

CI 810 B Lepp

First name: Beau

Last name: Lepp

Q1:

Improving the key elements of the exiting framework. It is currently ineffective and seems to lack seriousness in its purpose.

Q2:

To provide a clear and consistant classification system which has a clear and enforced purpose which apply to all media types.

Q3:

No. All forms of content should be classified based on the one scheme, regardless of the technology or platform used to access these.

Q4:

No. All content should be classified regardless of a complaint having been made or not.

Q5:

With regards to the impact of violent films, games and music on the behaviour of children, the current classification scheme does not take its role seriously, with adults taking their 2, 3, 4, 5 etc year old children to films classified M and MA15+, the current scheme allows this and in effect is a system made up of only 3 classifications - G, PG and R18+. We restrict alcohol and ciggerettes and prohibit their sale to children and to adults for children, but allow adults to take their obviously not mature children to films and to play games which alter their bain chemistery and behaviour - possibly a reason for the growing violence in children an society? Cinemas, shops and video stores should not be allowed to sell M and MA15+ material to adults for children as young as 5 years old! What is the point of a classification system which does not protect the young. Why have a restricted classification of MA15+ but allow 5 year olds to attend with their parents who can't afford a babysitter, or don't care about the damage to their children?

Yes, content for children should be classified.

Q6:

No. All content should be classified regardless of reach. This should be beyond reproach and therefore not swayed by the market position of producers or distributors.

Q7:

It may be advisable to provide conusmer advice but this could be done through simple exhibitor content warnings. It would be excessive to restrict the viewing of artwork, particularly for schools which require parental permission to exhibit PG and MA15+ material which is educationally essential.

Q8:

Yes for music, as it is already classified but should be regulated more strongly - particularly with adults buying restricted material for children. In terms of audio books, the rules that apply to printed books should apply to these.

Q9:

All content should be classified if commercially exhibited or sold. It should not then effect the screening of student films at schools etc.

Q10:

No, all content should be classified. However, greater regulation and a change to classification restrictions needs to be developed to ensure fewer children are exposed to graphic violence before they turn 10. Children should not be allowed to see MA15+ films at the cinema! I have seen far too many children aged 3, 4 and 5 at M classified films.

Q11:

N/A

Q12:

Education. Particularly, educating parents as to the effects of such content on developing minds.

Q13:

The current scheme is ineffective - as above - it is effectively G, PG and R18+ due to adults being able to buy and show children inappropriate content, not just at home but in public cinemas etc. To use the same scheme to classify and restrict content to children seems pointless.

The free home content filters introduced by the Howard government would suffice if parents were better educated. Trying to restrict the internet as a whole would be far too costly and problematic. Home filters for parents.

Q14:

Current restrictions of R18+ work well on this type of content, though perhaps fines for purchasing for children would help strengthen this. The MA15+ restricted offline content is ineffectively restricted, with adults able to take 5 year olds to see MA15+ films in the cinema - these are often sexually explicit films or graphically violent. MA15+ should mean no child under 15 is able to view regardless of whether they are with an adult or not.

Q15:

Yes.

Q16:

The classification board should review and regulate content, but should at times (when necessary) consult users and other government agencies.

Q17:

No, the government needs to be in control, with no ties to industry.

Q18:

None!

Q19:

Small independent films and student films that require classification should be subsidised based on certain criteria.

Q20:

No, the current system of PG, M and MA15+ mean nothing as they are effectively the same thing. Adults can buy and show children of any age films with graphic violence and sex scenes. There is no point having MA15+ if 4 year olds can view the film with an adult! M and MA15+ need to be restricted and parents need to be educated about these.

Q21:

As above, there are effectively only 3 classifications - G, PG and R18+ at the moment, this needs to change. The number of current categories (G, PG, M, MA15+, R18+) is fine but they need to change in order to be more effective and restrict content properly. Adults should not be able to take a 4 year old to an MA15+ film!

Q22:

N/A

Q23:

Not sure.

Q24:

Not sure

Q25:

Not sure

Q26:

Yes. If they are all the same they can be better enforced and understood, especially considering the migration of people from different states and territories.

Q27:

One which takes the best parts from the existing scheme and builds on these.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments:

Firstly, the current classifications are not working and need to restrict the viewing of MA15+ to only 15 year olds and not allow children as young as 4 to view these with a parent in a cinema!

Secondly, video games require the same levels of classification which allow for an R18+.