

OUTLINE OF SALTSRING PRESENTATION:

Just seen carefully selected material that constitutes one reading of sexual images. The images don't represent pornography per se, but selections from pornography, a selection of image

that are constructed to get you, the audience angry and mobilized. That's fine, it suggests that images can be read and interpreted in a variety of contexts; that curating material can provide a specific impact. It shows images that can be read to demonstrate that mysogny is a social problem that reoccurs in various forms. What I want to emphasize is that there are different pornographies; that some people would describe what I might consider pleasurable as pornographic. We all agree that there is sexism within the media. It operates within the representations and in the choice of who plays what role in producing the representatoinis. But its too simple to say, these images, which are of certain genres of porn are bad. These images should therefore be made to disappear. All porn is bad. The problem with this approach is that it places women in a place where we can again not discuss sex. Also HOW gross, represent fantasies, not reality. They are constructed. Real women may be the participants in a highly exploited industry, but they are adult women and

we need to speak about how we work WITH them as people not as VICTIMS (objects). I want to get back to the issue of sex trade workers, in a moment. Porn represents commercially produced fantasies, but they are fantasies none theless. Certainly power is an issue within sexual fantasy, think of your own. Fantasy, however is NOT linear. Let's talk about erotic fantasy. I do not think that there is a politically correct terrain for women. Women do have fantasies of conquest and submission. Strong women I know sometimes have VERY passive fantasies, especially when they are tired, or exercising control all day. There is an element to fantasy that is about exchanging power. The problem with the assault, on sexual images is that it removes a social space where women can really talk

~~excerpt from SEE EVIL a tape that looks at the impact of video cen~~  
without moralizing about their sexuality.

The Coalition for the Right to View unites the cultural community, women, gays, independent video and film distributors, technicians, writers and teachers. We are all concerned about the potentially destructive impact of Bill 30, the recently introduced video censorship legislation. We cannot state strongly enough that this legislation does not simply deal with pornography: it covers all categories of video.

Let us be clear: whatever rhetorical assurances the Attorney General may give the public, this IS censorship legislation, not simply an informative classification scheme. Bill 30 will give sweeping powers to the Director and to the Cabinet to define sexuality, suggestive or explicit, and to change the exact criteria for what is to be classified (restricted) and censored.

The CRTV has been consistent in its call for education, alternate positive images and social reform as solutions to the problems of violence and sexism depicted in some pornography. We continue to feel that these are the solutions to the popularity of porn. While we laud the proposed initiation of an educational programme about pornography, we deplore the ongoing lack of sex education for young people and adults. It is outrageous that this legislation will cost the taxpayers of the province \$558,900, this year alone, not including the expense to artists and distributors. These sums could better be put to use in developing and distributing alternative sex-positive images.

We do not believe that it is appropriate to give one person or a

small committee the power to decide what is offensive, what is sexually explicit and what is art and on that basis to proscribe access for an entire province. These are major concerns that are not easily defined in our society. There is no readily enforceable community standard. Yet the legislation gives wide discretionary powers to the director to make these judgements.

Nor do we believe that sexual explicitness should be separated as a criteria for restricting images. We do not feel that access to explicit sexual imagery is dangerous for youth. In fact, young people seek out pornography precisely because they are curious about sex, lack concrete information and are looking for role models. Suppression through restriction simply reinforces the ancient values that sex is dirty, not to be discussed and certainly not shown.

There is a punitive quality to the legislation: specifically the stiff fines and potential prison sentences for distributors or artists who resist the submission of their work. We are concerned that the act empowers "authorized individuals" or the police to seize videotapes, to inspect on site and to demand access to equipment and eventually to destroy tapes.

There are no real exemptions for artists' centres that coincide with the reality of screening and use of video in Canada. Video artists have been careful to preserve a wide public access to their work, not to limit it to a narrow elitist club, as the legislation proposes. Unfortunately, even the decision of what is an educational context is left up to the discretion of the director. There is a growing,

dynamic, independent film and video community in this city. This legislation will curtail its ability to communicate. Video centres reach many people with open public access, and programmed events. There is a strong tradition in this medium of work about sexuality, of reversing and decontextualizing the images from mass culture including porn, of exploring images by women as well as of them.

These important alternative visions could be lost. This is work that teenagers should see. This is work that should not be kept from public access.

While we oppose all censorship, we would certainly present a different analysis of an image involving a real youth of thirteen years and one in which the actor "appears" to be under the age of 14 or 18. The legislation collapses the goal of protecting young people from actual exploitation in child pornography with images being

allowed to address issues of youth sexuality, What about recent work such as My American Cousin? What about the many feminist tapes that present a retrospective view of growing up female in this culture. Must we again pretend that female is not sexual? The potential of abuse of this kind of wording is extreme.

The CRTV does not see censorship as a solution. The more extreme images will continue to be available underground, perhaps at a more precious cost to the buyer. Porn will be more attractive to teens because of the "verboten" label, (and will still be available at home). We don't think that the law will diminish the rampant incidence of sexual abuse, violence against women and children, rape and battery. In fact, it could well help us on our way to a society

where these crimes continue to accelerate even more: a society of repression, where imaginative resistance is not permitted and where a discussion of abuse, let alone of pleasure is prohibited.

Some points to take up:

- "adult" defined as "depicts explicit sexual scenes"
- coercing of person to engage in sexual act whether real or suggested
- bondage
- under age of 14 sexual suggestive
- under 18 in explicit scenes
- sex and violence

REGULATION 14(d)

definition of distribution: "rent, lease, sell, supply or offer to do so

film includes prerecorded video tape: contents of motion picture:  
what is definition? we assume means any moving picture literally

distributor: distributes to a theatre, or contracts with other

EXCLUSION: public library, university, educational institution where  
film is located for educational purposes: govt.

theater is a hall, building, premise, place, room PUBLIC exhibition

video distributor: to an outlet, video retailer: to a person

Must submit before public screening; must get o.k. to submit; if  
conditions must meet conditions; must attach certificate of approval;  
does not include educational purposes at university or other

instution,

same regulations apply to adult films

EXEMPTIONS:

1) film societies, non-profit societies with membership 18 or older;  
if motives are appreciation of video as art, info. or education; if  
exempted cannot show except to members

procedure:

film is submitted, payment of fee necessary, at discretion of  
director: fee waived;

cuts: coercion, incest, necrophelia, bondage in sexual context,  
suggestive of under 14, under 18 engaged in sexual scene, CANNOT  
APPEAR TO BE THOSE AGES

violence; brutality; torture; REALISM; bestiality

not approved if predominated by these scenes

powers:

- restrict use and exhibition
- restrict access by minors
- ads require submission
- clasification designation and warning



- once restricted cannot be distributed to minor; only in designated theatre (discretion of director); physical and visual segregation of materials

-

MUST BE LICENSED BY DIRECTOR TO DISTRIBUTE VIDEO "no person"

- license can be lifted, appeal board
- appeal within 10 days prohibition; seizure; refusal to issue licence, FEE to appeal

#### POWERS:

- to enter to inspect; to use premise's equipment to do so
- this individual may seize film; if not approved; may destroy after 60 days unless appeal
- contravention or obstruction will result in \$10,000 or less fine or 6 months in jail

#### SECTION 14:

- order in council to change operation and licensing of distributors; location; classification scheme; prescribe conduct re: adult; define explicit sexual scenes and sexually suggestive scenes; fees;

cost: \$558,900 by march 31, 1987 for realization and

in addition:

- 1) education and communication programme on porn