites containingl excessive, gratuitous sex and violence.
Q13:
Appropriate filters on computers and a more responsible stance by those who post material on sites.
Q14:
Pull th eplug on those sites.
Q15:
All the time
Q16:
Governments must act. Industry bodies are mainly motivated by profit. Users are motivated by lust
and/or pleasure.
Q17:

You've got to be joking. Allowing industries to regulate themselves is asking the cat to mind the
cream. Industries will slacken off when they think the government is busy elsewhere.
Q18:
None. I would not trust industry to be motivated by what is good for the people. Governments should
be but even here there is some doubt.
Q19:
Government should only subsidise small independent films if the content is beneficial to a wide
audience.
Q20:
Q21:
Q22:
It doesn't matter what the medium is: classifications should be the same for all media. What's good for
the goose is good for the gander.
Q23:
Yes,
Q24:
Excessive, gratuitous sex (pornography) and violence
Q25:
Q26:
State laws in this regard should be the same. It's an anomaly that what's prohibited in one state can
be ordered from another. Let the Commonwealth handle it under Communications.
Q27:
Something that is workable and enforceable
Q28:
Yes
Q29:
Other comments: