
**CANADIAN BROADCAST STANDARDS COUNCIL
ONTARIO REGIONAL COUNCIL**

CFYI-AM re the *Dr. Laura Schlessinger Show*

(CBSC Decision 99/00-0005)

Decided February 9, 2000

R. Stanbury (Chair), P. Fockler (Vice-Chair), R. Cohen (*ad hoc*),
M. Hogarth and M. Oldfield

and

**CANADIAN BROADCAST STANDARDS COUNCIL
ATLANTIC REGIONAL COUNCIL**

CJCH-AM re the *Dr. Laura Schlessinger Show*

(CBSC Decisions 98/99-0808, 1003 and 1137)

Decided February 15, 2000

C. McDade (Chair), Z. Rideout (Vice-Chair), R. Cohen (*ad hoc*) and K. MacKaulay

THE FACTS

CFYI-AM (Toronto) and CJCH-AM (Halifax) broadcast the daily call-in show hosted by Laura Schlessinger out of California. The host of the show responds to callers' queries on issues of varying kinds, dealing generally with questions relating to family, children, morality and religion, delivering what she describes as "thoughtful information, positive advice and time-honored solutions" to their concerns. She also frequently reads letters from listeners and articles from newspapers and other periodicals (including many which are critical of her views), commenting and reacting in accordance with the issues encountered. Although she is technically not rendering on-air therapeutic services, her advice can easily be understood by listeners to be of a psychological, if not pop psychological, nature. Perhaps because of this, although she is neither a medical doctor nor the holder of a Ph.D. in psychology, she

characterizes herself as *Dr. Laura* on the basis of the Ph.D. in physiology which she earned at Columbia University in 1974.

The complaints which arose in the matters before the Ontario and Atlantic Regional Councils resulted from the positions expounded by the host on a theme common to the complaints raised in the files dealt with in this decision, namely, her treatment of gays and lesbians. These complaints related specifically to the broadcasts of April 12, 14 and 16, June 2, 10, 22 and 30, and July 1, 1999 in the case of the Atlantic Region and August 13, 19 and 24, 1999 in the case of Ontario. While full transcripts of the relevant portions of the programs in question are supplied in the Appendix hereto, examples of the most pertinent comments are provided within the body of this decision under the individual headings to which they relate.

This decision results from four complaints which were sufficiently specific to be adjudicated by the CBSC's Regional Councils (the CBSC received other complaints about the show which made no mention of specific broadcast dates or times, or sometimes even of the particular broadcaster, the show being syndicated on a number of Canadian stations, and thus could not be handled by the CBSC as a part of its complaints resolution process). One of the complaints related to the broadcast of the *Schlessinger Show* on CFYI-AM in Toronto while the three other complaints related to CJCH-AM's broadcast of the show in Halifax. The full text of the correspondence relating to these four complaints can also be found in the Appendix but the Council finds that the following summary, taken from one of the letters, is particularly well-focussed and articulate as well as knowledgeable regarding previous CBSC jurisprudence and, consequently, provides a concise representation of the several complainants' concerns regarding the show.

The "Dr. Laura" program contains regularly made abusive and discriminatory comments about gays and lesbians, ranging from frequent characterization of sexual behaviour as "deviant", to implied and explicit comments linking homosexuality to paedophilia, to describing children being raised by lesbian parents as "victims", to frequent comments of a gay "agenda" to, among other things, get access to children for propaganda purposes in schools. There are also comments made that somehow gays can "change" their sexuality, comments made which were tantamount to professional opinion without any fair presentation of opposing views. I ask the CBSC to find that the program is in breach of Clauses 2 (Human Rights) and 6 (Presentation of News, Comment, Opinion, and Editorial) of the *CAB Code of Ethics*.

Moreover, given the fact that I have only listened to approximately eight to ten hours of the program this year, given the frequency and regularity which these comments have come up over relatively few broadcasts, in particular, terms sexually "deviant" and "gay agenda", I ask that the CBSC consider a determination that the program is of the "Ongoing breach by a series" types and warrants appropriate action.

CFYI's response to the complainant stated in part:

You may not share the moral views of Dr. Laura Schlessinger. However, she is entitled to express her opinion. Furthermore, her moral views are popular as evidenced by her significant and loyal listening audience.

I believe we do a very good job of providing balanced opportunity to present all sides of an issue, which will allow our audience to make up their own minds on the matter under discussion.

For its part, CJCH generally held that

We appreciate that a certain number of the issues that Dr. Schlessinger addresses on her program can be controversial. She is well-known for expressing strong opinions on issues that are politically, socially and religiously sensitive. Indeed, certain of her views on some of these controversial issues may at times, be offensive to some radio listeners.

...

We respect Dr. Schlessinger's right to express views and opinions that may be inconsistent with the opinions of station management, with those of some of our listeners, and which may even be considered to be politically incorrect.

... Given the state of the political debate in Canada, we believe it is important and necessary that all views on the issue are heard in as open a forum as possible.

The Ontario and Atlantic Regional Councils both agree that the facts and issues raised by the complaints in each region, as well as the substance of the challenged episodes of the program, are sufficiently similar and based on the same Code principles and Council reasoning that the Councils' respective decisions could logically be presented as a joint decision of both Councils.

THE DECISION

The Councils reviewed tapes of each of the shows emanating from their respective areas and considered the complaints under Clauses 2 and 6 of the *Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB) Code of Ethics*. They conclude that, although the focus of many of Laura Schlessinger's comments in the challenged episodes are of concern, when these are carefully analysed, *most* do not amount to a breach of either provision of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. They also conclude that those of her comments characterizing the sexuality of gays and lesbians as "abnormal", "aberrant", "deviant", "disordered", "dysfunctional", "an error" or the like and her generalized statements that paedophilia has to do with being gay and is more common among members of the gay community than the heterosexual community, are in violation of the human rights provision of the *CAB Code of Ethics* (Clause 2) and also constitute an unfair or improper expression of opinion or comment pursuant to Clause 6 of that same Code.

The terms of the foregoing standards established by Canada's private broadcasters are, in pertinent part, as follows:

CAB Code of Ethics, Clause 2

Recognizing that every person has a right to full and equal recognition and to enjoy certain fundamental rights and freedoms, broadcasters shall endeavour to ensure, to the best of their ability, that their programming contains no abusive or discriminatory material or comment which is based on matters of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, [sexual orientation], marital status or physical or mental handicap.

CAB Code of Ethics, Clause 6(3)

It is recognized that the full, fair and proper presentation of news, opinion, comment and editorial is the prime and fundamental responsibility of the broadcast publisher.

Sexual orientation has been “read in” the human rights provision of the *CAB Code of Ethics* since 1994. The Councils do not consider it necessary to review at length the CBSC decisions which have carefully explained and restructured Clause 2 so as to ensure that it reflects sexual orientation as one of the grounds of protection in the Code as it is in the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, the *Radio Regulations, 1986*, the *Television Broadcasting Regulations, 1987*, the *Canadian Human Rights Act* and all other relevant federal and provincial human rights legislation, as required by the Supreme Court of Canada. Those who wish to consult any of the previous CBSC decisions on this subject may consider, among others, *CHQR-AM re Forbes and Friends* (CBSC Decision 92/93-0187, August 8, 1994), *CJRQ-FM re Opinion Poll* (CBSC Decision 94/95-0135, March 26, 1996), *CHCH-TV re Life Today with James Robison* (CBSC Decision 95/96-0128, April 30, 1996) and *CKRD-AM re Focus on the Family* (CBSC Decision 96/97-0155, December 16, 1997).

Freedom of Speech in Canada

While the position of the CBSC on freedom of expression has been firmly established in its previous jurisprudence, it cannot be assumed that every person reading this decision will be familiar with what has gone before. Consequently, a brief review of this issue is merited here, particularly since this program originates in the United States and is broadcast in Canada. In other words, it originates in a jurisdiction subject to one constitutional legal regime and is re-broadcast in another jurisdiction with a constitutional legal regime which is *not* identical. (Nor, it should also be noted, ought one to assume that the *cultural* regimes in the originating and receiving countries are identical either. There is further discussion of this issue below.)

In a not dissimilar circumstance, that is to say, the consideration of an American-originating program being syndicated in Canada, namely, *CHOM-FM and CILQ-FM re Howard Stern Show* (CBSC Decision 97/98-0001+, October 17-18, 1997), the Quebec and Ontario Regional Councils highlighted distinctions between the Canadian and American approaches to the free speech issue which might result in the acceptability of a broadcast in one country and the non-acceptability of the same program in the other. To do this, they

compared the American *Bill of Rights* and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, the American *Communications Act of 1934* and the *Canadian Broadcasting Act*; as well as the CAB Codes. The latter have no equivalent in the United States. The Councils said:

In broadest terms, the texts of the First Amendment in the American *Bill of Rights* and the first and second sections of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* are materially different. The American approach is far more sweeping. It provides that

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

In Canada, freedom of expression is nowhere declared to be as absolute. In the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, Section 2(b), which declares the existence of the fundamental freedoms “of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication”, is expressly declared to be subject to the limitation imposed in Section 1, which declares:

The *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.

The Councils elaborated on the special role of private broadcaster Codes in Canada and their recognition by the CRTC in the broadcast regulator’s elaboration of the responsibilities of the CBSC and the broadcasters themselves.

[A]ll Canadian broadcast licensees know perfectly well that there are public rules *in Canada* to which broadcasters must adhere as well as others to which private broadcasters have *chosen* to adhere. In this latter category fall the Canadian Association of Broadcasters Codes, of which there is no equivalent in the United States. These are, however, viewed by Parliament and the CRTC as a necessary and integral component to our broadcasting system. As the CRTC said in its opening words to the Public Notice approving the creation of the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council (PN CRTC 1991-90),

The purpose of this public notice is to advise licensees and the public that the Commission fully supports the objective of the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council (the CBSC), which is to encourage high standards of professional conduct on the part of private radio and television broadcasters by ensuring that social concerns and values are reflected in their programming decisions. The Council administers specific codes of broadcast conduct and provides a means of recourse for members of the public regarding the application of these standards.

In the *Stern* decision, the Regional Councils also focussed on the CBSC’s specific approach to freedom of expression.

The CBSC has frequently observed that freedom of expression is the *basic* rule which it applies in the rendering of its decisions but it believes that this principle is not absolute. It is and must be subject to those values which, in a free and democratic society, entitle all

members of society both to speak *and* to be free from the abridgment of those other values in which they and other Canadians believe. Free speech without responsibility is not liberty; it is licence. The freedom to swing one's arm ends where it makes contact with one's neighbour's nose. The length of that arc is what the CBSC determines from case to case.

The CBSC has also previously stated its position that, in Canada, we respect freedom of speech but do not worship it. It will be *one* of the societal values to be weighed against others. It is significant but not absolute; material, to be sure, but not free of that compromise essential to ensure a balanced and free democracy for all who dwell there. It would be no consolation for those in pain that the inflictors induced that agony in the presumed legitimate exercise of *their* freedom. It follows that the CBSC focusses on a balance of values in its decisions and that the Council considers that it is essential that *Canadian* standards continue to be applied to programs aired by Canadian broadcast licensees, whatever the country of origin of the programs which they broadcast. As the Councils put this point in the *Stern* decision:

The globalization of the late twentieth century village does *not* mean the abdication of the maintenance of order within its Canadian borders. The existence of *other* standards in *other* parts of the global village cannot weaken the need to apply home-grown standards within the Canadian bailiwick. The bar should not be lowered in Canada just because it is set at a lesser height elsewhere in the village. There is no need for the chain of vigilance *here* to be as weak as its weakest links elsewhere. If, however, an alert to the re-definition of principles is called for by what is created in other parts of the village, Canadian broadcasters have *consistently* shown their willingness and skill to rise to such challenges.

The Councils do consider that CFYI was fair in stating its obligation to “provid[e] balanced opportunity to present all sides of an issue” and that CJCH was equally reasonable in declaring that “it is important and necessary that all views on the issue are heard in as open a forum as possible.” This is, of course, true until such time, if any, as the full-blown exercise of that right clashes with the right of individuals to be free from abusively discriminatory comment based on the enumerated and implied characteristics delineated in Clause 2 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. Freedom of expression does not, in the view of the Councils, impinge upon the right of persons in Canada, as in this case, to be free from abusively discriminatory comment based upon their sexual orientation. The onerous duty of the Councils is to determine whether that line has been crossed in the various episodes of the *Dr. Laura Schlessinger Show* to which reference has been made above.

The Host's Credentials

The Councils are troubled by the host's generalized approach to the question of gay and lesbian rights and culture and will have more to say about this issue following their findings with respect to a number of specific matters discussed immediately below. They have another threshold concern, though, before embarking on the specific issues raised by the complainants and it relates to how the host describes herself, namely, as “*Dr. Laura*”. It would be one thing for her to hold the opinion that the lifestyle which she criticizes is *sinful*; whether that perspective is reasonable or not, no particular qualifications are required to

hold and express such a view. Indeed, the question of sinfulness has previously been found by the CBSC to be a matter of opinion and, in that case, the CBSC has supported a broadcaster's right to air this point of view on the airwaves. In *CHCH-TV re Life Today with James Robison* (CBSC Decision 95/96-0128, April 30, 1996), the Ontario Regional Council expressed its position in the following terms:

In this case, it appears to the Council that it was the host's point of view with which the complainant took issue. The host's message was that monogamous heterosexuality was the "right" lifestyle. He expressed the view that a proper interpretation of the Bible leads to the conclusion that homosexuality is an unacceptable lifestyle (as is also the case with adulterous heterosexuality, according to his interpretation). It is not the Council's mandate to determine the correctness of the views presented, but only whether the views were presented in a non-abusive, legitimate manner. In a contrary circumstance, they would be in breach of the Code; however, in this case, the Council finds that the host's statements were expressed as his moral position, presented in a legitimate manner and not at all as hateful commentary.

On the other hand, the use of terms such as "aberrant", "deviant", "a [biological] error", "disordered" and "dysfunctional", which appear to have a *medical* connotation to them, is exacerbated by the host's insistence on describing herself as *Dr.* Schlessinger, when the degree which she has earned has no relevance to the opinions which she expresses. Schlessinger may have a *technical* entitlement to so describe herself. Nonetheless, it is the Councils' view that it is the societal cachet of the term "Dr." which Laura Schlessinger chooses to exploit with a view to adding weight to the positions she espouses. She may, by virtue of *other* training, be qualified to speak to the issues which she regularly addresses; however, it is an exaggerated, if not manipulative or misleading, choice which she makes to underscore the "Dr." association on a constant basis (even using it as a part of the access number which she gives out to potential callers, namely, "1-800-D-R-L-A-U-R-A"). Moreover, the Councils were particularly struck by the statement made by the host in her monologue of April 12 (cited in full in the Appendix) in quoting something written by the spokesperson for the American Psychological Association: "[T]his was the original comment by ... the APA spokeswoman. She said 'Mrs. Schlessinger,' and that's my mother; I'm *Dr.* Schlessinger." The Councils regret the deceptive effect that this must have on her audience, particularly in the context of the gay and lesbian issue at hand, but acknowledge that there is nothing in that choice which *per se* constitutes a breach of the broadcast Codes.

The Issues

While the Councils are very conscious of the cumulative water-dripping on a stone effect of the host's perspective on the various gay and lesbian issues which she broaches on an ongoing basis, they consider that it is important to deal with them one by one before concluding with some general observations. That being said, not every gay and lesbian issue raised by the complainants will be dealt with. Nor do the Councils consider this to be necessary since their concerns have more to do with the *treatment* of the various matters

than any resolution of whether Schlessinger is technically right or wrong on each or, indeed, any of them. The Councils' concerns are whether the host's comments are abusively discriminatory or constitute the opposite of "full, fair and proper presentation of news, opinion, editorial and comment." The Councils will, consequently, limit themselves to the host's comments on the gay agenda, the gay culture, fatherless homes, paedophilia, the murder of Matthew Shepard and her generalized allegations of sexual deviancy, aberration and dysfunction.

The Councils must also reiterate that the CBSC is *not* an evidence-gathering body. The consequence of this fact is that the Councils' responsibility is not to adjudicate between the two sides of the various issues treated in these broadcasts or even to sort out the preponderance of the political, scientific or medical argument. *That* is the responsibility of the two sides themselves in the public marketplace of ideas. In that exchange, the proponent of one perspective may hold sway from time to time but, in a democracy, the pendulum of ideas may at other moments swing in favour of the other protagonist in the debate. In the Canadian democracy, it is the responsibility of broadcasters to ensure that their programming, on an *overall* basis, presents such balance that all significant sides to an issue may be heard. It is not their responsibility, or even entitlement, to cut one side or the other off. *As long as no Code is breached in that process*, the intellectual jousting is to be encouraged. Although it is not otherwise directly material in this decision, the principles of Clause 7 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* should be borne in mind:

Recognizing in a democracy the necessity of presenting all sides of a public issue, it shall be the responsibility of member stations to *treat fairly, all subjects of a controversial nature*. Time shall be allotted with due regard to all the other elements of balanced program schedules, and to the degree of public interest in the questions presented. Recognizing that *healthy controversy* is essential to the maintenance of democratic institutions, the broadcast publisher will endeavour to encourage presentation of news and opinion on any controversy which contains an element of the public interest. [Emphasis added.]

In the case of the broadcasts at issue here, it is the Councils' view that, with respect to most, but not all, of the issues, the broadcasters have complied with their established standards. With respect to one critically important element, however, it is the view of the Councils that the show has gone too far and that the controversy has, as a function of those standards, become *unhealthy* and its treatment *unfair*.

The Gay Agenda Issue

Laura Schlessinger has dealt with topics related to the "gay agenda" in many of the broadcasts reviewed by the Council. Examples include the April 14 show, during which she dealt with the response of Bakersfield, California, parents to a gay teacher. They had asked that their children be removed from his class because they claimed that he was discussing his sexual orientation during the class. The host said, among other things:

[T]he issue is not, from what I read in the papers, the issue is not that he was homosexual. Period. It was that that was creeping into the classroom. So it sounds like he made it an issue. The teacher. From what I read in the papers. ... I find that outrageous. We have the right to remove children from sex education classes we think are inappropriate. Isn't that a form of indirect sexual education? ... [M]y question is: Why are we doing that? Why do you want to teach 6 year-olds about two men having sex with each other? If you're just trying to ... and you know, it isn't about tolerance, it's about acceptance. ... That's a big difference from "don't hurt anyone's feelings" because they have a problem, or they look different, or whatever. Somebody's in a wheel chair; you don't make fun. Somebody has a sexual identity problem; you don't make fun. I mean, that's sort of standard but that's not what's happening. What's happening is that there are programs all over the country now on TV trying to teach children that two men together is equivalent to their mommy and daddy. What is that? And if you say that's not a good thing, then you wanted Matthew Shepard killed.

Schlessinger then returned to the point of the gay teacher in the classroom, concluding:

But when people now are starting now to propagandize in the classrooms, that has to be stopped. So there's a difference between an individual who happens to be gay with a brilliant teacher who is teaching a subject. If people were hauling their kids out of that person's class, I'd be the first one telling them they were idiots. But there's a big difference between that and somebody bringing their homosexuality into the class and propagandizing it in any way. Then I would tell that person they're [*sic*] an idiot. I hope you're real clear on that. Now how can that be phobic and hateful and hostile? I just don't want our kids propagandized that what is abnormal is normal. I don't think it helps their growth, their psyche and civilization.

The challenged segments of the August 13 episode related essentially to the contents of a fax which the host had received and read in bits and pieces with her contrary arguments interspersed as she went. The author of the fax observed that Schlessinger had "increasingly become the mouthpiece for the religious right on the topic of homosexuality. I notice you are always careful to say homosexual instead of gay." The host's position on that was explained as follows:

When we have the word homosexual, we are clarifying the dysfunction, the deviancy, the reality. We change it to the word gay, it makes it more difficult to pinpoint the truth. So one of the things that the homosexual agenda did was to change the name. Just like somebody complained to me yesterday about ethnic cleansing, that it sounds like washing machine as opposed to murder. They were right. Ethnic cleansing sounds nice. Murder is the truth, homosexuality is the truth. Gay isn't.

She then dealt with the question of a gay agenda in the following terms:

She [the letter writer] says "No. 1, there is no organized gay agenda." I mean, I don't know what to say. The organized gay agenda writes me all the time. They have web sites everywhere. They're mobilized, they're unified. They're strong. They're well funded.

The Councils consider that Schlessinger's reluctance to use the appellations "gay and lesbian", which have been a *proper* part of the lexicon for years, says more about her reluctance to enter the current era than it does about gays and lesbians. As to the issue of her treatment of the so-called gay agenda, the Councils do, however, believe that Schlessinger's comments are themselves quite balanced. Her stance appears principally

to relate to the fact that there are organizations with a point of view to espouse and defend. She refers to some of them specifically, such as GLAAD (Gay and Lesbian Alliance against Defamation) and NAMBLA (North American Man/Boy Love Association), and says that, in general terms, “They have web sites everywhere. They’re mobilized. They’re unified. They’re strong. They’re well funded.” These do not seem, to the Councils, to be disparaging observations. They constitute a recognition that the associations are strong, positive and effective. In this case, the Councils have the sense that it is she who, in espousing her perspective, may be having to swim upstream. In any event, there is no way that she has made a generalized *negative* observation regarding the gay agenda. Grudging recognition perhaps of their effectiveness but *nothing* like the attribution of insidiousness and malevolence which the Prairie Regional Council believed was evident in *CKRD-AM re Focus on the Family* (CBSC Decision 96/97-0155, December 16, 1997).

Here Laura Schlessinger has referred to the odd individual example of a particular teacher’s views on gay issues being expressed in a classroom but she has not even generalized this case to the gay and lesbian association level. Moreover, she represents unequivocally that she would take strong issue with anyone who tried to keep a teacher out of the classroom on the basis of his or her sexual orientation. She is equally clear that she opposes the importation into the classroom (presumably by either a homosexually or heterosexually oriented teacher) of views regarding this aspect of sexual education. This is not to say that her opinion is or is not pedagogically correct but only that, here, the Councils consider that she is entitled to express that view without, on that account, being considered as expressing abusively discriminatory comments on the basis of sexual orientation.

The Gay Culture Issue

On the April 16 show, the host stated the following regarding “gay culture” (in response to an article in the *Deseret News* which dealt with a high school presentation about the gay community and gay culture):

The gay culture? I’m trying to understand, what is that? I remember the 70s and 80s that the line was that this is only about sex, it’s not about anything else, right? So what’s the gay culture? Is that where we get into the promiscuity and the paedophilia? Or are these just regulation human beings, who somehow have an error in their sexual orientation but otherwise are seriously regulation human beings? I’m confused. First I’m told for 20 years that it’s only about sex. Now I’m told it’s a whole culture. So what’s in the culture? What is it? If it’s just about sex, then the culture must only be about sex. Otherwise you’re American culture. But listen to this. “They presented a slide show, Friday, during the school’s popular culture assembly which also features dances from Polynesian, African and Latin countries.” That’s culture. Sexual deviations are not culture. They’re sexual deviations.

In the Council’s view, while the host’s views on this issue appear to be out-of-step with the times, they do not contravene any Code provision. That she opines that, because in the 70s and 80s, “the line was that this was only about sex” (if indeed it was ever so stated on a generalized basis), hardly means that a quarter of a century later nothing has changed.

Culture has since been broadly applied to define various groups in society which share common interests, values and goals; hence, the burgeoning, in Canada at least, of a plethora of cultures which unite discreet groups in society today.

The host's monolithic approach to the subject (if the culture is not "only ... about sex, ... [it's] otherwise ... American culture") is clearly narrow and conservative. More to the point, though, this is only a statement of *her* opinion. It carries no more weight than the opinion of those she hopes to contradict, and possibly less. Even if this perspective is also anachronistic, Schlessinger is as entitled to express that perspective as those who, for example, have views which do not reflect a 21st century perspective on the role of women or any other societal issues. In either case, the expression of such views might, in some circumstances, go too far, exceeding the bounds of the human rights provision of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. It is not, however, the opinion of the Councils that the host has gone too far in this case.

The Fatherless Homes Issue

The host's position on fatherless homes was made clear on June 22nd when she stated:

And then they tell me they are going to have a beautiful child and be a great mother, to a kid condemned to no two-parent home, with a dad. In spite of some stupid trash that comes out of the psychological community that says dad is not necessary, which I think is a plot for two women to have kids and to justify it. ... How can anybody in their right mind, with over forty years of concrete evidence on the devastation wrought to children, both male and female, with no dad, not see the psychological community publishing trash that minimizes or discounts the importance of fathers?

She then dealt with the same issue via a call from Christine, whose cousin, a lesbian, was at the point of adopting a child. She advised her that

That is the basic, central point. Whether it be two lesbians, a single heterosexual woman, to intentionally make or get a child and raise them in a situation, to obligate them destructively to a family situation with no husband and wife, no father is a travesty and it ought to be illegal.

After some intervening dialogue, Schlessinger took the following position:

You have a moral obligation to save this potential child so it will be directed towards a heterosexual family where it is the most ideal situation for the psychological development of a human being. This is, as I said, a travesty, a moral travesty filling in for the power of the particular ideology that doesn't give a damn about the kids, only about what we adults want. That's typical. That's not, that's not a gay agenda thing, that's more an adult agenda thing but particularly speaking there is a powerful, gay, ideological activist power group that makes it an issue of discrimination against them when in reality, it is a destructive reality for children.

On the August 19 show, she referred to NARTH (the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality) and then took a call from a woman whose sister was living with a lesbian partner who was then pregnant.

Julie: My husband and I since two years ago have become Christians and have strong Christian beliefs. My sister is living in a gay lifestyle. Her live-in girlfriend is pregnant. This is a choice they have made. They are already mad at me because I will not congratulate them on that choice.

The Host: What, of robbing a child of a father? You should congratulate them for that?

Julie: Of what?

The Host: Of robbing a child of a father?

Julie: Right.

The Host: Doesn't seem like a reason to congratulate anybody.

...

The Host: I can't celebrate people robbing, two men robbing a child of a mommy or two women robbing a child of a daddy.

Julie: I can't either.

The Host: It's as though it were irrelevant. As though it were a fact that a penis and a vagina, male and female, were somehow irrelevant and makes no difference to children. It's bizarre thinking. It's self-centred thinking on rights and not thinking what's in the best interest of children. It horrifies me, so I can't tell you what to do. I really rail against "You tell me if I should do this." I can't do that for your life. I could say that, you know, you don't have ill will toward an innocent child but you don't have to participate in things you find unholy, immoral, whatever.

While there is also significant medical literature regarding the normalcy of children raised by gay and lesbian couples, that is not the issue here, since, in the Councils' view, there is no point made by the host which is even directed at gays and lesbians *in particular*. Schlessinger makes it perfectly clear that, in her view, *any* child without one parent of *each* gender, which includes *single parent* children, will suffer on that account. In the circumstances, no argument of discrimination, much less abusive discrimination, can be sustained.

The Paedophilia Issue

The challenged segment of the broadcast of April 12 consisted of a monologue dealing with the publication in the American Psychological Association (APA)'s monthly journal of an article critical of Schlessinger's views on the relationship between homosexuality and paedophilia. In her comment, she said, among other things:

[U]nfortunately, what the APA says people take as actual science or it's a final word, like "homosexuality is now normal." How can that be? When a man cannot make love to a woman, how can that be normal? But since they dropped it out of the book of diagnostics, the general public has been made to accept that it is normal, but how can that be? Just use common sense. We're not talking about the entire person. We're only talking about the sexual orientation. ... Paedophilia, sexual sadism and such are no longer disorders, according to the APA. They're only disorders if the person who is sexually masochistic or sadistic is upset about it or it's ruining their [sic] work. You understand and that's exactly how homosexuality got normalized [sic] so to me it's the first step. ... Then it [the article] goes on to say "The bridge Mrs. Schlessinger builds between this study and the so-called attempt to normalize paedophilia is ridiculous."

It is unclear why Schlessinger would make the statement that "Paedophilia ... and such are no longer disorders" unless it was for some dramatic effect, in order perhaps to mock the view of the professionals with respect to a matter of such obvious societal concern. Paedophilia has been, and remains, a mental disorder in the American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (in DSM-III, 1980, DSM-III R, 1987, and DSM-IV, 1994).

On the June 2 episode, the host talked of a press release by the Iowa Association of Chiefs of Police which stated that their association had passed a resolution condemning the American Psychological Association for their then recently published article on paedophilia.

I'm very proud of you guys. Independently and across the country, there are studies which come to the same conclusion that the APA is standing behind, that it is sort of doing an "out of each side of the mouth": "We are completely against child molestation but we've examined this piece of study and say it is science." Well, if it's science then I guess you have to go along with paedophilia. You know? You can't have it both ways. We're really good people but we're leaving this door open. Maybe it's because they don't want to look like they made a booboo. You expect more from professionals. There will be much more to this story. This story is not going away until we make sure that this piece of trash cannot be used to hurt children. And it is a piece of trash. The primary person I know of who would be in a position to call this trash is the past president of the American Psychiatric Association. Of course the current Psychiatric Association president has not come to the table on this except in some indirect, insubstantial way. But the past president of the American Psychiatric Association says this is virtually non-science.

On June 10, the host said:

Well, according to Dr. Aarden VanWeg [ph.], an expert in homosexuality and other forms of deviant sexual behaviour in Holland, that although numerically there are more paedophiles that are heterosexual, percentage wise in a population, it is much greater in the homosexual community. So there is some relationship. No, not every homosexual is a paedophile. Obviously not. But it is a greater percentage, much greater.

On August 13, responding to a fax, the host stated:

It goes on and says "Paedophilia and child molestation have zero to do with being gay, homosexual orientation" and that's not true. That is not true. How many letters have I read

on the air from gay men who acknowledge that a huge portion of the male homosexual populus is predatory on young boys. There is nothing new here.

The link apparently drawn by the host between male homosexuality and paedophilia seems tenuous. To suggest that homosexual paedophilia is more prevalent than heterosexual paedophilia is not supported in a significant way by the authorities which she has cited, despite the implication to that effect in what she has said. Moreover, the position is not supported in any of the recent editions of the American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM) referred to immediately above. For example, the third edition (DSM-III, 1980) states that "Adults with the disorder are oriented toward children of the opposite sex twice as often as toward children of the same sex" as does the third revised edition (DSM-III R, 1987), "Attraction to girls is apparently twice as common as attraction to boys." DSM-IV (1994) puts the issue in similar, although not quantitatively identical terms: "Pedophilia involving female victims is reported more often than pedophilia involving male victims."

To the extent, however, that Laura Schlessinger's argument is only that *some* individuals, groups or associations may take the APA journal's article and *use* it to promote their perspective regarding sexual relationships between adults and children, she does bring the example of NAMBLA and, in the view of the Councils, is entitled to make *that* point. To the extent, however, that a broadcaster might air any generalized allegation by this or any other host that, at the broader level, paedophilia is more common among members of the gay community than the heterosexual community, without some support or substantiation of that position, there would be a risk that such broadcast could be in breach of Clauses 2 and 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. Her straightforward assertion on August 13 that the statement that "Paedophilia and child molestation have zero to do with being gay, homosexual orientation' ... is not true" is an inaccurate and prejudicial statement. Paedophilia is a disorder relating to the molestation of prepubescent children, whether male or female, by an individual 16 years or older, who is at least five years older than the child. Without getting into the relative numbers issue, the effective assertion by the host that paedophilia *has to do* with being gay is, in the view of the Councils, an abusively discriminatory comment based on sexual orientation in violation of the *CAB Code of Ethics*.

The Issue Surrounding Matthew Shepard's Death

On April 16, following some comments relating to a high school presentation about the gay community and gay culture, Schlessinger reverted to the issue of the relationship between the position taken by persons like herself and Dr. James Dobson of *Focus on the Family* and the murder of Matthew Shepard.

Now every time I hear that I get crazed and enraged. It is not open season on homosexuals in this country and the rare time there is an event it's usually some backwards idiot ... some redneck, skinhead mentality guys but it certainly isn't regulation members of society and it certainly isn't how after the Matthew Shepard thing, everybody went after Dr. James Dobson and *Focus on the Family* because he takes a position against homosexuality being taught in

the schools etc. He was viciously attacked after the Matthew Shepard tragedy because they, the gay activists, were saying somehow that the Christian community was largely responsible for that guy's death. You know what was largely responsible for that guy's death? Those two guys who killed him did not go out looking for a homosexual to kill that night. They were shooting pool. He went to the bar. He left with two guys he thought he was gonna have sex with. He got murdered. How many women has that happened to? How many women have left bars thinking they were gonna get some action with some guy who raped and murdered and tortured and murdered them? Far more women than homosexual men have ended up dead that way, I would guess. Is that a hate crime against women? I think so but they specifically picked the woman who was willing to leave for sex. If Matthew hadn't been willing to leave for sex, he might still be alive. That certainly doesn't make him responsible for his own death but when you put yourself into a situation of going off to have anonymous sex with people you meet at a bar, what kind of person is gonna leave with you? Usually scum.

She concluded:

[T]hat's just why most people are afraid to speak anymore 'cause you're told you wish people dead. You're phobic, you're hateful, you're murderous, you're inspiring death. Wrong. Mainstream America is not out shooting anybody. Skinhead mentalities are doing Jews and blacks and gays and, who knows, Asians. But that is a minute, but dangerous, group. But it isn't mainstream Christian America. Don't go there. Don't play that game. I'm calling you on it. This was a terrible tragedy but it's also one that might have been avoided if he had simply gone home with his friends instead of thinking he was gonna get a little.

It is not reasonable for the complainants to fault Schlessinger on this point. She is absolutely unequivocal that murder is the worst of all crimes and that there are no circumstances in which she or any conservative Christians would support it as a solution. She argues quite fairly, it would appear, that the fact that she holds some views which do not accord with those of the gay and lesbian population does not mean that she can reasonably be viewed as homicidal. She states, and the Council agrees, that it is totally unjustified for people to assert that, because of the position which she takes on gay and lesbian issues, that she "want[s] gay people killed in the street." She put the generic point as follows:

That's how bizarre and insane and irrational it gets. Nobody wants anybody killed in the street. But most people do not want an aberrant sexual orientation taught as normal to children.

As to Matthew Shepard, in particular, she asserts that his death did not result from his sexual orientation but rather that he went off with the wrong people for the wrong purpose, namely "to get a little", much as she has often argued that women have done and also ended up dead. Whether she may or may not be right regarding the motivation of the killer is not the issue; it is, to a reasonable listener, clear that she did not will things that way. The Councils can find no fault with the broadcasts in this regard.

The Sexual Deviancy Issue

It is, however, the view of the Councils that the host's statements on the sexual deviancy issue are qualitatively different from those on matters where the Councils have found no breach. They are also, it should be understood, presented on a cumulative foundation, built by the host, of critical and discriminatory (although not *abusively* discriminatory) comment made about gays and lesbians in virtually every program listened to in the context of this decision. In the case of this aspect of the nature of gays and lesbians, it is not merely the words used, but their cumulative effect and the admittedly pejorative perspective of the host regarding the sexual practices which she describes which are at issue. As a result, with respect to *this* issue, it is the view of the Councils that what the host may innocently describe as "opinion" in fact and in law amounts to abusively discriminatory comment based on the sexual orientation of the identifiable group about which those statements were made. The standards established by Canada's private broadcasters represent the limit of permissible expression and, in the view of the Councils, the host has, to the extent described below, exceeded the codified bounds of freedom of expression.

In the first place, the CBSC is well aware of the fact that both the American Psychiatric Association and the American Psychological Association have not for many years considered either homosexual or heterosexual proclivities of any diagnostic significance. Although, as long ago as 1952, the first edition of the American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* even codified such current generally accepted behaviours as masturbation and fellatio, as well as homosexuality, as pathological, homosexuality ceased to be viewed by the psychiatric profession as a disease, illness or even psychiatric disorder as least as long ago as DSM-II in 1973. Laura Schlessinger herself recognized this on several occasions in the program episodes reviewed. She challenged the position of those Associations on homosexuality, to be sure, but she did acknowledge it. That being said, the host consistently and vehemently asserted, on numerous occasions in the episodes complained of, that the sexual behaviour of gays and lesbians is either abnormal, aberrant, deviant, disordered, a biological error or dysfunctional, despite the fact that the *professional associations* responsible for such issues do *not* consider that homosexuality is even sufficiently abnormal to be characterized as pathological or diagnostically relevant.

Without being exhaustive regarding those instances, on April 12, she challenged the characterization of homosexual love as "normal". On the 14th, she referred to it as a "disordered behaviour" and as an "aberrant sexual orientation". On April 16, it was framed several times as "sexual deviation" and on June 10 as "sexual deviancy" and frequently as "deviant sexual behaviour". On August 13, in explaining the use of the term "gay", she said:

One of the first things you do is rename behaviours or what have you. Once you rename it... It's like in Vietnam, I remember quite clearly. Instead of calling them North Vietnamese, South Vietnamese, Communist or what have you, they started calling the Vietnamese agents gooks. One of the reasons you call them gooks is because it's easy to kill a *gook*, harder to

kill a *person*. So in changing the name of the thing, it changes how we perceive it and how we can behave toward it. When we have the word homosexual, we are clarifying the dysfunction, the deviancy, the reality.

On the same show, she stated where she would stand on the civil rights aspect of the issue, were she faced with it (she concluded that this was not such a situation):

Please, this is not about civil rights 'cause I would be the first one in the front of that line and I'm here to tell you that right now. I'd be the first one in the front of *that* line. But this is about taking a deviant behaviour, a dysfunctional behaviour, normalizing, sexualizing our kids. [Emphasis added.]

On the August 24 episode, the host disputed a position taken by Joan Garry, the Executive Director of GLAAD. She argued:

I have never called homosexuals biological mistakes. I have said the sexual orientation is clearly an error. With penises and vaginas we were meant for heterosexual sexual acting out in order to procreate the species. I mean that is just irrefutable. But she is outright lying by distortion. There are different ways to lie. This one is by distortion and misrepresentation. I have never called homosexuals errors. I have called the sexuality an error. ... I want you to know that Joan Garry completely misrepresented my presentation. I have never called a people an error. I have called the sexuality, orientation, an error. And I think that is irrefutable and obvious. It's dysfunctional, it's deviant. According to religion it is not moral. But biologically it is clearly an error. What causes the error, I can't argue about. A lot of professionals in the field believe it is psycho-social. Whatever the issues are, I have never called homosexuals errors. That's a misrepresentation. [Emphasis added.]

She also described (on August 13) the point at which she turned from the issue as a civil rights issue. Her assertion was that she dealt only with the sexual behaviour and not with the individuals otherwise in their social and human roles:

Where I turned is when the compassion and the basic civil rights turns into the destruction of the family, the manipulation of children to accept deviancy as diversity. That's where I turned. That's where the worm turned. And don't tell me it's not there. [...] That they can be great veterinarians, great plant growers, great anything is a fact. I'm talking about the sexuality.

The extent of her abnormality and dysfunction argument can also be appreciated in the context of her position that *reparative* therapy is required to restore gays and lesbians to "normalcy":

I would like homosexuals to have the ability to get reparative therapy so they could live quote "normal lives" and have the benefits of a heterosexual relationship.

The host's perspective is clear and unambiguous. Whether the terms she uses are "abnormal", "aberrant", "dysfunctional", "disordered", "deviant", "an error" or the like, her terminology is *clearly* pejorative. She is unhesitatingly critical, negative and unambiguous and her words are as critical and unrelenting as she can make them. In the end, she is utterly rigid about a *fundamental* issue which goes to the *nature*, the *essence* of gays and

lesbians. It is the view of the Councils that the host's argument that she can "surgically" separate the individual persons from their *inherent* characteristics so as to entitle her to make comments about the *sexuality* which have no effect on the *person* is fatuous and unsustainable. As the Supreme Court has said, where an identifiable group of persons is "defined by an innate or unchangeable characteristic", it *will* be protected by the human rights provision of the broadcasters' *Code of Ethics* in Canada just as all Canadians are protected by the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. The sexual practices of gays and lesbians are as much a part of their being as the colour of one's skin or the gender, religion, age or ethnicity of an individual. To use such brutal language as she does about such an essential characteristic flies in the face of Canadian provisions relating to human rights.

Whether or not *Americans* are so protected in their country is a non-issue for the CBSC. Gays and lesbians *are* so protected in this country. Whether it is or is not the case in the United States, gays and lesbians constitute a group benefiting from overwhelming judicial and legislative acknowledgment of gay and lesbian rights, not to mention popular support, under the human rights provisions in *this* country. The words of Supreme Court Justice La Forest cited in the previous paragraph from his opinion in *Egan v. Canada* [1995] 2 S.C.R. 513 were applied by him in the context of a decision on the constitutional validity of a statute challenged as being in breach of the *Charter's* protection of individuals based on their sexual orientation. He also held:

I have no difficulty accepting the appellants' contention that *whether or not sexual orientation is based on biological or physiological factors*, which may be a matter of some controversy, it is a deeply personal characteristic that is either unchangeable or changeable only at unacceptable personal costs. [Emphasis added.]

Since the sexual practices of gays and lesbians *define* them as homosexuals and are inseparable from their *personas*, any attempt by the host to justify her statements on the basis that she is speaking about the *practices* rather than the *individuals* must fail. In other words, the Councils have no hesitation in concluding that the statements are discriminatory vis-à-vis gays and lesbians on the basis of their sexual orientation. While there may be uses of the terms "abnormal", "aberrant", "dysfunctional", "disordered", "deviant", "an error" and so on which could, in some circumstances, be reasonable, their sheer weight in these programs and the host's unremittingly heavy-handed and unambiguously negative characterisation of those sexual practices is abusively discriminatory and in breach of the Code.

A General Perspective

Although it is the view of the Councils that, when her positions are analysed one-by-one, most are not in breach of the Code, despite the fact that some of these may be unenlightened and anachronistic, the Councils are left with the uneasy sense that there is an understandable *cumulative* effect of Schlessinger's positions on so many matters which

concern the gay and lesbian communities. The result of this perspective may well be that, while she does not *herself* advocate any of the homophobic hostility or, worse, brutality, which can be found in criminal corners of society, from her powerfully influential platform behind a very popular microphone, Schlessinger may well fertilize the ground for other less well-balanced elements, by her cumulative position, to take such aggressive steps. With the power emanating from that microphone goes the responsibility for the consequences of the utterances. It is for such reasons, among others, that the respect of Canadian broadcast standards assumes such great societal importance.

Ongoing Breach by a Series

This is the fourth occasion on which the CBSC has had to consider the prospect of recurrent breaches by a radio or television program. In the first such case, namely, *CIII-TV re Mighty Morphin Power Rangers* (CBSC Decision 93/94-0270 and 0277, October 24, 1994), the two weeks of episodes reviewed were thought to be a fair reflection of the type of approach and attitude which the show could be expected to reflect on an ongoing basis. In that case, the Ontario Regional Council concluded:

that their observations entitle them to take the generalized position that the approach of the entire series is such that it would likely be in breach of those articles of the *Violence Code* in the same manner as the episodes which the Council members viewed in order to render this decision.

Then, in *CHOM-FM and CILQ-FM re the Howard Stern Show* (CBSC Decisions 97/98-0001+ and 0015+, October 17 and 18, 1997), the Quebec and Ontario Regional Councils, faced with a substantially similar situation in terms of that show, stated:

[T]he Councils are of the view that, while the subject matter of the daily Howard Stern Show episodes of course varies from day to day, the presentation of the content which is the principal subject matter of this decision remains systematically *similar* in approach from one day to the next.

Most recently, in *CIHF-TV and CKMI-TV re The Jerry Springer Show* (CBSC Decision 97/98-1277, May 28, 1999), the Atlantic and Quebec Regional Councils concluded that:

it is their common view that the Canadian private broadcasters must, in this case, as private broadcasters have successfully done in the past, find a way over the course of the next 30 days to ensure that their future broadcasts not include those ... elements of the episodes which would otherwise be in breach of the Code.

It is clear that, in the case at hand, the broadcasters must equally find a way of ensuring, as broadcasters have successfully done in the past, that this show not continue to make abusively discriminatory comments on the basis of sexual orientation.

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 these cases, the Council considers that the broadcasters' responses, while not nearly of the length and detail of those of the complainants, adequately addressed the generic issue raised by the complainants. Moreover, the Councils do not consider that it is reading too much into some of those replies, at least, to sense that the broadcasters may have had more sympathy with the perspective of the complainants, while not thereby weakening in their resolve to defend the right of their program host to express her points of view, even if controversial. That is their right and nothing more is required of them in terms of their replies. Consequently, the broadcasters have not breached the Council's standard of responsiveness.

CONTENT OF THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE DECISION

CFYI-AM and CJCH-AM are required to announce this decision forthwith, in the following terms, during peak listening hours and, within the next thirty days, to provide confirmation of the airing of the statement to the CBSC and to the complainants who filed the Ruling Requests.

In the case of CFYI-AM,

The Canadian Broadcast Standards Council has found that CFYI has breached provisions of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters *Code of Ethics*. The Council found that, in episodes of the *Dr. Laura Schlessinger Show* broadcast on August 13 and 24, 1999, the broadcaster aired comments by the host which were abusively discriminatory with respect to gay and lesbian persons on the basis of their sexual orientation, in violation of the human rights provision of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. By broadcasting comments of Laura Schlessinger describing the behaviour of gays and lesbians as aberrant, an error, deviant and dysfunctional, and by making a generalized allegation concerning a link between homosexuality and paedophilia, CFYI breached the provisions of Clauses 2 and 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*.

In the case of CJCH-AM,

The Canadian Broadcast Standards Council has found that CJCH has breached provisions of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters *Code of Ethics*. The Council found that, in episodes of the *Dr. Laura Schlessinger Show* broadcast on April 12, 14 and 16 and June 10, the broadcaster aired comments by the host which were abusively discriminatory with respect to gay and lesbian persons on the basis of their sexual orientation, in violation

of the human rights provision of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. By broadcasting comments of Laura Schlessinger describing the behaviour of gays and lesbians as aberrant, deviant, disordered and dysfunctional, CJCH breached the provisions of Clauses 2 and 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*.

This decision is a public document upon its release by the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council.

APPENDIX A
to CFYI-AM and CJCH-AM re The Dr. Laura Schlessinger Show
(CBSC Decision 99/00-0005 and 98/99-0808+, February 9 and 15, 2000)
(Correspondence)

FILE REFERRED TO THE ONTARIO REGIONAL COUNCIL

I. File 99/00-0005

On September 1, 1999, a complainant sent the following e-mail to the CBSC:

I am writing with regard to file 98/99-1091 and wish to file another complaint with respect to several broadcasts of the "Dr. Laura Schlessinger" program on CHOG-AM in Toronto. [Note: No Ruling Request was returned with respect to that file.] I am enclosing a new document in two parts: (I) an elaboration concerning the initial complaint, and (II) my complaint concerning episodes since. For several reasons, including that people were on vacation (including my e-mail contact for direction at the CBSC), and that the station has a new General Manager, I sent a notice to the station already asking them to retain logger tapes regarding the June 10th, August 1st, and August 6th broadcasts, the latter two which are part of my new complaint (in addition to others).

Regarding the initial complaint, I will be sending by mail my request for a Ruling. However, as indicated in e-mail to Ms. Lucie Vincent, it was my desire to engage the station in additional dialogue given broadcasts of the program since the original one in the complaint of June 22. If there is to be a Ruling, the Council may decide to deal with the complaints together at one meeting, which would be fine with me. Regardless, I await the station's response to my new complaint and welcome it if they re-visit the first one.

I ask you to contact them regarding this new complaint. Thank you.

I. The complaint dealing with the June 10, 1999 broadcast

The complaint of June 22, 1999 dealt with the June 10, 1999 (2:00 p.m.) broadcast of the "Dr. Laura" program, and was as follows:

In her opening which lasted several minutes, Ms. Schlessinger attacked homosexuals, saying clearly their behaviour was sexually deviant, and akin to paedophilia and other illegal conduct. Her rant was "not" a response to a caller, rather it was her opening. It lasted several minutes. I believe the content amounts to spreading hatred against homosexuals. It perpetuates stereotypes of gays and may be illegal hate propaganda.

The complaint was sent by e-mail (which explains in part its brevity) and I acknowledge was not well written nor very explanatory of my concerns. In particular, I was misinformed with respect to the last assertion regarding "illegal" hate propaganda and now acknowledge it is not illegal in any criminal sense in Canada. Mr. Don Luzzi, the General Manager of CHOG-AM, made a serious attempt to interpret my concerns in his response of July 15, 1999. I will elaborate here on why I wrote what I did.

The General Manager goes to great lengths to explain that "Dr. Laura's" opening was not a discussion concerning homosexuals or homosexuality in itself, rather it was a discussion

to explain her issue with what she perceived as an attack on the use of religion in the debate of the California legislature regarding a piece of legislation giving protection from discrimination to homosexuals in schools. It seems to me that it doesn't matter if the entire discussion wasn't devoted to gays or homosexual behaviour, rather, if there were a few sentences (or even phrases) which might be abusive or discriminatory comment to gays contained within; there is an issue with respect to the broadcast code.

The General Manager also argues she presents "both sides" of the larger discussion and raises the fact that she is expressing her own opinion. This seems irrelevant to whether or not the specific statements contained within might be in breach of the broadcast code.

Some of the main statements made by "Dr. Laura" which raise my concern were excerpted by the General Manager as follows: She describes homosexual behaviour as "deviant sexual behaviour", and says "I'm worried about - the paedophilia, bestiality, sado-masochism and the cross-dressing. Is this all going to be rights too?" "...we are offended and concerned about bringing sexual deviant behaviour into kindergarten".

I used the term "rant" to describe the lumping in of gays with persons who commit paedophilia, bestiality, sado-masochism and cross-dressing. If I understand the General Manager's response, he believes this is not saying gays are akin to persons who commit these other acts, rather, "Dr. Laura" is simply saying "if we can't use religion to defeat legislation for gay rights, then we won't be able to use it to defeat legislation for rights of persons involved in these other things" (my words).

This seems to me to miss the obvious point: why would legislation to protect gays from discrimination lead to legislation for these other persons? "Dr. Laura" could have used other examples to raise concern about being able to use religion in the legislature (capital punishment is an obvious example) but does not. The statements made are clearly an expression of concern that gays themselves will bring these other things into the classroom. That homosexuality "leads to" paedophilia is one of the oldest, most pervasive, and abusive stereotypes of gays. In my view, there is a clear implication of a conspiratory [*sic*] agenda by gays to bring these other things into the schools. While "Dr. Laura" may be entitled to her opinion, which may very well be that homosexual behaviour is immoral, her expression of gays bringing these other things to schools is hateful and abusive.

(Moreover, "Dr. Laura" would, in a later broadcast, say specifically that homosexuality "leads to" paedophilia and raise the concerns of a homosexual "agenda" to get into schools. This will be raised in discussion of broadcasts of other dates below. This supports my interpretation as to what "Dr. Laura," is saying.)

II. More Recent Broadcasts With Comments at Issue. In addition to the June 10, 1999 broadcast, there are other broadcasts of the "Dr. Laura Schlessinger" program I listened to which have issues which I wish to raise:

- August 1, 1999 (broadcast commenced at 12:00 p.m.)
- August 6, 1999 (broadcast commenced at 2:00 p.m.)
- August 13, 1999 (broadcast commenced at 2:00 p.m.)
- August 19, 1999 (broadcast commenced at 2:00 p.m.)
- August 24, 1999 (broadcast commenced at 2:00 p.m.)

In discussing whether or not comment is abusive or discriminatory in each case, I consider (i) the words themselves and the tone with which they are said; (ii) how words (which

themselves may not seem abusive) are used; (iii) who is making the comment (an academic / professional therapist versus a religious commentator), which is part of the context in which the words are said; and (iv) the frequency of use of words, which I argue is part of the tone of the program and therefore should be considered when considering whether the comment is abusive or discriminatory.

August 1, 1999 (broadcast commenced at 12:00 p.m.)

At approximately 12:27-12:30 p.m., “Dr. Laura” took a call from a woman who had a brother who was gay and had a partner. The question to “Dr. Laura” was whether the brother should be excluded from the woman’s family vacation trip with her husband and children. “Dr. Laura’s” response was curt: that it “was justified” to exclude him. The call was short; there was no discussion or issue of sexual behaviour; “Dr. Laura” outright counselled the woman to discriminate in the relationship to her brother simply because he was gay.

It may be that a talk show commentator has an opinion that homosexuality or homosexual behaviour is wrong (based on their own moral position), or even sinful (based on their religious values). But can what is expressed be so broad as to counselling to outright exclude the gay person from a family event because they are gay? There was no allegation from the mother of [the] possibility of child molestation by the gay brother whatsoever. “Dr. Laura” made no such allegation either. Yet she came to a conclusion that it was justified to prevent the contact between the gay brother and the woman’s children on the vacation. What could have possibly been “Dr. Laura’s” justification? I cannot say here she was insinuating there was the possibility of child molestation on the basis of the information in the call. But an ongoing theme of “Dr. Laura” is that she is out to “protect” children, and given what she has said on other days regarding gays and paedophilia (see August 6 and 13th below), I cannot help suspect[ing] this is what “Dr. Laura” had in mind.

Regardless, even if one was to assume the position of a listener who has never heard “Dr. Laura’s” ongoing themes of the gay “agenda” and gays and paedophilia (discussed below), say a listener who has only ever heard one hour of “Dr. Laura” in their entire life, this call leaves but one impression alone: that it is o.k. to ostracize a gay person the family [*sic*] because of who they are. What could be more discriminatory than that? There may be no words in the comment that alone would be “obviously abusive”. But [it] is clear that there is some subtle implication in the comment that it is justifiable to exclude the family member. The tone and meaning render the comment discriminatory.

August 6, 1999 (broadcast commenced at 2:00 p.m.)

“Dr. Laura” in her opening monologue says “paedophilia ... has mostly to do with homosexuality”, and:

August 13, 1999 (broadcast commenced at 2:00 p.m.)

At approximately 2:35-2:37 p.m., “Dr. Laura” went on a rant dealing with the gay “agenda” and homosexuals and paedophilia. (I did the best I could to copy this down.) “Dr. Laura” again says homosexual behaviour is “deviant” and goes on to describe the (her words) “gay agenda”: “I don’t know what to say”, describing an “... organized gay agenda” that is “mobilized ... well funded”, and then lists five to seven points to support this: (1) that there is an agenda to make homosexuality “normal” as heterosexuality; (2) to “overturn the status of heterosexual” families to “accomplish acceptance” of gay relationships/families;

“essentially robbing” children of opposite gender parents; (3) “propaganda in our schools” ... “no agenda?”, “what happened to” ... “not trying to convert”; (4) “gays / lesbians do change” ... it is a “disorder”; (5) describes an “agenda” for adoption of children; (6) homosexuality “leads to paedophilia” and that gays are “predatory on young boys”. (I believe she tried to subsequently narrow it down to “some” gays, but more on this later). There is an explicit allegation that somehow there is an “agenda” to undermine families, do harm to children and society, gain access to children in schools for the purposes of propagandizing them or even worse “converting” their sexuality to gay/lesbian; and explicitly says there is a link from being gay to molesting children.

First, to deal with the express allegations of an “agenda” to undermine families, do harm to children and society, gain access to children in schools: can such statements be defended simply by arguing, as the General Manager does in his response to my complaint of the June 10 broadcast, that are based in [sic] “Dr. Laura’s” moral values? There are explicit *allegations* against an entire group ... how could this be argued not to be abusive on the basis that it is a moral position? The repeated allegations of a gay “agenda” are far more abusive than anything in *CKRD re Focus on the Family* (CBSC Decision 96/97-0155).

Next, that gays are somehow out to “convert” others, or even worse, molest children: These are two of the most traditional and pervasive stereotypes of gays, and likely the most hateful. They cause the most fear of gays and are responsible to a great extent for historic discrimination and ostracization. It is difficult for me to imagine a more hateful comment than linking homosexuality to paedophilia. I shudder to think what this kind of comment might result in, in terms of discrimination and violence to gays.

(In hindsight, with regard to the June 10 broadcast, is it now not obvious that in the June 10 broadcast “Dr. Laura” was clearly linking homosexuality to paedophilia? She has said so twice since. Or should listeners accept that on June 10 she was simply saying, as the General Manager argued, that she was simply concerned that one might not be allowed to use religious arguments in the legislature for other things such as rights for persons who commit paedophilia, bestiality, and cross-dressing?)

In the August 13 comment, when she hits the part of the “agenda” with respect to paedophilia, she eventually seems to try to narrow it by saying “some” gays molest children. If this is argued as not portraying all gays in the same way, I ask: how is the ordinary listener, who might have a gay friend, boss, sibling, child, or any other relative, expected to know if that gay person they know is or is not one of the “some” who will commit child molestation. The eventual restriction with the use of the word “some” cannot, I would argue, be accepted as making the comment “not a stereotype”. As well, the “some” is not in reference to specifically identified individuals or even certain individuals not specifically identified (i.e. the group of those with convictions of molestation), so how is it possible to interpret it as anything but a stereotype.

Moreover, with regard to the statement that homosexuality “leads to” paedophilia: Suppose it was said that “some black men commit murder”. Would it be acceptable to conclude therefore that being black “leads to” the committing of murder? This is precisely the kind of illogical and incorrect reasoning that “Dr. Laura” does with respect to gays. Could one say that, as “some” heterosexuals molest children, that heterosexuality “leads to” paedophilia? No! The broadcast code must not only protect against abusive words, but against the abusive use of words, which “Dr. Laura” seems to be skilled at. It’s not only a matter of what words were used (are they abusive?), but how are they used and what meaning is created. If the latter is not examined, commentators will become skilled at

careful selection and use of words and innuendo to avoid getting “caught” but still disseminating the same hateful message.

August 19, 1999 (broadcast commenced at 2:00 p.m.)

At approximately 2:27-2:30 p.m., “Dr. Laura” announces and endorses an organization known as “NARTH”, which claims to be able to help gays convert themselves to straight. At approximately 2:50-2:52 p.m., “Dr. Laura” is dealing with a call regarding a lesbian couple raising a child, saying they are “robbing” the child of a father, that the baby is an “innocent victim” simply because it is being parented by a lesbian couple. At approximately 3.07-3.09 p.m. , “Dr Laura” again uses the term “homosexual agenda”.

August 24, 1999 (broadcast commenced at 2:00 p.m.)

At approximately 2:35 p.m., “Dr. Laura” uses the term “sexual error”, “deviant”, and “biological error” to describe the sexuality of gays/lesbians. She does point out she is not describing persons as errors, rather their sexuality. At approximately 3:55 p.m. she yet again uses the term “agenda”. At approximately 4:11 p.m. she uses the term “deviant sexuality” to describe the sexuality of gays/lesbians.

The use of the terms “deviant”, “biological error”, “disorder”: “Dr. Laura’s” frequent use of such terms (going back to the June 10th broadcast) I would argue go beyond what is acceptable as comment based on one’s moral or religious values. They must be considered as crossing the line into abusive and hateful categorization of the gay *person* as a human being. First, is it really justifiable to go beyond simply saying that homosexual behaviour is wrong (from a moral stance) or even sinful (from a religious position) to saying it is “deviant”? The word “deviant” has a very negative connotation, going beyond the expression of a moral position. The *Oxford Dictionary of Current English* defines “deviant” as “deviating from what is *normal*, esp. sexually”. Does “normal” sound like expression of one’s moral position? Would “abnormal”? The same dictionary defines “disorder” as an “ailment or disease” and “error” as a “mistake”. Could these words be defended as expression of a moral position? When used by someone who is a therapist? Could this term “biological error” be defended as expression of a moral position if the speaker has a doctorate in *physiology*, as “Dr. Laura” does? The words are abusive to gays and their dignity.

The distinction between the “person” and the “behaviour”: Saying a person’s sexual behaviour is “deviant”, or that their sexuality is a “biological error” or a “disorder”, goes *beyond* saying the behaviour is wrong, it goes to who you are as a human being. The argument is often made: I am not against gays, I am against your sexual behaviour. This is the distinction “Dr. Laura” makes. I argue you *cannot* separate the behaviour from the person. First, what makes a person gay is that they are attracted to a person of the same gender. Every gay person, even a celibate one, *thinks* of intimate relations with others. The characterization of the behaviour as “deviant” is therefore abusive in that it goes to a gay person’s innermost thoughts and feelings, which are an innate part of the person as a human being, inseparable from you as a person. The effort to create a distinction between gays and their sexual behaviour use of the term “behaviour” is also discriminatory, in that it provides argument for those who would discriminate against gays/lesbians but [*sic*] being able to say they are not: I am not discriminating against you (say for example, in employment) as a person because you are gay, but am discriminating against you because of your behaviour.

Who is making the comment: In determining whether or not comment is abusive or discriminatory, you must consider not only the comment itself, but who is making it and in what context. If the ordinary listener were listening to some religious broadcast, and heard the commentator say homosexual behaviour is sinful, they would take it with a "grain of salt". If the listener heard "Dr. Laura" use terms as "deviant", "error", or "disorder" it would have a different impact. The host is a person, highly educated ("Dr. Laura" has a Ph.D. in physiology), immensely popular (the "Dr. Laura" program is now listened to regularly by 18-20 million listeners across North America), and who has qualifications as a therapist/counsellor. (See the "Talk 640" (CHOG-AM) web site for a detailed announcement of her credentials at www.talk640.com). "Dr. Laura" is not a religious program. The host does portray the show as one of solving moral dilemmas, and she does not hide that the positions she takes come from her value system, but this does not mean one can ignore her academic, intellectual, and professional credentials when considering the impact of her statements. Consider the following. If a teen, coming to realize that he/she might be gay, were to hear these statements, it would have a much greater impact than if he/she were listening to a religious commentator make statements that homosexual behaviour is sinful. The words would resonate through the teen as a person as indicating hate in the world far beyond a religious position of immoral behaviour. Would the teen go see a therapist or counsellor? The thought of hearing that the behaviour in your innermost thoughts, of which you have no control, are as curtly and frequently labelled "deviant" may very well frighten the teen from talking or confiding to a counsellor (would they be like counsellor "Dr. Laura"?). You only have to consider that the suicide rate among gay teens is now known to be several times higher than among straight teens to realize the impact of a hateful and hostile world. The host's academic and professional qualifications and the type of program (not being a "religious program") affect the meaning and impact of the use of her words. "Dr. Laura" saying sexual behaviour is "deviant" or that sexuality is an "error" or a "disorder" has a much different meaning and connotation than the word "sinful" used by a commentator from a religious or moral position. It is hateful for a person in her position (looked up to as a counsellor) to make these comments.

The frequency of the comment: The argument that the use of these terms is abusive comment is even more compelling when used as frequently and spontaneously as "Dr. Laura". You must consider the cumulative effect of repeated use of these terms as well when you consider if they are abusive comment. It may be that in some situations, the single use of a particular term might not "cross the line" in the sense of breaking the broadcast code, but if the term were repeated over a time period, the cumulative effect of the use would render it abusive. I have argued the use of the term "deviant" is itself abusive. If, however, you disagree, I ask you to then consider the cumulative effect of the *frequent* use of this and the other terms used by "Dr. Laura". The frequency creates an *atmosphere* of hostility that goes beyond a single use. As well, it is worth considering that the program is broadcast not only three hours each weekday, but repeat broadcasts occur in the evenings and weekends. Consider the argument of the right of free expression when the same thing is repeated over and over again. If a term of concern is used, say, six times (for example) already in one month, does the freedom of expression argument really defend a seventh use? It's already been expressed so many times. Eventually, the argument wears thin and the consideration of the harm done outweighs the right to express the view. For all of these reasons, the frequent use of the terms such as "deviant", "error", or "disorder" go beyond saying sexual behaviour is "sinful" or "wrong, and the comments are abusive and discriminatory.

The comments supporting that it is possible for gays to “convert” their sexuality: “Dr. Laura’s” comments that somehow the sexuality of gays can be changed (August 13th, 19th) are different than, say, a religious commentator expressing their belief in the “power of conversion” as in *CHCH-TV re Life Today with James Robison* (CBSC Decision 95/96-0128). Should the comments be subject to the same standard in determining if they are a breach of broadcast code? The comments amount to professional opinion, given the host’s academic and professional credentials. The comments should be subject to scrutiny to a standard beyond that of being abusive or discriminatory. The comments at that point become public affairs programming, and should be subject to at least *some* fairness and accuracy scrutiny. The comments are clearly contradictory to what is widely held among psychiatric professionals: that gay sexuality is neither a disorder (it was once classified as such but is no longer) nor something which can be changed. There was nothing presented as opposing “Dr. Laura’s “ views presented in the programs whatsoever.

The final issue: In approximately eight to ten hours of this program that I listened to, there was *not one* call taken from a gay or lesbian person asking for help with some situation. The program is discriminatory to the point where it simply never portrays gays or lesbian situations from their perspective. Whether refusal [to] take calls from gays or lesbians amounts to discriminatory *content* subject to the CBSC and CRTC’s Codes, I leave for you to determine.

Conclusion

The “Dr. Laura” program contains regularly made abusive and discriminatory comments about gays and lesbians, ranging from frequent characterization of sexual behaviour as “deviant”, to implied and explicit comments linking homosexuality to paedophilia, to describing children being raised by lesbian parents as “victims”, to frequent comments of a gay “agenda” to, among other things, get access to children for propaganda purpose in schools. There are also comments made that somehow gays can “change” their sexuality, comments made which were tantamount to professional opinion without any fair presentation of opposing views. I ask the CBSC to find that the program is in breach of Clauses 2 (Human Rights) and 6 (Presentation of News, Comment, Opinion, and Editorial) of the CAB *Code of Ethics*.

Moreover, given the fact that I have only listened to approximately eight to ten hours of the program this year, given the frequency and regularity which these comments have come up over relatively few broadcasts, in particular, terms sexually “deviant” and “gay agenda”, I ask that the CBSC consider a determination that the program is of the “Ongoing breach by a series” types and warrants appropriate action.

The broadcaster’s Operations Manager responded to the complainant as follows:

In your letter of September 1, 1999, you have identified four separate days of Dr. Laura Schlessinger’s program dealing with homosexuality. In addition, you make reference to your other complaint of June 22, 1999, regarding the same subject. You have advised in your letter of September 1, 1999 that you would “be sending by mail my request of a Ruling”. Accordingly, we will not respond again to your original complaint.

In your letter of September 1, 1999, you have identified and extracted the specific words or sentences used by Dr. Laura Schlessinger in her discussions of homosexuality. You have interpreted these words and sentences, expanded and made detailed inferences based on your views. You are certainly entitled to your opinion. It our responsibility to

ensure our broadcasts meet Canadian Standards. I will not "engage ... in additional dialogue" with you on your views.

As you are probably aware, TALK640 is a talk, news-based, information station. Part of our programming includes discussion amongst our announcers and listeners on many topical and controversial issues.

Dr. Laura Schlessinger has publicly stated on numerous occasions her belief in traditional family values and protection of children. Furthermore, she has publicly stated that she has "compassion" for homosexuals. In fact, her web site of today's date clearly reiterates her position on homosexuality. A small part of this is as follows:

"I'm sorry, hear it one more time [to make it] perfectly clearly: If you're gay or a lesbian, it's a biological error that inhibits you from relating normally to the opposite sex. The fact that you are intelligent, creative and valuable is all true. The error is your inability to relate sexually intimately, in a loving way to a member of the opposite sex - it is a biological error.

People who are gay or lesbian are not to be hated or attacked. I spent most of my career supporting groups like Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays because I didn't want families to throw out their children simply because they were gay or lesbian - they are still decent and functional human beings or maybe they're not because that indecency goes everywhere. A bunch of guys having sex after leaving bar with each other [is] indecent. Likewise a bunch of heterosexuals leaving bars with each other and having sex with each other is indecent. I don't care which way it flies".

You may not share the moral views of Dr. Laura Schlessinger. However, she is entitled to express her opinion. Furthermore, her moral views are popular as evidenced by her significant and loyal listening audience.

I believe we do a very good job of providing balanced opportunity to present all sides of an issue, which will allow our audience to make up their own minds on the matter under discussion.

The complainant was unsatisfied with the broadcaster's response and requested, and sent his Ruling Request on November 6, 1999. On November 8, the complainant sent a concluding e-mail summarizing his perspective and providing a reply to points raised in the broadcaster's response.

I sent the signed Ruling Request form by fax to the CBSC office on Nov. 6 1999 following careful consideration of the station's response received by email Oct. 27 1999.

It appears from reading some of the Rulings on the CBSC web site that the Council sometimes considers comments by the complainant on the station's response. I ask that the following be considered by the Council in deciding whether to accept the Ruling Request and in the Ruling itself (if made).

BROADCASTS AT ISSUE My letter to the station, as the station made note of in its response, made reference to an earlier complaint (File 98199-1091). As well the complaint received by the CBSC on Sept. 7 199 made reference to two broadcasts no longer at issue. I acknowledge that my own misunderstanding of deadlines led to the inclusion of these

other broadcasts, and that the Ruling Request is now for only the broadcasts of August 13, 19, and 24, 1999. This means the first parts of what I sent on Sept. 7 can be ignored; only the last 3-3 1/2 pages are relevant.

STATION'S INITIAL RESPONSE The station's initial response was to request a meeting or phone call to 'resolve the matter'. I responded with an email requesting an explanation but apparently this was not received (I am sending within two days a separate letter dealing with communication difficulties with the station if this is an issue in accepting the Ruling Request). I was not initially averse to a meeting but considered the request unusual, given a meeting or phone call, as opposed to a written response, could not be reviewed by the Council. As well it seemed to be an invasion of privacy, and has the potential to introduce other disagreement (for example as in *CFSK-TV (STV) re an episode of Friends* (CBSC Decision 95196-0159, December 16, 1997). If the station was concerned with responding to what might be perceived with a lengthy complaint, or had any other questions or comments, it could have sent email and I would have responded.

RESPONSE TO COMPLAINT I have five points of difficulty or disagreement with the station's written response.

On two minor notes, its reference to the show's popularity seems irrelevant to whether or not the on air comments were abusively discriminatory, nor would popularity be a vindication of a broadcast which might be in breach of the code. The 'Howard Stern' program is immensely popular yet there have been Rulings against the station which broadcast it. Second, the references to the 'Dr. Laura' web site do not seem relevant either. There are numerous things on that web site which I believe would support the positions in the complaint, but what seems at issue is what was said on air, not what is on her web site.

Third, the station did not refer to any of the arguments made in the complaint dealing with why the on air comments were abusively discriminatory, (or, for that matter, cumulative effect of comment, or exclusion of homosexuals from the callers or portrayal of their situations in a non judgmental light). I did not expect CHOG to respond to every argument, but it could have done a few.

Fourth, even more concerning, the response does not refer to anything in the specific broadcasts. What was written could be a general response to complaints concerning any 'Dr. Laura' commentary dealing with gay issues.

Finally, and this is most troubling, the station's central response seems to be 'she has a right to express her opinion' (paraphrase). The station does not seem to understand what is at issue: were the comments abusively discriminatory (this despite numerous references to this term in the complaint). Even an ordinary person like myself can navigate through the CBSC'S web site (which has exceptional organization and is written in plain language) to see the issue is not about the right to express an opinion, or the correctness of it, but rather whether the comments were abusively discriminatory. The web site even has examples of what was found to be and what was not.

How can a station be serious in its claim of wanting to respect broadcast standards when it clearly demonstrates it does not understand what it means to be in breach of the code?

(Also, the response was written by the Operations Manager for CHOG, who is in the same position for the sister station Q107, which airs 'Howard Stern' if I am not mistaken.)

RULING REQUEST I ask that a Ruling be made because I believe the station's response is not adequate considering the seriousness of hateful comment toward gays. Few straight people realize the effect of the hostile world towards gays, in particular to gay teens struggling with their sexuality. I recently spoke to a volunteer on the province wide Gay youth phoneline who told me of how their lines are jammed every night and of the existence of the procedure to deal with the 'suicide concern' calls. Most gays, and I know someone myself, have known someone who has made an attempt to or committed suicide because of the struggle in accepting their sexuality. Hateful comments on the air make their contribution to the world gays find themselves in. If I wrote a lengthy complaint, it was because of my conviction that it is time for the largely straight world to start understanding what it has built. The on air comments by Laura Schlessinger deserve a critical examination, much more than what CHOG was apparently prepared to give. For this reason I hope you accept my request and have a Ruling.

Hopefully, it will deal with:

(1) whether the comments in the three broadcasts are abusively discriminatory, including consideration of the cumulative effect of repeated use of terms like 'sexually deviant' and 'biological error', and the effort to separate comments concerning gays' 'sexual behaviour' from themselves as persons (this despite the fact that the innateness of sexual orientation, or inseparability of sexuality from the person, is the basis for Supreme court decisions dramatically rewriting the country's legislative landscape. Of course, these are Canadian decisions; the show is American based).

(2) whether the problem is formulaic to the program,

and

(3) whether complete exclusion of gay callers, and exclusion of gay perspectives in a non judgmental light, are broadcast code jurisdiction. As the Broadcast codes are a standard of what was said on air, the exclusion of gay callers / perspective seems not to be an issue in CBSC / broadcast code jurisdiction. Rather, it seems to me that 'off air' decisions or conduct, not on air comment, is the proper characterization of this issue. I hope the Council at least briefly comments on this.

Thank you.

FILES REFERRED TO THE ATLANTIC REGIONAL COUNCIL

II. File 98/99-808

Following a general complaint about the Dr. Laura show (which could not be pursued by the CBSC given the lack of specifics), the following specific and code relevant complaint dated April 16, 1999 was sent directly to CJCH-AM by the complainant and copied to the Council:

I am writing further to my letter of April 14, 1999. Rather than put the matter off, I have decided to provide you with some specific comments made this week by Dr. Schlessinger on her program. The following are the more offensive comments contained in these programs. I trust the specific time references will permit you to verify that my quotes are accurate.

April 12 4:14 During the course of a monologue Dr Schlessinger asked rhetorically, "How can (homosexuality) be normal"

April 14 3:14 - "Homosexuality is disordered behaviour"

April 16 4:20 She, in the course of a monologue on paedophilia, thought it necessary to recommend the book, Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth. Just one example of many where she feels compelled to link homosexuality with paedophilia.

April 16 5:30 - Dr Schlessinger began a lengthy monologue which lasted until approximately 5:44. The monologue began with her report of a presentation at a US school on gay culture.

She began by mocking the very use of the words gay culture by asking, "What is that, is that where we get into paedophilia and promiscuity?"

She then further stated that "homosexuality is a sexual deviance"

She then went on to assert that Matthew Shepherd was largely responsible for his own death.

April 16 5:55. "Homosexuality is not moral behaviour"

It is abundantly clear to this listener that Dr Schlessinger's comments on the question of homosexuality are discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation. The fact that she feels it necessary to bring the subject matter up so often is disturbing by itself. I am copying this letter to the CBSC in the expectation that this time my complaints are specific enough to engage the CBSC's complaints resolution process and look forward to your reply.

The Program Manager of CJCH responded to the complainant's letter on May 25, 1999 with the letter below. Along with his response, he also included a newspaper article by Susanne Hiller of the National Post which was entitled: "A heated debate over child sex"

I am writing in response to your letters of April 14 and 16, 1999 in which you expressed concern regarding certain remarks made by the host of the Dr. Laura Schlessinger Show which is broadcast each weekday afternoon on Talk Radio 920 CJCH, Halifax.

As a member of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters ("CAB"), Talk Radio 920 CJCH has undertaken to adhere to several voluntary broadcast codes and standards developed by the CAB and administered by the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council ("CBSC"). Moreover, CJCH accepts responsibility for all of the programming which is broadcast on its radio station.

We note that your complaint relates to certain of Dr. Laura Schlessinger's views on homosexuality which were expressed on her show on April 12, 14 and 16. We appreciate that a certain number of the issues that Dr. Schlessinger addresses on her program can be controversial. She is well-known for expressing strong opinions on issues that are politically, socially and religiously sensitive. Indeed, certain of her views on some of these controversial issues may at times, be offensive to some radio listeners.

It is Dr. Schlessinger's willingness to address sensitive issues, such as homosexuality, in a blunt and straightforward manner, which attracts a significant number of listeners to her program. As you may know, the Dr. Laura Schlessinger Show is currently one of the most popular syndicated radio programs in North America.

I am attaching a copy of a lengthy article which was published in the National Post on Saturday May 8, which you may find of interest. You will note that Dr. Schlessinger's views on a somewhat different issue are referred to therein in the context of a debate on a contentious subject which is being engaged in by child psychologists and others.

While the views referred to in your letters which were expressed by Dr. Schlessinger on her April 12, 14 and 16 broadcasts may not reflect those of the management of CJCH, they do not, in our opinion, contravene any of the broadcasting standards or codes to which CJCH subscribes. As a talk radio station, CJCH encourages vigorous debate and the respectful expression of varying points of view on controversial issues. We respect Dr. Schlessinger's right to express views and opinions that may be inconsistent with the opinions of station management, with those of some of our listeners, and which may even be considered to be politically incorrect.

As you know, at this stage in Canada's social and political development, homosexuality and the political status of gays and lesbians in Canadian society remain issues of intense political debate. There continue to be many well-respected members of the public who hold deep convictions regarding public acceptance of homosexuality. Given the state of the political debate in Canada, we believe it is important and necessary that all views on the issue are heard in as open a forum as possible.

Accordingly, while we view Dr. Schlessinger's comments regarding homosexuality to be somewhat near one end of the spectrum, we do not believe that her views on this sensitive subject are inconsistent with Canadian broadcasting standards.

I trust this letter is responsive to your concerns.

The complainant was unsatisfied with the broadcaster's response and requested, on June 2, 1999, that the CBSC refer the matter to the Atlantic Regional Council for adjudication.

III. File 98/99-1003

This complainant first filed a complaint on June 10, 1999 (by completing our "complaint form" located on our web site). He expressed his concern by stating that "[the host's] comments about an article on a gay cruising area in the States were stereotyping gays and promoted hatred towards gays." This complaint was followed by an e-mail on the same day in which he wrote:

I am writing to complain about the Dr. Laura Schlessinger program, broadcast over CJCH 920 News Radio (CHUM Broadcasting). Her comments at 4:15 pm on Thursday June 10, 1999 promote hatred towards gays. She commented on a Planned Parenthood film about sexuality in which they (Planned Parenthood) talk about homosexuality -- as in a high school student finding his male track coach attractive. She then said something about paedophilia. I found her comments to be very offensive.

Her comments at 4:45 pm about a PBS special on homophobia in American schools were just as offensive. I believe this inciting of hatred towards gays, (that cannot be challenged on her show), is wrong and does not belong on Canadian airways.

To: Canadian Broadcast Standards Council - Please accept this as an official complaint and may be put on the public record. Thank you.

To: News Radio 920 CJCH (CHUM Broadcasting) - I hope you will take this program off the air. Until then, CHUM stations have lost me as a listener. Sorry.

To: Equality for Gays and Lesbians Everywhere - Just sending this to let you guys know about my complaint maybe there will be more. Keep up the good work!

The complainant returned his signed Ruling Request on June 22, accompanied by the following letter to the CBSC:

Please find enclosed my signed "Ruling Request" form in regards to my complaint (Dr. Laura Schlessinger, File # 1998/1999-1003). I had been in contact with [the] Director of Programming, CJCH, by telephone a couple of weeks ago (around the 7th I believe) to ask if CJCH staff monitored programs going out over the air for content. And in particular the "Dr. Laura Schlessinger" show. I can not remember the exact conversation, but he told me that there is a seven second delay in the broadcast, and that it is not listened to second by second, but that it is listened to. I told him how I felt about some of Ms. Schlessinger's comments regarding gays and aids. He said they were my opinion and offered Ms. Schlessinger's fax number, which I refused.

My complaints are based on the Broadcasting Act as published in "Canada Gazette Part II, Vol. 125. No. 23. page 3430:

SOR/91-586 23 October, 1991

1. Paragraph 3(b) of Radio Regulations, 1986 is revoked and the following substituted therefor: "any abusive comment that, when taken in context, tends to or is likely to expose an individual or a group or class of individuals to hatred or contempt on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age or mental or physical disability;"

The Program Manager of CJCH responded to the complainant's letter on July 2, 1999 with the letter below. Along with his response, he also included the above-noted newspaper article by Susanne Hiller of the National Post entitled: "A heated debate over child sex".

I am writing in response to your e-mail of June 10, 1999 in which you expressed concern regarding certain remarks made by the host of the Dr. Laura Schlessinger Show which is broadcast each weekday afternoon on Talk Radio 920 CJCH, Halifax.

As a member of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters ("CAB"), Talk Radio 920 CJCH has undertaken to adhere to several voluntary broadcast codes and standards developed by the CAB and administered by the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council ("CBSC"). Moreover, CJCH accepts responsibility for all of the programming which is broadcast on its radio station.

We note that your complaint relates to certain of Dr. Laura Schlessinger's views on homosexuality which were expressed on her show on April 12, 14 and 16. We appreciate that a certain number of the issues that Dr. Schlessinger addresses on her program can be controversial. She is well-known for expressing strong opinions on issues that are politically, socially and religiously sensitive. Indeed, certain of her views on some of these controversial issues may, at times, be offensive to some radio listeners.

It is Dr. Schlessinger's willingness to address sensitive issues, such as homosexuality, in a blunt and straightforward manner, which attracts a significant number of listeners to her program. As you may know, the Dr. Laura Schlessinger Show is currently one of the most popular syndicated radio programs in North America.

While the views referred to in your letters which were expressed by Dr. Schlessinger on her June 10 broadcast may not reflect those of the management of CJCH, they do not, in our opinion, contravene any of the broadcasting standards or codes to which CJCH subscribes. As a talk radio station, CJCH encourages vigorous debate and the respectful expression of varying points of view on controversial issues. We respect Dr. Schlessinger's right to express views and opinions that may be inconsistent with the opinions of station management, with those of some of our listeners, and which may even be considered to be politically incorrect.

As you know, at this stage in Canada's social and political development, homosexuality and the political status of gays and lesbians in Canadian society remain issues of intense political debate. There continue to be many well-respected members of the public who hold deep convictions regarding public acceptance of homosexuality. Given the state of the political debate in Canada, we believe it is important and necessary that all views on the issue are heard in as open a forum as possible.

Accordingly, while we view Dr. Schlessinger's comments regarding homosexuality to be somewhat near one end of the spectrum, we do not believe that her views on this sensitive subject are inconsistent with Canadian broadcasting standards. I trust this letter is responsive to your concerns.

The complainant reiterated his dissatisfaction, this time vis-à-vis the station's response, in a letter dated July 8 addressed to the CBSC:

Re 920 CJCH's reply dated July 2, 1999 (received July 7):

paragraph 5 -- "vigorous debate"? With who? "respectful expression"? of what?

paragraph 6: "intense political debate" I am not against debate — in our courts, in our parliament and yes even on live local call-in radio shows. But Schlessinger's program is none of the above.

When I was a child (I'm white) I was told by a friend that I should not play with Afro-Canadians because they had "germs". The school yard slang that was used had me terrified that I might "catch" something. Schlessinger's show does the same thing to the youth in today's schools and the only "winners" of this "debate" are Schlessinger, her producers and broadcasters.

IV. File 98/99-1137

On June 22, 1999, the complainant in file 98/99-1003 (also being adjudicated by the Atlantic Regional Council at the same time as the present complaint), sent the following letter to the CRTC:

Please consider this a complaint regarding the Dr. Laura Schlessinger program as broadcast over CJCH radio, Halifax Nova Scotia, on June 22, 1999 at about 4:10 in the pm. Her ranting about homosexuality was just down and out hateful. This assault was to the point of inciting people to fight against my community. I will tell you now that with the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council I have a complaint regarding Schlessinger's June 2nd and 10th shows (File No.: 99/99-1003), however I was so appalled by her comments today, I wish to file this complaint with the CRTC as per directions on your web page.

My complaints are based on the Broadcasting Act as published in the "Canada Gazette, Part II., Vol. 125, No. 23. page 3430.

SOR/91-586 23 October, 1991

1. Paragraph 3(b) of Radio Regulations, 1986 is revoked and the following substituted therefore,
" any abusive comment that, when taken in context, tends to or is likely to expose an individual or a group or class of individuals to hatred or contempt on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age, or mental or physical disability;"

This letter was accompanied by a typed memorandum dated July 6. This document was not addressed to anyone but on the top of it the complainant scrawled "Please consider this an official complaint." The memo went as follows:

I am just so angry right now (5 pm, July 5, 1999). I heard Schlessinger at 4:09 moralizing about a sheriff with aids — it was as if the producers of the show were trying to make up for all the things Schlessinger has said about gays in the last month. (However, she still stereotyped). You know, in Pre WWII Germany, Hitler first vilified his victims — Jews, gays, gypsies, then he attacked their art, and then degraded them - "they" were not really human. Over the past month Schlessinger has done the same thing to me. And this disgusts me.

Note: numbers in "{ }" refer to:

1) Psycho Social Issues in Primary Care of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth; Jennifer L Kreiss, MN, RN, and Diana L Patterson, DSN; Journal of Pediatric Health Care, Volume 11 Number 6, p. 266-274. November/December 1997

2) Fulfilling The Promise: Community Response to the Needs of Sexual Minority Youth and Families; Steven E. James, PhD; American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 68930, July 1998

3) The article by David Gelinter, Schlessinger refers to June 30, 4:52 pm.

4) "American Psychiatric Association Rebukes Reparative Therapy"

5) "Anti gay Hate Crimes"

July 1, 5:25 pm (ed. This is not related to homosexuality, but at that time of day, should she not be worried that young children might be listening?)

"does the Sharon Stone move with the no underwear and vagina flashing is a slut your friend is a slut, that's what I call a slut. I don't know what you call a slut, how far do you have to go to be a slut dear. What is your definition {1}

July 1, 5:07 pm — article — "When two boys kissed lying together and two girls kissing..." (LS) — "no they were just being vulgar and pornographic because little kids get off on potty words." (please note at this point she goes on about free speech) {1,2}

July 1, 4:56 — Caller "oh boy they put me right through" (ed. sorry I just found that interesting) she goes on to talk about her daughter being close to the callers -mothers - widows (female life-partners) . (LS) — "Maybe there is some more dangerous thing that you just cannot... and you hang up you will remember she is molesting her... {5}

June 30, 4:52 — (LS) talking about article - "intelligent honest compassionate it takes a very important stance" {3,4,5.}

June 30, 3:36 — caller is a gay man who lives in a heterosexist society, and wants to come out to his parents. (LS) — "not having grandchildren, NO [emphasis mine] parent is just going to say "fine" if they are decent and religious parents; their issue is not whether you would act out on it" (so if he has sex then he is not decent or religious!) {4,5}

June 30, 12:06 am — While reading a movie review (three single women who want children) Schlessinger remarks: "obligating a child to no father"... "rearing children in the presence of a full time father, any father at all." ..."looser women who either cannot get relationships either because... lesbians or just plain jerks" {1,2,4,5}

June 29, 11:28 pm — While reading a letter from a psychologist concerning 'alternative family forms' Schlessinger makes remarks that are offensive.. "notice how cautious they are not to use homosexual or lesbian" (accent on homosexual and lesbian) Do you believe this kind of nonsense... should be taken as public policy. [ed.: Note to Dr. Laura, The letter came from a psychologist!] {1,2,5}

June 29, 11:13 pm — Caller — "my cousin, (and) she is a lesbian, (and) my husband and I have been friendly with her for the past four or five years and we have been friendly with the woman that is living with... they are going to adopt a child."

(LS) "TWO LESBIANS GOT A NEWBORN!"

(LS) "HOPEFULLY (it's) GOING TO BE A HETEROSEXUAL CHILD, TO DEAL IN A HETEROSEXUAL WORLD..." "REALLY NEEDS THE BALANCE OF THE FEMININE AND THE MASCULINE".... "THIS TO ME IS A TRAVESTY ON CHILDREN"

"YOU HAVE A MORAL OBLIGATION TO TRY TO SAVE THIS POTENTIAL CHILD"

(this is morals? this is religious? this IS hate) {1,2,4,5}

June 29, 10:10 pm — I find her use of fear and the perversion of truth to sell her products most offensive.

(LS) on promoting her *Perspective* (American Library Association) making sure children have the right and the opportunity to view pornography {4,5}

June 29, 10:07 pm — Please remember as you read the next complaint that all segments were aired at sometime or another in the afternoon when you can reasonably assume that children (perhaps heterosexual children) of "alternative families" would hear her.

(LS) "If two lesbians can have, adopt, or make children after psychological community says fathers are not relevant, then there is a lot of power," ..."this is all growing ugly, devastating, and dangerous ... and it is all connected." {1,2,4,5}

June 28, 4:35 — Schlessinger here implies that only heterosexual people who believe in God have values. The caller and her husband at first wanted her sister (a lesbian) to be the god-mother of their baby, then they became 'religious'.

(LS) — "let's just make believe she is a raging atheist and now that you are becoming serious Christians" {4,5}

June 27, 12:07 — 'The Rant', as I call it, is a rebroadcast of programming of June 22, 4:10 pm (about 11 minutes) for which I put in a complaint to the CRTC.(LS) — "If you folks don't start standing up for heterosexual marriages and heterosexuality, pretty soon that which you know as this country and family, will be gone" (which 'folks'?; stand up how? with lies? and if that doesn't work, with clubs? and if that doesn't work, maybe those uppity homosexuals should just be gotten rid of altogether so the country will not be destroyed.) {2,4,5}

[*Rest in peace Matthew Shepard*]

June 25, 11:15 — Schlessinger reads a 'letter' from "x-gay". Does not the CBSC's decision: CKRD re Focus on the Family (CBSC Decision 96/97 - 0155) apply to this? {4,5}

June 25, 5:08 — Movie review — 'And Baby Makes Two' (see June 30, 12:06 am)

June 25, 4:15 — A couple (two-woman-family) want to adopt a child.

(LS) — "moral travesty" [see June 29, 11:13 pm]

June 22, 4:10 pm — What about gay and lesbian children? This "rant" of hers is just so appalling. At 4:10 pm what is a gay or lesbian youth going to think of himself or herself if he/she hears his/hers parents listening to her rantings. I wonder how many high school kids were beaten after this aired — just because they were or appeared to be gay. [see June 27, 12:01 am] {1,2}

June 21, 10:15 pm — In a letter to an editor, a lesbian complains about Schlessinger's column being in her daily paper. (LS) — "deviant sexual behaviour ... what would we lose ..the family." {1, 2, 4, 5}

June 16, unknown — (LS) reads an article in "Citizen Issue Alert", about an article in an American Psychological Association publication that looks at the long term effects on people who suffered from childhood sexual abuse. She talks [about] NAMBLA (North American Man-Boy Love Association), then goes on to talk about the 'National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality' (NARTH) an organization that advocates that homosexuals can be "treated" {re: June 22, 4:10 pm} using therapies that have been discredited by the American Psychiatric Association, and which, they say, may actually do harm. Press conference sponsored by the 'Family Research Council'.{4,5}

What's her message? *Homosexuals are sick, they abuse kids, but we have the organization to cure them.*

My complaint is her promotion of 'NARTH' as a reputable organization that promotes 'cures' or therapies that have been discredited by the American Psychiatric Association. {re: CKRD re Focus on the Family(CBSC Decision 96/97-0155) {4,5}

June 10, 4:45 pm — [complaint filed with the CBSC *concerning this broadcast*] {1, 2, 4, 5}

June 10, 4:15 pm — [complaint filed with the CBSC concerning this broadcast] {1, 2, 4, 5}

June 9, afternoon — This is not directly related to homosexuality but I found her remarks offensive. (LS) — She had been talking about Canada just before these remarks (talking about the USA) ". . . from many one... one ... not take this one and take many out of it which the US is doing also, now you got witches at Fort Hood...NOT ALL THINGS ARE EQUAL, NOT ALL THINGS DESERVE THE SAME RESPECT (emphasis mine)....this country is also - America - was never meant to be multi-cultural which I think is one of the most destructive forces we have..."

June 8, unknown — Schlessinger brings the list of the best 100 gay novels of all time to our attention. She then states the number one gay novel of all time according to this list is "Death in Venice". She does not name the author, she just names the book, and then she perverts it. I had never heard of the book, so I looked it up and discovered the name of its author, Thomas Mann. This is what "The New Encyclopedia Britannica" (Vol. 7, Micropedia, Ready Reference, 15th edition) of his writings:

"*Assessment* Mann was the greatest German novelist of the 20th century, and by the end of his life (1955) his works had acquired the status of classics both within and without Germany. His subtly structured novels and shorter stories constitute a persistent and imaginative enquiry into the nature of Western bourgeois culture, in which a haunting awareness of its precariousness and threatened disintegration is balanced by an appreciation of tender concern for its SPIRITUAL [emphasis mine] achievements."

Thomas Mann, the author of "Death in Venice", the best gay novel of all time, won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1929.

June 7, 4:10? — "if they can bring 'Queer Studies' into our colleges then I think we should able to say "God" at graduation, not that that is great balance" The word phrasing and her inflection implies that gays are not religious, and if you are not religious, in her eyes, you are immoral. This is stereotyping.

June 7, 3:40 pm — (LS)— "this is the gay male life-style — screwing people you don't know? This is entertainment? this sounds healthy? — Homosexuality should have been taken out of the 'Diagnostic Statistical Manual by the psychiatrists?" [lets stereotype and demonize those homosexual sex deviants? they are not like us people who have morals]

June 2, xx:xx pm -- (this complaint is currently before the CBSC) {4, 5}

This document was also accompanied by the various articles referred to by the complainant.

The station's Program Manager responded to the complaint on August 9, 1999 with the following:

I am writing in response to your most recent complaint, dated July 6, 1999, regarding the Dr. Laura Schlessinger program, which is broadcast on Talk Radio 920 CJCH.

Unfortunately, your letter was not forwarded to us by the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council until July 28, 1999, and as station logger tapes are held for a period of 30 days, we are unable to comment specifically on the items in your letter spanning the dates June 7 to June 28, 1999.

Regarding the instances outlined concerning items broadcast June 29 to July 1, 1999, we would reiterate the points outlined in our letter to you of June 30, 1999. You should also note that we have reviewed the logger tapes of the Dr. Laura Schlessinger shows which were broadcast on those dates. While we acknowledge that Dr. Schlessinger expressed strong opinions on sensitive issues, including homosexuality, and that her views were, at times, controversial, we do not believe that her statements were inconsistent with any of the Canadian broadcasting codes or standards to which CJCH subscribes.

In our view, Dr. Schlessinger has a right to express opinions on politically sensitive and controversial issues. As noted in our June 30 letter, homosexuality is an issue that has been subject to intense political debate in Canada. There are many members of the public who continue to hold deep convictions regarding the political status of gays and lesbians in Canadian society. We do not believe that it is anyone's interests to stifle that debate.

I trust this letter responds to the issues raised in your complaint.

On August 23, the complainant returned his ruling request with respect to the June and July broadcasts of the show as per his complaint of July 6th.

APPENDIX B
to CFYI-AM and CJCH-AM re the Dr. Laura Schlessinger Show
(CBSC Decision 99/00-0005 and 98/99-0808+, February 9 and 15, 2000)
Transcripts

The following are transcripts of relevant portions of the *Dr. Laura Show* broadcast on CJCH-AM and CFYI-AM.

Broadcast of April 12, 1999 on CJCH

Laura Schlessinger: The APA has given a forum for an article which is starting to normalize my opinion and the opinion of others who I mentioned two weeks ago when I first did this piece, normalizes paedophilia and the papers don't run with it. So I guess what I should do is have a little problem at a speaking thing so the media comes in and then hit 'em with the paedophilia thing. Think they'll go for it then? It's not sexy enough? Doing little children? Performing oral sex on little children? Having them performing oral sex on you? Masturbating little children, having them masturbate you? That's not sexy enough? I mean, what do you have to do to get attention here? But with much respect I have for the *Washington Times* they immediately picked it up. They talked about the article and they mentioned me, Laura Schlessinger, "also known as Dr. Laura one of the Nation's top rated talk show hosts with up to 18 million listeners blasted the 31 page report yesterday. She said the study published in July of the APA's monthly *Psychological Bulletin* was proof that the 155,000 member organization had gone soft on child molesters." Well, that's her take. But I think that's fair. Either that or nobody's watching the store. And unfortunately, what the APA says people take as actual science or it's a final word, like "homosexuality is now normal." How can that be? When a man cannot make love to a woman, how can that be normal? But since they dropped it out of the book of diagnostics, the general public has been made to accept that made it normal, but how can that be? Just use common sense. We're not talking about the entire person. We're only talking about the sexual orientation. Anyway, reading it off, she quotes me as saying "I'm scared this study can be used to normalize paedophilia to change the legal system," she said. "The APA will quietly redefine paedophilia like it did homosexuality." Which, by the way, it has. Paedophilia, sexual sadism and such are no longer disorders, according to the APA. They're only disorders if the person who is sexually masochistic or sadistic is upset about it or it's ruining their [*sic*] work. You understand and that's exactly how homosexuality got normalized. So to me it's the first step. The article goes on to say "...Reaction to the APA report first surfaced in December in a scathing critique published by the National Association of Research in Therapy in Homosexuality in Encino, California." Quote "If psychology indeed recognizes consensual paedophilia as harmless, then civil law and social norms will be under pressure to follow the lead of social science as they did on the issue of homosexuality," the organization said. Now, this is the original article about this and this was the original comment by Rhea Farberman, the APA spokeswoman. She said that "Mrs. Schlessinger," and that's my mother, I'm Dr. Schlessinger, "Mrs. Schlessinger had, quote, 'some valid criticisms'". So, you see, I get credit. I had valid criticisms of the study but added that publication of an article in the *Psychological Bulletin* does not imply endorsement by the APA. Why not? I challenge that. Then why put it there? If I had valid criticisms of the methodology, why did it get published? And endorsement means that they stand behind the research. Or why are they publishing it? So now you want me

to tell the public, Miss Rhea, you want me to tell the public that when you publish something you don't give a damn if it's right or wrong. You don't guarantee nothing? Really? Then it goes on to say "The bridge Mrs. Schlessinger builds between this study and the so-called attempt to normalize paedophilia is ridiculous." Now hang on to that statement because in one more sentence I'm gonna read you who already celebrated it. "The APA is on the record time and time again to protect children and to protect the integrity of families," Okay? David Miller writes on Welcome to NAMBLA home page, quote, "A new study bolsters the long-standing claim of NAMBLA," which is the National Association of Man-Boy Love. Man-boy love. "Activists said consensual sex between men and boys doesn't cause sexual damage. This meta analysis which combines the results of 59 different studies is published in the pre-eminent journal of the American Psychological Association." So the first thing that happened is a paedophile organization said it got the green light from the APA publishing that article. Let's go back over what that woman said about me. "The bridge she builds, Dr. Schlessinger builds, between this study and the so-called attempt to normalize paedophilia is ridiculous." Let me go back. "A new study bolsters the long-standing claim of men-boy love activists that consensual sex between men and boys doesn't cause sexual damage. The analysis which combines bla bla bla was published in the pre-eminent journal of the American Psychological Association." Hmm, so Rhea, you would have expected an apology. Instead, let's see, what was the original date? It was March 22nd that I went on the air, April 8th the APA came out with the statement, which doesn't refer to me directly but refers to people who are commenting about this and that were misrepresenting the findings. Obviously they're talking about me and you'll hear that in a minute. Here's one, two sentences. "The actual findings are that, for this segment of the population, college students, being the victim of childhood sexual abuse was found to be less damaging to them than generally believed." Listen how that's worded. "However one overall statement in the results was that students who were the victims of childhood sexual abuse were on the average slightly less well adjusted than students who were not victimized as children." Well, Rhea, I read the report. Clearly you didn't or you're lying because, Miss Rhea, the next sentence after that sentence in the report, discounts that less adjustment by putting it on FE. The psychologists like to do that so you don't know what they're talking about. FE - family effect. They discounted the sexual abuse as causing the slightly less adjustment and said it was due to family effect. So the first time there's a report from the APA they misrepresent. Are they hiding? Are they running? Are they nervous? Was anybody paying attention? Going on. CNS executive editor, Scott Hagensen, published this last week. "APA under fire for child sexual abuse report" I don't know what fire it is. Let's see, Deborah Saunders. Wait a minute. Deborah Saunders did something. I'm trying to remember everybody that did something. Kathleen Parker. I think there may have been one more but... "Under fire". I like that. "The American Psychological Association is trying to correct what it called 'misrepresentation of the organizations division on child sexual abuse' and the finding of a report on the topic published by the organization." Listen to this next sentence. This is good. "But the association appears to be selective in who it publicly criticizes for their use of the report. Singled out for criticism was Dr. Laura Schlessinger who railed against the report in a broadcast earlier this month calling it 'One that attempts to normalize paedophilia'. The broadcaster also voiced strong opposition to the report's conclusions which included renaming child sexual abuse adult-child sex, a value-neutral term according to a text of the document obtained by CNN." Rhea Farberman, now, my friends, has escalated. Remember in the beginning she said I had valid criticisms but I took this leap, and then I read you, I read you that NAMBLA, Man-boy Love Association, said 'See, we're justified now, we can go out and do your kids'? "When Dr. Schlessinger made statements that we felt were a real distortion of the facts we said so." Where? Where did they say so? What were the distortions? What are the facts? Continuing her croak, "What Dr. Schlessinger did in a public forum, I think you know she's

got 18 million listeners and I think those listeners deserve the correct information.” Does that sound like a valley girl? Now listen to what the writer does ‘cause he’s not stupid. “While Schlessinger is being criticized for real or perceived misinterpretations of scientific fact and conclusions, the APA is taking no public action regarding the use of its published documents by one particular group which promotes the agenda of sex between adults and children, the North American Man-Boy Love Association cites the APA published study and other research documents as justification for sex between children and adults saying that sexual encounters between men and boys are often quite positive and beneficial for the participants regardless of their ages.” This article goes on.

Broadcast of April 14, 1999 on CJCH

Schlessinger is discussing a teacher who is an open homosexual. There were several students who asked to be removed from his class because they claimed that he would discuss his homosexuality in class. This caused an uproar in the community. The mother of one of the children claims that she does not hate gays, she just doesn't want it taught to her son in school.

Laura Schlessinger: I had read about this situation in the papers so I have some familiarity with it. This was sent to me by a woman who did send a letter to the editor in the *Bakersfield Californian* and they wouldn't publish it, she said. In all fairness to the newspaper and it kills me ever to be fair to an institution that is so rarely fair to me but I don't mean that paper. I just mean “papers”. But in all fairness, they might have just had so many and they can only print so many. So I don't know whether it was ... specific ... see, I can't take that leap. I could guess but I can't take that leap. She says,

Dr. Laura, incredibly in Bakersfield, California, a conversation is raging over a local incident that was featured on *Dateline*. My 13-year old nephew is one of the children featured. He along with 13 other children asked to be removed from their science teacher's class after he revealed he was homosexual and did and said things in class with respect to homosexuality that made the children uncomfortable.

I have to stop as a sidebar here because the issue is not, from what I read in the papers, the issue is not that he was homosexual. Period. It was that that was creeping into the classroom. So it sounds like he made it an issue. The teacher. From what I read in the papers. Okay. Back to the article.

After the parents removed their children, Mr. Merrick filed a complaint against the State Labor Board alleging discrimination. He also demanded that the children be returned to his classroom. Merrick prevailed on the complaint. The State ruled that the parents did not have the right to remove children from his class.

I find that outrageous. We have the right to remove children from sex education classes we think are inappropriate. Isn't that a form of indirect sexual education?

After the case was profiled on *Dateline*, a barrage of anti-Christian hate letters poured into the letters column of the *Bakersfield Californian*.

Yeah, recently someone wrote an article about me and described me as right-wing Christian, so I know there is an anti-Christian bias.

The barrage of anti-Christian hate letters poured into the letters column of the *Bakersfield Californian*. I was one of the few who wrote a letter from the parental - Christian - constitutional standpoint.

Well, there may have been others.

The newspaper has refused to print my letter. I believe they do not want to print it because it is an articulate counterpoint. I faxed a copy of the letter. It may or may not be anything you care to talk about. If it is, my heart would soar that my point will have been heard by gazillions more than the measly readership of this newspaper.

You shouldn't be hostile.

I do not hate gay people. Every American ought to be quaking in their boots at this ruling. I also believe in the right to have control over any negative thing a parent may not want to expose their child to. The recent responses [this is her letter] to *Dateline's* biased reporting of Mr. Merrick was amusing but misinformed. My 13 year old nephew was rightfully removed from Mr. Merrick's class. He asked his parents, as did all 13 to be removed from the class. I've noticed that the leftist lunatics preach tolerance and renounce prejudice and censorship with intense and maniacal fervour until it comes to tolerance and free speech of Christian beliefs.

I think that is, sidebar, I think that's absolutely true, absolutely true. 'You're supposed to tolerate me, I don't have to tolerate you.' That's the mentality. But it's gone past tolerance. You have to accept as truth what I say and [indecipherable].

Then suddenly with a 180 degree hypocritical about face they say people are for the systematic and all encompassing censorship and tolerance and prejudice of Christian-Judaeo beliefs, valued doctrines of speech. Thankfully the higher courts have consistently removed their children and teach them at home. Historically the right of the family to the free exercise of their faith exceeds any rights that Mr. Merrick may have. While Mr. Merrick may not approve of my religion, neither do I approve of the religions of atheism and humanism.

[Laughing] Which, incidentally, are classified as religions.

The goal of the parents removing their children from Mr. Merrick's class is not hatred or murderous vengeance. The goal is to not give the appearance of acceptance or advocacy. The parents have this right not only to free speech but freedom of religion. All of the parents who removed their children from Mr. Merrick's

classroom did so quietly and without any unseemly behaviour. They didn't picket, they didn't yell and scream, they didn't call television, they didn't try to embarrass the man. They tried to have their children in a different environment where there was not any, as has been alleged, proselytizing of homosexuality.

That's all they did. And I don't even see where that's a religious issue per se, other than God forbids the behaviour when it's a disordered behaviour. Period. In spite of the APA who just merely voted it out for that research.

All of the parents who removed their children from Mr. Merrick's classroom did so quietly and without any unseemly behaviour. The only hatefulness in this matter was displayed by the other side who spit acid and gritted veins in their foreheads when they hear the word "Christian". Christian prejudice of Mr. Merrick is impossible. There is no prejudging to it. He has stated he is a homosexual. There are Christian parents who cannot turn a blind eye of acceptance and convey that acceptance by allowing their children to remain in class. The persecution of Mr. Merrick has been a weak one compared to the daily intolerance, prejudice and censorship directed at law-abiding Christians and ... [those] who are just trying to raise their children in a society that is getting more depraved by the day.

There's an important point here. There was an article ... where did I put that? There was an article in the *Los Angeles Times* about a week ago, somebody reviewing a PBS television show which is geared towards teaching kids ... I'm looking around, I don't see it ... teaching kids in the classroom from kindergarten up about homosexuality and my question is: Why are we doing that? Why do you want to teach 6 year-olds about two men having sex with each other? If you're just trying to ... and you know, it isn't about tolerance, it's about acceptance. 'Accept this as normal and okay'. That's a big difference from 'don't hurt anyone's feelings' because they have a problem, or they look different, or whatever. Somebody's in a wheel chair; you don't make fun. Somebody has a sexual identity problem; you don't make fun. I mean, that's sort of standard but that's not what's happening. What's happening is that there are programs all over the country now on TV trying to teach children that two men together is equivalent to their mommy and daddy. What is that? And if you say that's not a good thing, then you wanted Matthew Shepard killed. And if you think I'm taking another one of those big leaps I'm always being accused of, you're out of your mind. Just about every time you read the rhetoric about somebody who says 'This is not about tolerance, this is about acceptance and normalizing homosexuality,' the next thing you hear is you're homophobic, you're hateful and you want gay people killed in the street. That's how bizarre and insane and irrational it gets. Nobody wants anybody killed in the street. But most people do not want an aberrant sexual orientation taught as normal to children. If you want people to not cast aspersions on other people, you just teach that. I don't believe in hate crimes legislation; I think anytime you kill a person you've done the ultimate sin. Period. Gay, straight, tall, short, male, female, it doesn't matter. That is the highest sin. There is no greater sin. But I'm telling you there's this huge movement that has intimidated parents and folks in general, legislators, in a threatening way, that if you do not advocate that homosexuality should be taught in the school as normal acceptable behaviour, that you are hateful, hostile and phobic. And these are the people who preach tolerance. [Chuckling] Hateful, hostile and phobic if you simply don't agree. This is outrageous. There's legislation here in California, which went so far - it hasn't been passed - but it

went so far as to state if you, if any school - like a religious school - any school didn't engage in these studies, then they couldn't get federal aid. Huh? Is that serious? You folks need to pay more attention. Now I need to remind you, from the mail, faxes, the calls, the letters that we get, this is not the homosexual population at large, these are the activists. But I get so much mail from homosexuals who are not activists, who are free to open their mouths, terrified. I mean you get organizations that out people to force them into positions of serving the activists. A lot of ugly stuff going on out there. So if he brought his homosexuality to the classroom instead of teaching whatever the heck was the subject ... I mean, I don't remember my history teacher ever discussing sex. They discussed boring things like wars and remembering the Presidents in order, you know. I'm sorry. I don't mean to insult anybody, but, you know, it's a little dry. [Laughing] I'm not insulting anybody, it's fabulous, it's wonderful, great. But when people now are starting now to propagandize in the classrooms, that has to be stopped. So there's a difference between an individual who happens to be gay with a brilliant teacher who is teaching a subject. If people were hauling their kids out of that person's class, I'd be the first one telling them they were idiots. But there's a big difference between that and somebody bringing their homosexuality into the class and propagandizing it in any way. Then I would tell that person they're an idiot. I hope you're real clear on that. Now how can that be phobic and hateful and hostile? I just don't want our kids propagandized that what is abnormal is normal. I don't think it helps their growth, their psyche and civilization. It's as simple as that. I'm Dr. Laura Schlessinger...

Broadcast of April 14, 1999 on CJCH

The host reiterates points made in the show from April 12 regarding a report on the effects of adult-child sex and paedophilia.

Broadcast of April 16, 1999 on CJCH

Lisa, a caller, tells the story of her sister who had a child out of wedlock and wants to know if it's appropriate for the father, who skipped the country and returns only once a year to renew his visa, to see the child.

Laura Schlessinger: It's of no value [to a child] to see a stranger one day out of 365. And I regret your sister didn't have the wisdom and the strength to put the child up for adoption.

Lisa: No, no. She loves the baby. She has the baby.

Laura Schlessinger: The women who give their children up for adoption are not women who don't love their babies. They're women who know that a two-parent home is the ideal place for a child, so I'm sad she didn't do that. ...

[...]

Laura Schlessinger: I'm Dr. Laura Schlessinger. I just read an interesting article from the *Deseret News* in the metro section, and I don't quite understand. "An East High presentation about the gay community raised the ire of hundreds of parents and students, but students in the Gay-straight Alliance say it's a significant step forward in cultural awareness. 'We just wanted to express our culture,' said the Alliance historian." The gay culture? I'm trying to understand, what is that? I remember the 70s and 80s that the line was that this is only about sex, it's not about anything else, right? So what's the gay culture? Is that where we get into the promiscuity and the paedophilia? Or are these just

regulation human beings, who somehow have an error in their sexual orientation but otherwise are seriously regulation human beings? I'm confused. First I'm told for 20 years that it's only about sex. Now I'm told it's a whole culture. So what's in the culture? What is it? If it's just about sex, then the culture must only be about sex. Otherwise you're American culture. But listen to this "They presented a slide show, Friday, during the school's popular culture assembly which also features dances from Polynesian, African and Latin countries." That's culture. Sexual deviations are not culture. They're sexual deviations. Otherwise the person is a regulation human being. They can be an attorney, a dancer, anything, a dentist, right? I thought it was only about sex. What the hell are we talking about here? "The Alliance presentation was reviewed and approved by the principal who took responsibility for the fallout. Dozens of parents said the slide show was gay propaganda and indoctrination" — Obviously! — "that was illegally shown to their children without consent. They said the administration should have known the presentation would offend most of the students." Couple of delicate things here to deal with. The slide show defined terms such as gay, which is a made-up term so you won't say the word homosexual 'cause homosexual implies sex. What does gay imply, happy? Lesbian and bi-sexual, now that's supposed to be considered to be normal, too? Events and symbols of importance to the gay community such as Pride Day, the Rainbow Flag, gay friendly places to live and gay community centres. Some parents said the slide show needed to present the downside of the gay lifestyle. Isn't that the culture? We're not gonna show that part? The decimation by AIDS, the promiscuity, the other health ailments. Go read Dr. Jeffrey Satinover's 'Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth'. He's an extremely compassionate psychiatrist who truly feels deeply for the issues, problems, health and welfare of homosexuals and that's not what I read in the book. But I'm confused again. What's the culture if it's only about sex? Otherwise it's just [a] regulation ... person. Worse. "Students were told the assembly was mandatory. Students who tried to leave were told to take their seats. They were forced to see it. Later the administration gave some clap-trap that students were not allowed to leave campus during assemblies." All right, let them go into the lunchroom so that's, that fell short. Now this is the kind of thing that really makes me angry and I almost hate to bring it up because it's painful and sensitive and people who are agendized have a hard time hearing such things without leaping, so I'm gonna try to be very clear. One of the mothers of a homosexual student said "I didn't want another Matthew Shepard incident here." Now every time I hear that I get crazed and enraged. It is not open season on homosexuals in this country and the rare time there is an event it's usually some backwards idiot ... some redneck, skinhead mentality guys but it certainly isn't regulation members of society and it certainly isn't how, after the Matthew Shepard thing, everybody went after Dr. James Dobson and *Focus on the Family* because he takes a position against homosexuality being taught in the schools etc. He was viciously attacked after the Matthew Shepard tragedy because they, the gay activists, were saying somehow that the Christian community was largely responsible for that guy's death. You know what was largely responsible for that guy's death? Those two guys who killed him did not go out looking for a homosexual to kill that night. They were shooting pool. He went to the bar. He left with two guys he thought he was gonna have sex with. He got murdered. How many women has that happened to? How many women have left bars thinking they were gonna get some action with some guy who raped and murdered and tortured and murdered them? Far more women than homosexual men have ended up dead that way, I would guess. Is that a hate crime against women? I think so but they specifically picked the woman who was willing to leave for sex. If Matthew hadn't been willing to leave for sex, he might still be alive. That certainly doesn't make him responsible for his own death but when you put yourself into a situation of going off to have anonymous sex with people you meet at a bar, what kind of person is gonna leave with you? Usually scum. How many times on this show have you heard me tell women "You don't leave

bars with guys.” You don’t do that. You don’t have a few drinks and go with a guy you don’t know. There are dead bodies of women strewn all over this country, most of whom have never been found, who have done that. So, in all fairness, this was not open season. Matthew Shepard did not die because these guys said, according to everything I’ve read, “Let’s go out and kill a homosexual today.” That’s not what happened.. I understand that is what happened in Georgia to that one young man whose name I don’t know. But to exploit Matthew Shepard, to intimidate people who do not want to accept the acceptance of homosexuality as normalized, to say therefore that you wish somebody dead is part of the absurd intimidation you see from the activists. That’s absurd. That is absurd. He, like many many thousands of women, made a bad mistake leaving with people you don’t know to have sex, with slimeballs, who should never see the light of day. They should get the death penalty. You torture and you kill somebody, to me, you should die. Those two guys get the death penalty, period, in my mind. I understand, what is it going to be, one of them is just in prison, forever. That’s not good enough, although some people say that’s better because prison is not fun. But this is what’s happening, very intimidating to stand up for any value or any sense of perspective because you’re told you wish to see people dead. And I spoke to Dr. James Dobson — after that whole event went down and after the activists went crazy blaming him and the Christians of the United States for creating a hate environment. That man was so moved, so upset — he’s a serious Christian; serious Christians don’t wish anybody dead. I mean, that is so absurd. But they used poor Matthew Shepard’s death as an opportunity to attack serious Christians who have a serious moral problem with sexual deviation, period. But I have never, ever, ever heard a serious Christian wish somebody dead, never. Boy, if there’s a group that doesn’t, that’s it. And that’s just why most people are afraid to speak anymore ’cause you’re told you wish people dead. You’re phobic, you’re hateful, you’re murderous, you’re inspiring death. Wrong. Mainstream America is not out shooting anybody. Skinhead mentalities are doing Jews and blacks and gays and, who knows, Asians. But that is a minute, but dangerous, group. But it isn’t mainstream Christian America. Don’t go there. Don’t play that game. I’m calling you on it. This was a terrible tragedy but it’s also one that might have been avoided if he had simply gone home with his friends instead of thinking he was gonna get a little. And women do this everyday. Last night, somewhere, I’m sure a woman was killed leaving a bar with some bum. You don’t take risks for sex or for drugs. You don’t take risks for this. So, if you’re talking about the gay culture and the gay culture of promiscuous anonymous sex between men contributed to Matthew Shepard’s death, how do you like that? That’s more true than Dr. James Dobson had anything to do with it.

Broadcast of June 2, 1999 on CJCH

The host talks of a press release by the Iowa Association of Chiefs of Police which states that they passed a resolution condemning the American Psychological Association for their recently published article on paedophilia.

Laura Schlessinger: I’m very proud of you guys. Independently and across the country, there are studies which come to the same conclusion that the APA is standing behind, that it is sort of doing an “out of each side of the mouth”: “We are completely against child molestation but we’ve examined this piece of study and say it is science.” Well, if it’s science then I guess you have to go along with paedophilia. You know? You can’t have it both ways. We’re really good people but we’re leaving this door open. Maybe it’s because they don’t want to look like they made a booboo. You expect more from professionals. There will be much more to this

story. This story is not going away until we make sure that this piece of trash cannot be used to hurt children. And it is a piece of trash. The primary person I know of who would be in a position to call this trash is the past president of the American Psychiatric Association. Of course the current Psychiatric Association president has not come to the table on this except in some indirect, insubstantial way. But the past president of the American Psychiatric Association says this is virtually non-science. It is a setup. He even points out prior articles which the authors have written agendizing positively paedophilia. They had an agenda when they came to the table.

Broadcast of June 10, 1999 on CJCH

Laura Schlessinger: This is so difficult, and I know because I get the ugly activist faxes every time I deal with this, but I think it's fair. There was, in the Los Angeles Times, an editorial that says "Ugly Turn on Gay Rights Debate". Of course that caught my eye. Guess who they say was ugly? And guess who [sic] they say was an ugly act. One of the ugly acts was holding up a Bible. That is now an ugly act. Holding up the Bible. Espousing Judaeo-Christian principles is now an ugly act. I thought it was "drop dead I hate you, your mother wears army boots"; no, it's holding up a Bible. Let me just read a little bit of this to you: "The debate over gay rights". Rights. Rights? For sexual deviancy, sexual behaviour, there are now rights. That's what I am worried about with the paedophilia, the bestiality and the sado-masochism. Is this all going to be rights too? To deviant sexual behaviour. It is deviant sexual behaviour. Why does deviant sexual behaviour get rights? I don't understand that to start out with but moving along. "The debate over gay rights threatens to inflame state politics with opponents, already sponsoring a vitriolic public campaign." Holding up the Bible. That's vitriolic, I guess. "For them to continue would be a great mistake, risking new divisions among Californians, not just on the issue of sexual orientation but along religious and ethnic lines as well. First coups were fired in the assembly when Sheila Coulls [sp.] New Democrat for Santa Monica," she's an outspoken lesbian, "presented her bill and it lost." The concern of a lot of these bills is that it takes sexually deviant behaviour into schools from kindergarten up and says it's not non-equivalent to heterosexuality. Sort of undermines the basic foundation of civilization which is the family, which is defined by God, man and a woman... a man and a woman in a covenant. I don't see where deviant sexual behaviour has rights above that. And why an assault on basic Judaeo-Christian values is not considered hostile but resistance to the assault on Judaeo-Christian values is considered hostile. That's not fair. Really, basically, it's just not fair. It goes on to say, argue, that "homosexuality or the chosen lifestyle does not merit civil rights protection. Some suggested that being gay was linked to bestiality or paedophilia." Well, according to Dr. Argyle Danweig [sp.], an expert in homosexuality and other forms of deviant sexual behaviour in Holland, that although numerically there are more paedophiles that are heterosexual, percentage wise in a population, it is much greater in the homosexual community. So there is some relationship. No, not every homosexual is a paedophile. Obviously not. But it is a greater percentage, much greater. So they ought to do their homework before they say these things. "They implied that Assembly Woman Coulls and Carol Miggden [sp.], both Democrats... both open lesbians, intended to promote the gay lifestyle in schools" That's true. So you know what their answer is? "An irate Miggden retorted 'How can you look at me and Miss Coulls and believe we are depraved?' How is that a logical response to 'we are offended and concerned about bringing deviant sexual behaviour into kindergarten' have to do with you not being

competent, educated, etc.? Nobody said they were quote "bad people", or not competent, or not intelligent, or not good citizens. They just said the sexual behaviour was deviant and we don't want it in schools. We don't want it to be recognized on the same level as heterosexuality. But you know, they fight dirty. But you read this whole, and you can read this for yourself, this was in the *Los Angeles Times* today, it was an editorial, and the only ugliness are the Judaeo-Christian value people. They are the only ones who are ugly. Oh, I think being called homophobic, hateful, murderess, vitriolic, is very ugly. Yikes. There is an assault on Judaeo-Christian values and you are not allowed to retort, if you do you are a bad person. Huh? I don't get it.

Broadcast of June 22, 1999 on CJCH

The host expresses concern over a bill which would require more info re birth control in sex education.

Laura Schlessinger: We've seen the devastation. "Gee, I'm shacking up and I'm having sex and life is wonderful. I'm pregnant and he's gone 'Bye'". Talk about... You know, there was a time where women actually got paid for servicing men. Now they volunteer. And then they tell me they are going to have a beautiful child and be a great mother, to a kid condemned to no two-parent home, with a dad. In spite of some stupid trash that comes out of the psychological community that says dad is not necessary, which I think is a plot for two women to have kids and to justify it. If two lesbians can adopt or make children, after the psychological community says fathers are not relevant, then there is a lot of power. Right? Believe me, all the points connect to one place. You can see how this is going. How can anybody in their right mind, with over forty years of concrete evidence on the devastation wrought to children, both male and female, with no dad, not see the psychological community publishing trash that minimizes or discounts the importance of fathers? What's that for, if it isn't to promote single motherhood and lesbian adoptions and child rearing? What's it for, if it isn't to do all that? Then I'm amused when women call all upset that the men walk out of their lives after they spend all this time saying men aren't necessary for anything. Well then, handle this yourself. This is all growing ugly, devastating and dangerous. And it's all connected.

Broadcast of June 30, 1999 on CJCH

The host takes a call from a woman who's cousin is a lesbian and wants to adopt a child. The woman and her husband turned the lesbian couple down for a recommendation because they were going to put the kid in daycare. Dr. Laura responds as follows:

Laura Schlessinger: That was your basis?

Christine: That is what we told them at the time because I did not have all of my vertebrae for my moral backbone in place yet. So, our relationship has deteriorated since then. They have not been keeping in touch with us. We saw them at Christmas, but anyway. We got an invitation for the baby's shower yesterday. I'm invited to the baby's shower. Because I haven't told them all of my thoughts about their adoption...

Laura Schlessinger: So two lesbians managed to get a newborn...

Christine: They don't have the baby yet from what I know but the baby must be coming since I got the invitation.

Laura Schlessinger: So two lesbians who are going to put the kid in daycare who are obligating a child to no father on purpose when we know that the optimum situation for what is hopefully likely going to be a heterosexual child to deal in a heterosexual world and relationships really needs the balance between the feminine and the masculine for the correct balanced development be it a male or a female child, that the state and private agencies are now continuously giving newborn children to two lesbians who are ensuring there will be no dad, who additionally are not even going to be there to take care of the kid. That to me is a travesty on children. It is catering to agendas and ideologies and the feelings of adults and is going to destroy a whole population of children who will not be able to relate well because they don't have the male and female developmental input.

Christine: I agree with you so much and you've helped me get to that realization so the fact that they are not going to have a father, I have not made that point to them.

Laura Schlessinger: That is the basic, central point. Whether it be two lesbians, a single heterosexual woman, to intentionally make or get a child and raise them in a situation, to obligate them destructively to a family situation with no husband and wife, no father is a travesty and it ought to be illegal and that is what I wish you would have the backbone to tell them before they follow through.

Christine: That is what I wanted to know.

Laura Schlessinger: Do they not have fathers? Do they not think their fathers had input? Are they going to adopt a male child and tell him his place is what?

Christine: I know.

Laura Schlessinger: Christine, what is your question?

Christine: My question is, if I do make another statement to them, and you have answered that for me, that I should come forward and say it is not just that they are putting the kid in daycare, but I object to everything that they are going to be...

Laura Schlessinger: You have a moral obligation to save this potential child so it will be directed towards a heterosexual family where it is the most ideal situation for the psychological development of a human being. This is, as I said, a travesty, a moral travesty filling in for the power of the particular ideology that doesn't give a damn about the kids, only about what we adults want. That's typical. That's not, that's not a gay agenda thing, that's more an adult agenda thing but particularly speaking there is a powerful, gay, ideological activist power group that makes it an issue of discrimination against them when in reality, it is a destructive reality for children. And I think that is the point you need to make because your job, if you accept it, is to try to save that child from being divorced of a dad on purpose. It's one thing when there are tragedies and it is another thing, to say it doesn't matter? And some of the psychological literature that is published under the venue of the American Psychological Association even this month does go into that farcical notion that fathers don't matter and that is part of the feminist and liberal feminist and the lesbian agenda is to make sure fathers are minimized as having import so that they can go forth and just do what they want. Remember what Gloria Steinem said: "A woman without a man is like a fish without a bicycle. So what." Do you really think that is healthy for children? So why did Gloria Steinem spend all those years shacking up with some guy hoping he would marry her?

Broadcast of July 1, 1999 on CJCH

The host takes a call from a woman whose mother has passed on after living a lesbian lifestyle. Her question is, should she allow the lesbian partner to remain as grandmother to her children?

Laura Schlessinger: Why do you want to cut her out of your daughter's life now that she's bonded and been the surrogate grandmother... Why do you want to cut her out now?

Danielle: I feel that there is...

Laura Schlessinger: I didn't ask about your feelings. I asked you what concrete thing drives you to want to terminate her from your daughter's life?

Danielle: There's too much tension between her and I and I don't want...

Laura Schlessinger: But what can you do to stop that?

Danielle: I don't know...

Laura Schlessinger: Your daughter is bonded so you owe it to your daughter. So what can you do to stop the tension? We can all do things to stop tension, even with people we hate.

Danielle: So you feel that...

Laura Schlessinger: Don't ask me about my feelings.

Danielle: Do you think it would be harmful to discontinue this relationship? I have three children but she seems to be the most bonded with my oldest.

Laura Schlessinger: And how does it hurt the child to be bonded to her? The reason she's not bonded with the others is because you are standing in the way. Don't argue with me because I know I'm right here so don't even bother, don't even waste our time.

Danielle: They are still kind of young. They are younger.

Laura Schlessinger: That is correct, so don't even bring it up it is not even relevant. What can you do to decrease the tension so that your daughter can continue to have this nice woman who is putting herself out when she's not even biologically related, putting herself out to be a grandmother surrogate. What's your problem and how can we fix it?

Danielle: Well, also some things that happened while they spent some time together. This person doesn't have many parenting skills and my child comes back overstimulated and...

Laura Schlessinger: Danielle, do you just not like that she's gay?

Danielle: No, not at all. That has nothing to do with it.

Laura Schlessinger: Then what is your problem? You are just picking at straws, baby. You're not saying anything that holds substance.

Danielle: The problem I'm having is, I don't know, there are some things, unresolved business.

Laura Schlessinger: Danielle, o.k. I'll tell you what one of the parenting skills is. Here is one of the prime parenting skills: you don't make your own petty little problems get in the way of your daughter's relationships that mean something to her. How's that? How's that? That is a parenting skill.

Broadcast of August 13, 1999 on CFYI

Laura Schlessinger: This was faxed to me there's no return numbers or what have you but usually the kind of cowardice I don't respond to, but this is too good or what have you. It is from Hillary and I want to read a little bit of the writing. "As you have increasingly

become the mouthpiece for the religious right on the topic of homosexuality. I notice you are always careful to say homosexual instead of gay." That was part of the gay agenda like everything. One of the first things you do is rename behaviours or what have you. Once you rename it, like in Viet Nam, I remember quite clearly. Instead of calling them North Vietnamese or South Vietnamese, Communist or whatever, they started calling the Vietnamese Gooks agents. One of the reasons you call them Gooks is because it's easy to kill a Gook, harder to kill a person, so in changing the name of the thing, it changes how we perceive it and how we can behave toward it. When we have the word homosexual, we are clarifying the dysfunction, the deviancy, the reality. We change it to the word gay, it makes it more difficult to pinpoint the truth. So one of the things that the homosexual agenda did was to change the name. Just like somebody complained to me yesterday about ethnic cleansing, that it sounds like a washing machine as opposed to murder. They were right. Ethnic cleansing sounds nice. Murder is the truth, homosexuality is the truth. Gay isn't. "You concluded this segment about it's never been about normalizing all forms of sexual behaviour." Excuse me. That is such a bizarre off-the-wall opinion, this must have come out of the grist propaganda of the religious right. "As of late, for whatever reason, I have become one of the RR's biggest fund raisers. 'Send us money to stop the deviant.'" I don't know what she's talking about. "Before you keep riding on this bandwagon, let me inform you of a few things. You are intelligent so I hope you research before starting off with second hand rhetoric." Honey Babe I'm real informed. "I'm going to help inform you now. Get informed about the issues. Know that I could be legally fired from my job in 42 states for being lesbian and I'm fighting." That's fine, that's civil rights. And I back that. "And so do the people, so do the psychiatrists in the early 70s who were fighting against the intimidation and political activism of the pro homosexual movement to take homosexuality out of the diagnostic manual. They were totally in support of civil rights of making sure nobody was harmed or mistreated in society. And that stands today." She says "No. 1, there is no organized gay agenda." I mean, I don't know what to say. The organized gay agenda writes me all the time. They have web sites everywhere. They're mobilized, they're unified. They're strong, they're well funded. Let me go on No. 1. The agenda:" Normalizing homosexuality is moral, psychologically healthy and equivalent to heterosexuality." That was done by a vote, not by science, but by a vote of the minority of the American Psychiatric Association back in the 70s. And if you want more clarification on that is the truth, because I am not ignorant, go out and get *Homosexuality and Politics of Truth* by a psychiatrist Jeffrey Satinover. It was published by Baker books in 1996. One of those compassionate erudite books on the entire subject of homosexuality. Whether you're homosexual, straight, undecided, this is the book to read. *Homosexuality and Politics of Truth* by Jerry Satinover. This is the book to read. So that was No. 1. No. 2 was to overturn the structure of heterosexual families to accommodate acceptance of two men or two women for marriage and parenting, intentionally robbing a child of the opposite sex parent in spite of the need for that and if you don't think that's an issue, read the *American Psychologist* which came out last month from the American Psychology Association, it's been written coast to coast for weeks now, Deconstructing the Essential Family, which actually says mothers and fathers are not necessary, heterosexual marriage is not necessary and they admit to their ideology of supporting homosexual lesbian marriages and parenting. Please. Propagandizing in our schools. There's no agenda? It's elementary! Incredible videotape by two lesbians which is supposed to be about teaching kids not to breach anybody's civil rights. That was a lie. It is so blatant, it's obvious. And it went around many PBS stations. It was a propagandizing piece to have children approve of homosexuality as young as in kindergarten, and any expressions opposing opinion was discounted and humiliated. Should I go on? Probably the most important and the most evil towards homosexuals themselves is the elimination of the ability of homosexuals who wish to change to find a

therapist who will do it without being condemned as being unethical. And gays do change. Lesbians do change. Homosexuals do change. If they so desire, a reasonable percentage of them, because you have to consider the percentage of change for any quote "disorder" is not that great, but the homosexual agenda has eliminated that. How about gay marriages? How about adoption by gays of children? Instead of giving them priority or equal status with a mother and a father? What is that if that isn't an agenda? Please, this is not about civil rights 'cause I would be the first one in the front of that line and I'm here to tell you that right now. I'd be the first one in the front of *that* line. But this is about taking a deviant behaviour, a dysfunctional behaviour, normalizing, sexualizing our kids. It goes on and says "Paedophilia and child molestation have zero to do with being gay, homosexual orientation" and that's not true. That is not true. How many letters have I read on the air from gay men who acknowledge that a huge portion of the male homosexual populis is predatory on young boys. There is nothing new here. I read you those letters from gay men. There are places that some... This is not all. Don't say I said all. But they themselves said they say this in so many places around the world where you can go on vacation and do kids. And I would like to see most of the gay activists stand up and tell me that they don't think it is reasonable for a gay young man to act out sexually with an adult male. I hope that sounded reasonably organized. The letter goes on but it is so much of a blank slate in dealing with reality that I can't even believe it. I have always been in a position of compassion with people who have to deal with not being able to be heterosexual and get married and have families and have that heritage and lifestyle. I have always been compassionate about that. Where I turned is when the compassion and the basic civil rights turns into the destruction of the family, the manipulation of children to accept deviancy as diversity. That's where I turned. That's where the worm turned. And don't tell me it's not there. And don't tell me I'm full of hate. And don't tell me I want anybody killed. You can't play those arguments with me. I'm too honest, truthful and on the table. I don't want anybody hurt. I don't want anybody killed. I would like homosexuals to have the ability to get reparative therapy so they could live quote "normal lives" and have the benefits of a heterosexual relationship. That they can be great veterinarians, great plant growers, great anything is a fact. I'm talking about the sexuality. I'm not talking about the ultimate intelligence and capability of a homosexual to function as a decent citizen in society and I never attack that. And anybody who says I have is lying. I have stood behind all of that. But a lot of that is obfuscated because I have to deal with these agenda points which are totally destructive to both homosexuals and society as we know it. Aside from the basic immorality. Which would have been number 6. I'm Dr. Laura Schlessinger.

Broadcast of August 19, 1999 on CFYI

Laura Schlessinger: I tell you of the latest issue of NARTH, the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality. It has a lot of information here about the people who have led a homosexual lifestyle who have shifted out of that and it might be of interest to some of you homosexuals or some of you families or whoever. So I think that's really important. For information about this particular publication right now, you can call NARTH at 818-789-4440 and ask for their latest issue, August 1999. I think it has a lot of very important information on quote, ex-Gay. If you are interested, that's where you go.

Dr. Laura takes a call from a woman whose sister is a lesbian.

Laura Schlessinger: Julie, welcome to the program.

Julie: Hi, Dr. Laura. Thanks for taking my call.

Laura Schlessinger: My pleasure.

Julie: I just wanted to let you know, first, I am my kid's mom.

Laura Schlessinger: Good.

Julie: I have a terrible turmoil.

Laura Schlessinger: Oh no.

Julie: My husband and I since two years ago have become Christians and have strong Christian beliefs. My sister is living in a gay lifestyle. Her live-in girlfriend is pregnant. This is a choice they have made. They are already mad at me because I will not congratulate them on that choice.

Laura Schlessinger: What, of robbing a child of a father? You should congratulate them for that?

Julie: Of what?

Laura Schlessinger: Of robbing a child of a father?

Julie: Right.

Laura Schlessinger: Doesn't seem like a reason to congratulate anybody.

Julie: No. I mean, they're completely selfish and I know that there is eventually going to, I mean, there's eventually going to be a baby and there's also going to be parties, like showers and stuff and I'm not sure what to do about all these upcoming events because ...

Laura Schlessinger: Send a little gift for the baby; all babies need things but the baby is the innocent victim in all of that.

Julie: That's right.

Laura Schlessinger: So you send the baby a thing, whatever, you know, baby stuff.

Julie: And stay home.

Laura Schlessinger: I can't celebrate people robbing, two men robbing a child of a mommy or two women robbing a child of a daddy.

Julie: I can't either.

Laura Schlessinger: It's as though it were irrelevant. As though it were a fact that a penis and a vagina, male and female, were somehow irrelevant and makes no difference to children. It's bizarre thinking. It's self-centred thinking on rights and not thinking what's in the best interest of children. It horrifies me, so I can't tell you what to do. I really rail against "You tell me if I should do this." I can't do that for your life. I could say that, you know, you don't have ill will toward an innocent child but you don't have to participate in things you find unholy, immoral, whatever.

Julie: Right, but she has trouble understanding that.

Laura Schlessinger: She will not because she will have to undo all she is doing.

Julie: And they can't do that.

Laura Schlessinger: No. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Whoa. Yes, they can, and many people have.

Julie: I know. I pray every day they will come to their senses and give this baby up for adoption.

Laura Schlessinger: Well that's likely not going to happen.

Julie: I know. But I can still pray for it.

Laura Schlessinger: You can pray for anything you'd like. The answer is that you be compassionate and understanding towards the child but that you do not have to be celebratory over things you find immoral, unholy or whatever.

Julie: OK.

[...]

Laura Schlessinger: There's a poll out, my information sheet is not exactly clear on the question, but the issue is the Boy Scouts and homosexuality. I don't know if the issue is gay Scoutmasters or, I mean, homosexual Scoutmasters or homosexual Scouts or both

but *Time Magazine* is conducting a poll today around the issues of the right of Boy Scouts to exclude homosexuals, as I said, I don't know if Scouts or Scoutmasters are involved, you'll have to check it yourself. That's not clear on my sheet. Please go to their site, cast your vote, whatever your opinion is — I'm not soliciting you to agree with my opinion, I haven't even told you my opinion — but please go to their site and cast your vote. This might be one of the few polls worth participating in. So visit *Time Magazine* at www.pathfinder.com and go to the "polls" section. Go to the "polls" section; it really is important for you folks to start getting involved, regardless of what side of an issue you're on. I know there are a lot of talk show hosts who specifically call for you to speak up for certain things. I do that, too, but, in general, I'm just asking you to get involved. Period. Whether you agree with the position I may or may not present on the air or not and it is very important. Lesbian and Gay New York Magazine or Newspaper, I don't know what it is, this was just faxed to me. "The head of GLAAD believes that Schlessinger poses the greatest threat to lesbians' and gay men rights than the usual suspects such as Rush Limbaugh who, Garry argues, only reaches the 25% who will never get there on gay rights anyway. In Garry's view, Schlessinger taps into the swing middle, the roughly 40% of the population who tell pollsters they are uncertain and confused about lesbian and gay issues." Well, good, then you are getting some kind of education, so you can make an informed decision but meanwhile this is an important vote, because, you know, these things get stacked. Trust me, these get manipulated; I'm not accusing *Time* of anything. I'm just accusing polls in general and a lot of people are just not informed and you don't even know who the population is. [unintelligible] ... get involved in the first place so whatever side, if you're that 40% undecided, start thinking about all that you've been hearing on this show, on the news, that you've seen in your schools or that's being promoted in kindergarten, much less high school, and decide whether or not you think this is a healthy or good influence. Or if reality and truth and values have been almost bashed to death by this notion of diversity and rights over any kind of morality and obligation. You really have to get involved because it matters. It's not an issue of somebody in the next block. All right. It matters, so get involved.

Broadcast of August 24, 1999 on CFYI

Laura Schlessinger: This out of *Science Magazine*. It's a few months back. It was April 22nd. Sometimes I'm a little late in bringing things to your attention. I'm sorry. In *Science Magazine* on April 22nd, they published a study "Male Homosexuality: Absence of Linkage to Micro-Satellite Markers to XQ28". Basically what that means is gay genetics. There was a study, in 1993, famous Hamer (sp.) famous gay gene study on male homosexuality's biological origin. The argument being if it's biology then you can't argue with a person and that's like skin colour. But the reality is that this article failed to replicate that study. And I've got to tell you, in science, one of the number... *the* number one rule is data that cannot be replicated isn't to be believed. I mean, if something is scientific fact, then it can be replicated. "National gay advocacy groups which have long quietly heralded the original Hamer (sp.) study as the long sought proof that gays are born not made, had little or no comment about the significance of the way this latest research was", certainly you haven't seen it *well*, "publicized." I guess it is not politically correct information, I don't know.

[...]

Laura Schlessinger: I just want to make you aware. I haven't read the whole thing. Somebody faxed me; they downloaded the GLAAD web site. That is the Anti-defamation

organization for quote "gays and lesbians" and there is a letter from their, I think she is the head of it, Joan Garry, I've got it exactly, Executive Director, and just want to let you know of something that is totally incorrect because it's very offensive. She says that I said, she says (it is summed up in her quote to me), "that we are biological, developmental errors, biological mistakes." I have never called homosexuals biological mistakes. I have said the sexual orientation is clearly an error. With penises and vaginas we were meant for heterosexual sexual acting out in order to procreate the species. I mean that is just irrefutable. But she is outright lying by distortion. There are different ways to lie. This one is by distortion and misrepresentation. I have never called homosexuals errors. I have called the sexuality an error. And this is not a small quibbling point because a lot of people who don't listen to my program will read this and assume that I said something that offensive. Bigoted, which is a phrase thrown at me, I mean a word thrown at me. So I want you to know that Joan Garry completely misrepresented my presentation. I have never called a people an error. I have called the sexuality, orientation, an error. And I think that is irrefutable and obvious. It's dysfunctional, it's deviant. According to religion it is not moral. But biologically it is clearly an error. What causes the error, I can't argue about. A lot of professionals in the field believe it is psycho-social. Whatever the issues are, I have never called homosexuals errors. That's a misrepresentation. And there you are. Just wanted to correct that for people who read these things because the problem when you go on activists sites or propangandize [sic] sites, is that they do what they can to stimulate emotion to mobilize people. Probably every side in the universe does that. The problem with that is that it mobilizes people hatefully. I mean, that engenders hate towards me, that I would say such a thing. It engenders an emotional reaction towards me of hate from a group that is always worrying about hate. But as I told you, activist groups only see censorship, hate mongering as people disagreeing with their position. You're not allowed to dissent without being called bigoted, hateful, hate mongering, homicidal and the rest of that. So you know that when you read articles about me and it's a homosexual issue and all those words are there, it means they are too weak to argue the points so they are just going to do personal attacks. A homosexual male sent me a, I think that homosexual male sent me a copy of, and he was offended instead of arguing points, they were simply personal attacks. I was very grateful. Philosophical points divide us, then you just have enemies.