
**CANADIAN BROADCAST STANDARDS COUNCIL
ONTARIO REGIONAL COUNCIL**

Showcase Television re *Bubbles Galore*

(CBSC Decisions 98/99-1087 and 1133)

Decided November 19, 1999

A. MacKay (Chair), R. Stanbury (Vice-Chair), P. Fockler, M. Hogarth,
S. Whiting and M. Ziniak

THE FACTS

On Friday, June 19, 1999, Showcase Television aired the motion picture *Bubbles Galore* at about 11:10 p.m., following an introduction of the controversial film by film critic Cameron Bailey. Briefly summarized, the film's story and relevant bits of the backstory are as follows.

The profession of the lead character, Bubbles Galore, is that of an adult film star who has left her role as an "exploited" *participant* in such films to become a *creator* of pornographic movies, which she will produce and direct with a woman's perspective. Presumably as a part of accomplishing this goal, if not also for other reasons, Bubbles has severed all ties, professional and romantic, with her former director/producer/lover, Godfrey Montana. He is alienated by, if not also jealous of, her new career, if not also annoyed by the fact that, at the start of the film, he is informed by his theatrical exhibitor that screentime for his forthcoming film will not be available because of Bubbles's new feature. He is determined to destroy her as a competitive adult film producer. For her new film (within the film), Bubbles casts an apparently naïve new porn star in the leading role. She and the other characters of the film are totally unaware that this woman is more than what she appears to be; she is, in the reality of the film, a heaven-sent "guardian angel" who is posing in the role of porn star in order to aid other women victims of the sex trade (as she was in her former life). The two other leading characters are Buck and Vivian. Bubbles has a real soft spot for Buck, whether as the result of the relationship which they both had when they worked together for Godfrey or out of sympathy for the fact that Buck is now so heavily into booze and drugs that he has become impotent. During much of the film, Bubbles has a very impersonal relationship with her devoted lesbian assistant, Vivian, who, late in the film, develops a sexual, if not also a romantic, relationship with Bubbles.

There is considerable nudity, sexual activity and foul language in the film, as well as a few scenes involving violence. Two of the latter involve the henchmen of Bubbles' former lover, who, in the first instance, humiliate the impotent Buck sexually and, in the second, rape Vivian. While Buck is seen to suffer at the hands of his attackers, Vivian seems bizarrely detached from, and unfazed by, the ugly attack on her. While Buck is clearly oppressed by the humiliation, Vivian's detachment from the event seems, in some respects, to place her psychologically in control of the events which are clearly happening against her will.

The broadcast of the film was preceded by the following viewer advisory in both audio and on-screen formats: "The following program contains scenes of nudity, sexuality, violence and coarse language. Viewer discretion is advised." The movie was rated as 18+. After each commercial break, a voice-over indicated that "*Bubbles Galore* continues on the Showcase Revue. Viewer discretion is advised." At midnight, following a commercial break, the "long version" of the viewer advisory in both audio and on-screen formats was repeated and an on-screen icon again displayed the 18+ rating.

There were several complaints received by the CBSC but only two which followed through with Ruling Requests; these are the basis for this decision. The first complainant (of June 21) said that she was "registering a complaint in regards to graphic sexual content" which did not constitute "appropriate subject matter for **television** [emphasis original]" at 11:00 p.m. or any hour. The second (of June 22) had similar concerns and put them more explicitly. (The full texts of both letters of complaint, the broadcaster's reply and the subsequent letters from the complainants are included in the Appendix to this decision.) Although it is not an issue for this Council, the complainant also expressed concern about the use of public money for the production of the film.

The broadcaster replied to the two complainants on July 19 and 28 respectively, saying, in part, that *Bubbles Galore* was "a feminist satire of the pornography business -- not a pornographic film." It also explained the procedures it has in place "in order to double-check compliance with these [broadcast] Codes." Neither of these complainants was satisfied with the response and both returned their Ruling Requests with accompanying letters. The first said, in part:

I was not seeing the filming of two people during a sexual act in bed etc, but a graphic, domineering, degrading scene. It was a porno movie within a cheaply produced porno movie!!!!!!

... Am I being told that a movie with a sleazy low life man, his large penis sticking out of his open zipper, INSISTING forcibly to the woman kneeling in front of him, to take it in her mouth, falls within the "ethical guidelines" of this station and broadcasting codes?

She added that parents are not always at home and that even an 11 p.m. broadcast time was unsatisfactory.

I still STRONGLY..... VERY STRONGLY.... object to films of this nature being aired on television. They belong on a video... in the adult section of a video store, for rent/purchase... NOT.... I repeat... NOT ON TELEVISION FOR A GENERAL VIEWING AUDIENCE!

The second complainant said that “many of its scenes were disgusting, degrading and unnecessary” and that “a ‘viewer advisory’ is not a license to indulge in unsavoury programming.”

THE DECISION

The CBSC’s Ontario Regional Council considered the complaint under Clause 4 of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters’ (CAB) *Sex-Role Portrayal Code* and Articles 1.1, 3.1 and 7 of the *CAB Violence Code*. It viewed a tape of Showcase’s broadcast of *Bubbles Galore* and reviewed all of the correspondence. It considers that the broadcast of the film is not in breach of any of the foregoing provisions.

The Type of Film

The first complainant was concerned about the appropriateness of the subject matter for television at any hour. The second complainant shared that view but was more specific about the film, alleging that the “movie was scum”, that it contained “sex, violence, bad language and very little in the way of a plot” and asked whether “the standards of decency have fallen so low that vulgar people can show anything they want on T.V.?”

The Council wishes to make it clear at the outset that broadcasters are entitled to the benefit of freedom of expression. The CBSC has, however, often made the point that, “in Canada, we respect freedom of speech but do not worship it,” meaning that other important Canadian social values are frequently set against free speech in reasonable limitation of that principle which is not absolute, even as cast in the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Where, for example, a broadcaster violates one of the Codes administered by the CBSC, the Council will limit that particular free expression in conformity with the principles established by Canada's private broadcasters. Conversely, where a complainant may be offended by “inappropriateness” of subject matter, bad taste, a badly scripted, plotless or otherwise badly made film, the Council's position is that the complainant must resort to the on/off switch as his or her personal sanction or, of course, register his or her protest to the broadcaster. Although the point has not generally been made in previous decisions, the Council’s experience is that broadcasters pay attention to audience complaints.

Accordingly, in this decision, the Ontario Regional Council deals only with those elements which touch on Code principles, whether these arise from the complaints themselves or are raised by the Council on its own initiative. Thus, it does not delve further into those aspects of the film which may merely touch on questions of taste or decency. Nor does the

Council deal with the cartoonish nature of the film, the overly broad brush strokes which may or may not be intentionally applied by the film's creators, except to the extent that these have a *direct* effect on the Council's understanding of elements of some of the analysed scenes.

Sex-Role Portrayal: Exploitation in Evidence?

Pursuant to Clause 4 of the *Sex-Role Portrayal Code*, although the question was not pointedly raised by either of the complainants, the Council considers that it is useful to briefly broach the issue of exploitation on the basis of gender. While it is only accurate to observe that, on a strictly quantitative basis, there may be more nudity of women than men depicted in the program, the Council considers it material to remember that the goal of the movie, as well as the film within the film, has been to portray adult film creation from the point of view of women. The creative point, therefore, is intended to be inherently sensitive, hence unexploitative, from the perspective of gender portrayal. In any case, there is male nudity depicted and, in the context of the film, the Council is not of the view that there is any material imbalance in this respect. Moreover, as will be discussed below in a different context, the creators of *Bubbles Galore* have clearly depicted the female characters of the film as superior to the male characters in both morality and intelligence but not in so inegalitarian a fashion as to unbalance the equation from the other point of view. Although not precisely applicable to this movie, the Ontario Regional Council believes that the observations of the Prairie Regional Council in *CKX-TV re National Lampoon's Animal House* (CBSC Decision 96/97-0104, December 16, 1997) are worth noting.

It is essential to remember that the principal goal of the *Sex-Role Portrayal Code* relates to the *equality* of the sexes and not to issues of sexual behaviour which do not go to equality or exploitation, which is itself a form of *inequality*.

While the portrayal of the women in the film is not overly flattering, it cannot either be said that the portrayal of the men is any better or advantages them in any way. All in all, the presentation of almost every one of this group of young college people is as unflattering as one might expect from a film emphasizing the frivolous, narcissistic, often gross, occasionally disgusting portrait of college fraternity life which can best be characterised as high farce. The question of portrayal inequality does not come into play.

Gratuitous Violence: The Principle and the Jurisprudence

While most forms of dramatic programming with violent elements (other than programming intended for children) are subject to certain requirements as to the time at which they may air or the advisories or ratings which must accompany them, the case of gratuitous violence is very different. The basic principle is, of course, that programming broadcast at any time of the day or night by a Canadian licensee may not contain *gratuitous* violence, even though the watershed hour may long since have passed. In the decision in *CITY-TV re Silence of the Lambs* (CBSC Decision 94/95-0120, August 18, 1995), the Ontario Regional Council provided what remains the definitive understanding of the term.

Gratuitous violence is defined by the Code as being “material which does not play an integral role in developing the plot, character or theme of the material as a whole.” Where, in other words, a program includes scenes of violence which are unnecessary to the progress of the story, which do not drive the plot forward, which play no role in the development or definition of the characters and are clearly serving a sensationalistic purpose, that program will be seen to contain gratuitous violence.

In the *CITY-TV* decision, the Council pointed out that “the film deals with the sociology of serial killers, one in prison for much of the film and one at large” and that, while much of the film could be expected to, and does, deal with the “constant *threat* of imminent violence”, there is only one occasion when the viewer is exposed to murders taking place *during* the course of the edited broadcast version of the film, namely, on the occasion of the escape of Dr. Lecter, the protagonist, from custody. In that case, therefore, the Council did not consider, in the first place, “that the film was afflicted by considerable violence” and, in the second place, did consider that “the violence present [was] integral to the development of plot and character.”

Similarly, in *CIHF-TV (MITV) re an Episode of “Millennium”* (CBSC Decision 96/97-0044, February 14, 1997), a case in which the complainant alleged that the violence depicted was gratuitous and sadistic, the Atlantic Regional Council concluded that the violence was integral to the story being told.

As in the case of *Silence of the Lambs*, the theme of this episode of *Millennium* involves a psychopathic serial killer and the attempts to put an end to his homicidal activities. While violence is central to the tale being recounted, the underlying saga is that of a former law enforcement official with psychic powers who is attempting to restructure his family life away from threats he and his family had suffered in the “backstory”, *i.e.* the time prior to the beginning of the first episode of the series. Such violence as occurs in the episode is central to the plot and character of the principal protagonist. Furthermore, the scenes complained of do not generally show the occurrence of violent acts as much as they do the *results* of the violent acts and, at that, the violence is not overplayed. There is also violent *imagery* and effective editing which give rise to fear, if not terror, on the part of the viewer. These are a part of a genre which is aimed at adult audiences but which does not *per se* fall afoul of the interdiction against gratuitous violence.

In *CHCH-TV re the movie Strange Days* (CBSC Decision 98/99-0043 and 0075, February 3, 1999), the facts were, in one material sense, different from those in the present case.

There, the Council faced the fact that one of the very *premises* of the film was *violence*. That is not, of course, the case of *Bubbles Galore*. Even so, in the *CHCH-TV* case, the Council refused to be caught in the circular trap of justifying *any* violent element on the basis that *every* violent element in the film would be needed to drive forward a plot which is *based* on violence. It stated:

To the extent that a program has violence as its fundamental premise, the question for the Council is to determine whether *that* premise alone will justify any and all portrayals of violence which the creators of the program might wish to include in it. To this circular argument, the Council must answer no. If this were the case, Article 1 would be rendered devoid of substance and the Council cannot presume that this was the intention of the codifiers.

Gratuitous Violence and the Case at Hand

In the present case, one of the difficulties faced by the Council is what it considers the rather erratic structure and execution of the film. While its task has been rendered somewhat more difficult thereby, it is not the case with respect to the issue of gratuitous violence. It is clear that the two scenes containing violent elements are atypical of a film whose creators appear to wish to deal more with eroticism and irony as the basis for their story. Nonetheless, the tale does involve conflict and this between an individual who has been created in the stereotypical mould of a Mob-like gangster (Bubbles' ex-lover) and a relatively defenceless heroine (Bubbles, perhaps not in an entirely traditional heroic mould) with her flawed "saviour", Buck.

In other words, the storyline is such that some physical violence can readily be understood as being required to drive the plot forward as a component of the conflict resolution. Unless, in such circumstances, the violence is so excessive with respect to what is necessary in the evolution of the tale, it will not be considered gratuitous. That, in the view of the Council, is the case here. The scene in which the two goons attack Buck is discomfiting and humiliating, to be sure, if not downright ugly. All things considered, including the buffoonish, if not cartoonish, nature of the two thugs, the absence of dangerous weaponry, the lack of blood or other evidence of significant physical harm, the Council does not view the violence as excessive, much less gratuitous.

The Rape Scene: The Application of Article 7

In dealing with rape, which is, by definition, an act of violence, the Council must consider both the general provision in Article 7.1 and the first sentence of Article 7.2, both of which are really a subset of Article 1.1, *and* the second sentence of Article 7.2, which provides that "Broadcasters shall be particularly sensitive not to perpetuate the link between women in a sexual context and women as victims of violence."

To some extent, at least in the general context of dealing with rape, the Ontario Regional Council is assisted in its view of the matter by previous decisions which it has rendered. In the first of these, *CTV re Complex of Fear* (CBSC Decision 94/95-0022, August 18, 1995), the Council drew certain conclusions about rape in general terms. It held:

The Regional Council noted four rape scenes in the film. While any scene depicting rape is necessarily awful, the members remarked that no scene lasted more than several seconds, none depicted the actual rape, and none glamorized the rape. In fact, scenes following the rapes depicted the *consequences* of the rape: the shock and despair of the victims as they related the event to the police; the occasional refusal of police to accept the characterization of the event as a rape; victims' self-doubt as to blame for the occurrence; the imputed role of previous victim behaviour as a contributing factor; and so on.

In no way did these scenes encourage or glorify violence against women. While the film dealt with a form of crime that is defined by violence against women, the film itself did not depict gratuitous, or unnecessary, violence against women. In other words, the Council affirmed that a film *about* rape does not necessarily *condone* rape.

The Council concludes that there is nothing in the scene in question which sanctions, promotes or glamorizes any aspect of the violence asserted by the rape scene involving Vivian. Indeed, there is much in the scene which could be described, as noted earlier, as cartoonish and, in some senses, the scene is as removed from a realistic depiction of a rape as one could imagine. During the scene, as an apparent dramatic contrivance of the film's creator, Vivian remains, as also noted above, detached, unmoved, apparently unconcerned by the rape which is taking place. It is almost as though she has occupied a superior psychological position, asserting to the perpetrator that, "to the extent that you wish, by this act, to assert your control over me, you have failed. I am unaffected by what you are doing." When he says that he will put his penis in her mouth, she simply replies that, if he does so, she will bite it off. When he takes out a gun and asks her whether she would like some "lead come", she is equally unruffled. While there is no denying the despicable and criminal nature of the act, in the context of the "duelling" individuals, psychologically speaking, the Council considers that Vivian has had the upper hand. Moreover, the rape scene demonstrates none of the serious concerns which the same Council had in the case of *CHCH-TV re the movie Strange Days* (CBSC Decision 98/99-0043 and 0075, February 3, 1999), in which the woman was sexually attacked in graphic fashion, with fear and pain writ large over her every feature, and ultimately strangled to death.

The one scene, though, which has most troubled the Council is the gruesome strangulation and rape of a woman which, in its length and graphic presentation, exceeded *in the television context* what may have been necessary to advance the plot. Whether the scene should have been as long (or longer) in the theatrical version is not at issue. For the television version, measured against industry Codes, it is the view of the Council that it could have been edited without sacrificing any artistic integrity, and ought to have been edited in order to be long enough to make its point but not so long as to amount to violence for violence's sake.

If a further element were required to "to perpetuate the link between women in a sexual context and women as victims of violence", the film *Strange Days* provided it. As the

Council put it, “That link could not be more evident than in a case such as this, where the recording of the event for sale as a thrill-seeking narcotic is its *raison d’être*.” In the circumstances, the Council concluded that “The length and graphic component of the scene constitute an unacceptable example of gratuitous violence against women, contrary to Article 7 of the *Violence Code*.”

Almost none of the elements which permitted the Council to conclude as it did in the case of *Strange Days* is present here. All in all, in terms of the way in which the scene was filmed, together with its purpose in the development of the film’s plot, it is considerably closer in nature to what the Council reviewed in the case of the motion picture *Kids*. In that case, the Ontario Regional Council decided that the lengthy rape scene was not in violation of the Code for the following reasons.

In this case, the rape scene is quite lengthy, lasting close to five minutes. It is the final “active” scene of the movie. While, as stated in the decision excerpt quoted above, rape scenes are always disturbing, the Council notes that this particular scene is neither graphic nor “energized” by violent action or sounds, but rather is depressingly slow moving and silent and, on another level, haunting. The young girl who is raped is the one who, throughout the movie, has been coping with the knowledge that she is carrying the AIDS virus. However unpleasant the rape scene, by virtue of what it represents, the Council does not consider it explicitly violent. In the Council’s view, despite its length, this scene was integral to the plot’s development, including the irony of its setting and the twist of the plot, in the sense of the viral nemesis which will ultimately be suffered by the rapist. For these reasons, coupled with the absence of a graphic or explicit presentation of this scene, the Council considers that it not gratuitous, and that it did not otherwise sanction, promote or glamorize violence.

Here, too, disturbing as the scene is, in no small measure resulting from the fact that Vivian is so unaffected by the violent act portrayed in the scene, a circumstance in which one would be inclined to project a more emotional reaction onto her, the Council considers that Vivian represents the film’s triumph of Woman over Man in the world of the “pornographic arts”. Calm and collected is portrayed by the filmmaker as superior to unruly and uncontrolled. This aspect of the film, like many others, is a caricature, structured to make a point (whether well or badly). In some senses there is no violence intended to be seen as real, much less glamorized. This scene, while an unenviable component of an unenviable film, does not amount to a breach of the *Violence Code*.

Broadcaster Responsiveness

In addition to assessing the relevance of the Codes to the complaint, the CBSC always assesses the *responsiveness* of the broadcaster to the substance of the complaint. In this case, the Council commends the broadcaster on its thorough and detailed response. Although the complainant was not convinced by the arguments of the Showcase representative, the Council does believe that the broadcaster addressed fully and fairly all the issues raised by the complainant and, consequently, has not breached the Council’s standard of responsiveness. Nothing more is required.

This decision is a public document upon its release by the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council. It may be reported, announced or read by the station against which the complaint had originally been made; however, in the case of a favourable decision, the station is under no obligation to announce the result.

APPENDIX
to CBSC Decision 98/99-1087 and -1133
Showcase Television re *Bubbles Galore*

I. The Complaints

The Council received several letters of complaint regarding *Bubbles Galore*; however, only two Ruling Requests were returned to the Council.

The first complaint:

The following letter of complaint dated June 21, 1999 was sent to the CRTC's Head Office which forwarded the matter to the CBSC in due course:

I am registering a complaint in regards to graphic sexual content shown on Friday, June 18th, on the Showcase Network and 11pm.

I think airing this type of material is totally out of place at that hour **and in general**. This is not appropriate subject matter for **television**.

I am not so naive to believe that we can stop such material being produced, but I personally, and as a mother, do not want it available on my home television set where impressionable youth can watch it unsupervised.

I am truly appalled that there is not more appropriate control already in place.

I thank you in advance for your serious consideration to my concerns.

The second complaint:

The following letter of complaint dated June 22, 1999 was sent to the CRTC's Head Office which forwarded the matter to the CBSC in due course. Along with his letter, the complainant attached a Starweek Magazine article entitled "Blonde bombshell".

I read the enclosed cutting in the Toronto Star's Starweek Magazine and, out of curiosity, watched part of "Bubbles Galore" on Showcase on Friday evening (June 19th.) I had hoped that Bill Anderson had been exaggerating in his review of the movie or that, if he hadn't, the Censor Board would step in and block out the raunchy parts. My hopes, however, were in vain as the movie was as bad as Anderson had predicted and the Censor Board didn't do anything about it.

The movie was scum as sex, violence, bad language and very little in the way of a plot, and didn't have any redeeming factors that I could discern; there wasn't any good photography, no good acting (there was lots of bad acting) no moral lessons, no literary worth.

In my opinion it was a porn movie. Pictures of females sucking a penis, plastic though it be, should not be shown on public television. I believe that would be the opinion of most Canadian viewers.

Παγε 2

So where was the Censor Board when it was needed? Have the standards of decency fallen so low that vulgar people can show anything they want on T.V?

I'm most annoyed that Sheila Copps handed over public money for such a trash movie and I'm most annoyed that the C.R.T.C. allowed such garbage to be broadcast.

I'm writing to protest that Showcase programming very often seems to push beyond the limits of decency and to ask that you take whatever steps may be needed to curtail their showing of vulgarities, sex and violence on public T.V.

II. The Broadcaster's Response

Both complainants received the same identical response from the Communications Manager of Showcase. The Communications Manager responded to the first complainant on July 19th, 1999 and to the second complainant on July 28, 1999 with the following:

We are in receipt of your letter to the CRTC, which was forwarded to us by the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council. We regret that you were offended by Showcase's broadcast of *Bubbles Galore* on Friday, June 18th.

An independent, low budget film with an over-the-top-slapstick style, *Bubbles Galore* is a feminist satire of the pornography business -- not a pornographic film. Canadian director Cynthia Roberts has received several awards for her cutting-edge work, which challenges conventional methods of story-telling and film production.

While Showcase is proud to broadcast a wide range of Canadian films, it is our policy to carefully consider each film that is aired on the network. Before we decide to broadcast a film, our Programming Department screens it to ensure that it is suitable for broadcast. The determination of suitability includes ensuring that the broadcast would not contravene the Canadian Association of Broadcasters' "Sex-Role Portrayal Code for Television and Radio Programming", the "Broadcast Code for Advertising to Children" or the "Voluntary Code Regarding Violence in Television Programming". The film *Bubbles Galore* was also screened by members of our senior management group in order to double-check compliance with these Codes.

In order to assist our viewers in making their viewing choices, we run a viewer advisory before our films indicating whether they contain scenes of violence, nudity and/or coarse language. In the case of *Bubbles Galore*, a "viewer discretion is advised" advisory was shown before the broadcast and after each commercial break.

We are also concerned with the content of shows broadcast during hours when children may be watching. Once we have decided to broadcast a program, our Programming Department schedules it at the most suitable time. For example, we air series and films which contain scenes of violence or have content intended for adult audiences only after 9:00 p.m., according to these codes. *Bubbles Galore* aired at 11:10 p.m. ET/PT and again at 1:06 a.m. ET/PT.

Thank you for taking the time to voice your opinion. We do appreciate feedback and hope that this letter has addressed your concerns.

III. Additional Correspondence

The first complainant was unsatisfied with the broadcaster's response and requested, on July 22, 1999, that the CBSC refer the matter to the Ontario Regional Council for adjudication. Along with her signed Ruling Request Form, she included the following note:

Thank you for your letter of July 13th, 1999 in regards to my complaint about "Bubbles Galore" which aired June 18th, 1999 on the Showcase network. I have now received a reply letter from Showcase, and I am writing to you as I do not feel a direct response to Showcase would do any good at all. My complaint is also with the governing forces that make policy decisions.

To be blunt... I feel their reply is nothing but LIP SERVICE and in general A PILE OF CRAP!!! Their letter stated "Bubbles Galore is a feminist satire of the pornography business--- not a pornographic film". Give me a break!!! What is their definition of pornography??? Certainly not what the majority of Canadian citizens feel I am sure! I was not seeing the filming of two people during a sexual act in bed etc, but a graphic, domineering, degrading scene. It was a porno movie within a cheaply produced porno movie!!!!!! (I have since learned that this low budget film" was made with funding from the taxpayers. This is yet another unbelievable farce that boggles my mind.)

Am I being told that a movie with a sleazy low life man, his large penis sticking out of his open zipper, INSISTING forcibly to the woman kneeling in front of him, to take it in her mouth, falls within the "ethical guidelines" of this station and broadcasting codes? Is there no social conscience left? I guess not!

In regards to the "voluntary code regarding violence in the television programming" 3.1 Programming/3.1.2

"Accepting that there are older children watching television after 9pm, broadcasters shall adhere to the provision of article 5.1 (viewer advisories), enabling parents to make an informed decision as the suitability of the programming for their family members".

What good does "viewer advisories" do if parents are not there?

Parents are not always home at 11pm and their teenage children are free to watch whatever they want! These guidelines are ridiculous to say the least! Bottom line is..... this type of movie should not be aired on general television under ANY circumstances.

I do not remember in detail other scenes, but the one described on the previous page certainly has remained in my memory because of the intimidating nature. I was channel surfing and this scene jumped off my screen. I could not believe my eyes. As a viewer I was indeed very offended.

I still STRONGLY..... VERY STRONGLY.... object to films of this nature being aired on television. They belong on a video... in the adult section of a video store, for rent/purchase... NOT.... I repeat... NOT ON TELEVISION FOR A GENERAL VIEWING AUDIENCE!

I want you to know that I am not some old lady prude, or a feminist totally objecting to this. I am not an activist. I am just an ordinary woman who feels there is a certain place for material such as this and that the controls that are in place are NOT sufficient. I just cannot believe that this movie (and I'm sure many others) have passed the so-called programming guidelines. Who in their right minds can condone such content on television????

Παγε 4

I am now returning the "Ruling Request" that was sent to me by your organization. Ethics on television need to be reviewed drastically if this type of film is considered ACCEPTABLE material.

I hope you can sincerely appreciate my disgust with this matter. If I could only remove Showcase from my cable selection I would, but I would lose other worthwhile stations by doing so as it is offered in a package format. I am considering it though. I just cannot understand why this type of movie would be shown on television. I do not mean to repeat myself, but I am just totally baffled by the guideline decisions that are currently in place in this country.

Thank you for your time in dealing with this matter.

The second complainant was also unsatisfied with the broadcaster's response and requested, on August 7, 1999, that the CBSC refer the matter to the Ontario Regional Council for adjudication. Along with his signed Ruling Request Form, he included the following note which was sent to Tara Lapointe and copied to the Council:

Thank you for your letter dated July 28th (file # 1133). While I appreciate that people can often hold conflicting views about what is good or bad, to me, Bubbles Galore was amateurish in it's production, it's acting and it's photography: as well, many of it's scenes were disgusting, degrading and unnecessary. I have to agree with Bill Anderson's assessment, in the Starweek Magazine, that the movie overstepped the accepted standards of decency. Since you don't see it that way, I am asking the C.B.S.C. for their opinion.

The display of a "viewer advisory" is not a license to indulge in unsavory programming.