

Mr G M Dawson,

Dear BBC,

Thank you for sending me this Charter Review which I am only to glad to respond to.

.1. The thing I most value about the BBC is that you have a vast range of subjects covered and seem to cater for the majority of the public. As I do not sleep a lot I find the Open University programmes very interesting at 3.30am. It is better than watching the other channels with their repeats of chat shows etc.

You do cover a lot of sport, which I enjoy, but why is it that Tennis is never [or as far as I am aware] been the number one show in the ratings yet you think it is a good idea to have Wimbledon on two sides at the same time, after taking off rating winnings shows?

If tennis was that good every year it would be no.1 and no.2 in the ratings - yet it never is. When the olympics are on we never get to watch over eight hours of the same sport continuous not like we do with tennis.

To me all that seems to be screened during school hours are programmes aimed at either women, children or pensioners. Do you not realise that there are a lot of men out there that are fathers, or unemployed, who would like to watch something of interest to them?

Why start a film night when you know it will have to take a break for the news? That is so annoying! The one strength you used to have was being able to show a film without a break but now you often ruin that ideal.

Another thing do the powers that be over films not realise that all they have to do is check the calendar to see when christmas films should be screened or when it is Friday the thirteenth to show the film of the same title on the Friday the thirteenth for example.

Does no one know that if there is a film with sequels we would like to see the first one first not no.3 followed by no.2 then to watch the original weeks later! Why do you show the first in a series of films then wait months to show the second one? Why do you not devise a timetable so that a series of films are shown over a matter of a few weeks? Why air highlights of the snooker well after midnight [and darts etc] yet tennis is different? Stop putting films on at around 1am - put them on at around 11.30pm.

The most annoying thing you do is to advertise something to start at a certain time and end at a certain time and yet you hardly ever keep to that schedule. What you do do is to end something almost on the hour, then show a trailer of something to come [which lasts for about a minute] which means the next thing is slightly over running and ends slightly late. SO WHAT you may say. So what, I'll tell you so what when I set the timer on the video to tape for just one hour I expect to find the item recorded for that hour, but no, because of your slight over running I find I have missed the last fifty seconds of that item. It is no good trying to tell me to put the timer on for a extra few minutes to be on the safe side - I cannot do that - for the simple reason is if I am recording a item at 8pm until 9pm on BBC1 and the next item on BBC2 to 9pm until 9.30pm it just will not work. So when you advertise a schedule will you please stick to it?

And when something goes wrong with our picture why is it all we get told is "we are sorry for any problem you may have had, it was a technical fault"? Why can you not tell us the real reason? We will be able to understand the phrases "a aerial has been blown up" "the person in charge at this end forgot to put the tape/cd in" "someone tripped over a lead and pulled it out of it socket" "lightening has struck the main antenna"

On the same sort of thing why is it when you are doing a outside broadcast the person you are interviewing always has trouble with the ear piece? Yet if you put a TV in front of them they would have no trouble understanding everything that was being asked of them. Please do not try to tell me it would cause 'feedback' because we know it would not due to the fact we see people, all the time, being interveiwed in their own homes and we see th TV on in the background - with them on it - with no 'feedback'.

You seem to me to almost be in touch with the latest technology. The reason I say this is because you still tell us to put www. Before everthing and yet on ITV we only have to put GM. To get in touch with GMTV.

Your online services are great as long as you keep right up to date with everthing.

This is the 21<sup>st</sup> century and you still think it ridiculous to show adverts. Why? After all you do show some adverts for some of your own products so why not go the whole hog and show real adverts?

The radio licence was abolished, the dog licence was abolished because it was realised they were so out of date so do you not think it was about time the BBC stopped living in the past and abolished the licence? After all the BBC is just one of hundreds of TV stations yet we have to pay you for the privilege of watching what you say we can watch, a bit outdated don't you think?

Surely this ridiculous situation of paying the BBC a fee to watch hundreds of other channels is just one of self boosting ego to tell everyone "you cannot watch that TV set you have bought unless you pay us to watch it" when you sit down and think about it it is so old fashioned. It is not democracy it is dictatorial. The sooner you abolish it the better.

Just think if you did decide to catch up with the rest of the world and enter the 21<sup>st</sup> century and start advertising you would receive a lot more revenue than you presently do, and it would not bother anyone how much you pay your over paid soap stars, or give people £200-£500 to the bargain hunters [our licence money] or pay for a makeover or holiday presenter to go on holiday.

Seeing as how it is public money that pays for the BBC why are there hardly any public information films shown?

Is it not reasonable to expect the top people in the BBC to let us know just how much of a obscene amount of money they are being paid out of our licence money - after all they work for us.

Who do these people think they are to tell us what we can and cannot watch? After all they watch it first and then tell us it is not for us to watch? Why can some adult not make the brave decision to allow any programme to be aired but put a warning out first that it may offend some people. If you do a bit of research on C4 you will see that when they had a "red warning triangle" season of programmes they were well in with the ratings war. It was always in the paper that people would rush home just to see what C4 were showing.

The BBC could do like all other channels and have a separate channel just for sport and films - after all you have plenty of kiddies channels - why not some for us adults?

I cannot understand why you should be held accountable to parliament when no other business in GB has to be. Tell them if they want you to be accountable to them then they should fund you completely and not us the public.

Yours Faithfully

G M Dawson

