

CI 98 D Myles

First name: Daniel

Last name: Myles

Q1: Improve key elements of the existing framework. That being said I do not see the point of wasting taxpayer dollars classifying everything if a respected overseas classification body (ie UK or US classification boards) have already agreed on a classification for a title. We can save ourselves a lot of time and money by using this rating as a guideline. Australia should adopt a scheme whereby if 2-3 other western authorities have already rated say a movie or video game MA15+ or equivalent it will automatically be rated as such here in AU.

Q2: Allow adults to enjoy material over all mediums (dvd's, print, games, tv, books etc) and give parents the power to make informed choices about what material they should allow their children to consume.

Q3: Absolutely. It is ludicrous to think that the Internet should be treated exactly the same way as books or tv. When the classification laws were first launched there was no such thing as the Internet. We are currently very backwards when it comes to classification in Australia when compared to the rest of the western world and we need to position ourselves to be a leader in classification with a sensible guideline for consumers. When it comes to the Internet it is ridiculous that everything can be classified. The amount of money, time and resources it would take just to play catchup would be completely unreasonable let alone keep up to date (millions of new pages are added weekly). Australia should stop trying to play nanny police with the Internet and allow parents to make informed decisions about net usage for their children. There are many end based programs out there designed to regulate the flow of information when browsing that parents can use to limit information available. There are also ISP's such as webshield which provide family friendly feeds. Netalert was a government initiative stopped by the Labor government who claimed it was "too hard to use" when in reality there was absolutely no demand.

Q4: Yes, if we adopt a system similar to the one pointed out in Q1, and "match" a rating given by a group of 2 or 3 similar classification bodies of other Western countries then rarely would anything have to be classified unless subject to a complaint. Even then we need to be careful with how we action that complaint as I certainly do not feel that the "reasonable persons test" is actually a true reflection of the 2011 reasonable person. There is a lot of material that would fall into the category of RC at the moment that I believe adults should be allowed to access. Remember RC does not = illegal, only a judge can make that determination. Euthenasia sites, safe drug taking, fetish sites involving spanking, whipping, candle wax, graffiti art sites, suicide sites and forums, these should not be refused classification solely based on their controversial nature and adults should be allowed to view them if they so wish. Reasonable person should include not just vocal minorities such as the ACL and co.

Q5: Again if we adopt a "follow the classification decision of 2-3 other countries when they agree" model then there would be very little to classify here. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with our current classification

system (G, PG, M, MA15+, R) apart from lack of R18+ for games which is by itself a sign of a very aging (and broken in the case of R18+ requiring consensus by all state AG's for it to be changed) and the RC category. Why do we even have RC? There is no other Western country that comes to mind that even has a category equivalent of it. It needs to be completely removed or at the very worst updated to reflect the times.

Q6: No, content is content. This being said content needs to be classified within context. Just because a movie or game is going to be a blockbuster title that everyone will see / play doesn't mean it should get different treatment to a small indie movie that only a few thousand people may see.

Q7: I'm not sure what this question means. If this means, should artwork be scrutinised before it is shown to the public so the government doesn't have another Bill Henson incident then no I don't think it should be classified. For whatever reason the Australian government has itself all worked up over "potential" child exploitation material based on rhetoric and the cries of a very vocal segment of the community (ie you can usually hear them shouting out "won't somebody think of the children!!" in the middle of a screening of Rambo or Die Hard. Instead perhaps artists can have their works peer reviewed and if there is a consensus that a small minority of people might be offended then we can pop a sign out the front of the gallery saying "Wowsers beware, art may offend." or something along those lines.

Q8: No, I do not agree with the banning of satanic heavy metal rock music (it isn't my cup of tea, I'm more partial to Kylie Minogue) but I'm sure a lot of people enjoy it.

Q9: No

Q10: No, PS Billboards displaying 2 adult men, hugging fully clothed advertising condoms is not inappropriate public advertising as some might have us think.

Q11: Common Sense

Q12: Parents (believe it or not that's what parenting is), family friendly ISP's such as webshield and PC based filtering software. This way EVERYONE is happy as it gives the user a CHOICE.

Q13: Parents, Parents, Parents, Family Friendly ISP's and PC based filters.

Q14: It's not already controlled?? Nothing need to change here

Q15: When its rated MA15+ or higher

Q16: government agency = very minimal, industry bodies can engage and make recommendations on what classification a product should have, users should have a choice in what they consume (within the law of course)

Q17: Yes, or even better as I have pointed out, if a regulatory body such as PEGI etc has already rated something, save ourselves money and time and use that rating.

Q18: G, PG, M, MA15+ R18+.

Q19: Yes, non for profit, independent films and music etc should be done pro bono.

Q20: MA15+ is confusing for computer games as parents think this means they are suitable for ALL teenagers. This is not the case. R18+ sends a stronger message. This however does not mean that MA15+ should be abolished.

Q21: R18+ for computer games absolutely must be introduced, by not doing so Australia stays the laughing stock of the western world and continues to live in the dark ages. MA15+ and M need to be redefined (iI think there is merit in both these ratings) or given an age bracket indicator. Either that or bring our classification scheme in line with the UK or US equivalent.

Q22: Don't need it online. Anything physical such as a DVD or Game the existing markings are fine.

Q23: Yes

Q24: Obviously child pornography and any other illegal material. This is illegal and people viewing it should be arrested and prosecuted by the authorities.

Q25: Definitely not

Q26: Yes, its ludicrous that we have differing laws for different states. The law should be changed that classification decisions are made federally if at all and apply to all states / territories.

Q27: New simplified scheme based on using the classifications given to material by reputable overseas bodies such as the UK or US.

Q28: It depends on what the federal government plans to do with those powers. If it means a more regulated internet then no. The net has been fine for 20 years and does not need to be changed through a new framework which will just waste taxpayer money, create more confusion and can only end in a poorer quality of service for the end user.

Q29: Common Sense

Other comments: Australia needs to stop playing nanny state. It also needs to stop pandering to extremist groups who would have all content above G rated banned. The government would also do itself a favour by giving parents the power to make an informed choice for their children instead of trying to babysit the children for them. It's called parental responsibility.