
**CANADIAN BROADCAST STANDARDS COUNCIL
ONTARIO REGIONAL COUNCIL**

CFTO-TV re News Promo ("Deadbeat Dads")

(CBSC Decision 97/98-0549)

Decided July 28, 1998

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

THE FACTS

On December 3, 1997, CFTO-TV (Toronto) aired a news report on the use of the Internet to track down delinquent child support payers. The "promo" for the item was framed as follows: "A new tool to target deadbeat dads - the Internet". The actual report, however, dealt with, and used the term, deadbeat *parents*.

The Letter of Complaint

On November 5, 1997, a viewer wrote directly to CFTO News. In his letter, the complainant stated:

On Wednesday evening (November 3, 1997) at around 11:20 pm, while watching the news on CFTO, there was a brief "preview spot" featuring Ken Shaw highlighting a story which was to follow on Night Beat News. The story was about an Internet website which listed delinquent child support payers. Ken Shaw, however, did not call them delinquent child support payers. Neither did he call them deadbeat parents. He called them "deadbeat dads".

I believe that such a hateful, gender-specific term to be irresponsible, inaccurate and unfair editorializing.

I checked out the website which was featured in this story, and the very first delinquent parent (of the four listed) was, in fact, a female. The website, in fact, referred to delinquent support payers as "deadbeat parents".

The power which television, and particularly television news, has to shape societal values is immense. When Ken Shaw uttered that insidious phrase, my teenage son immediately looked in my direction. As a father who has paid over \$70,000 in child support over the last 6

years, in addition to raising my children more than half the time, I am outraged that you can vilify a whole class of people on the basis of marital status and sex.

I request that you provide me with:

1. Copies of any departmental, station, network or industry standards or guidelines which address the issue of gender stereotyping.
2. Assurance that you have taken positive steps which will ensure that the hateful sobriquet "deadbeat dads" will be henceforth used editorially by your staff with the same frequency as the term "nigger".

On January 6, 1998, the complainant wrote a subsequent letter to CFTO-TV stating the following:

I faxed you last month regarding a comment made by Ken Shaw made on the Nightbeat News newscast.

I have still not received any reply regarding my complaint, not even any acknowledgement of it.

When I reviewed my original complaint and found [*sic*] that I had mistakenly dated it November 5, rather than December 5. If this is the cause of the delay in responding, I apologize for the confusion.

The Broadcaster's Response

On January 9, 1998, the Vice President of News and Public Affairs for CFTO-TV responded to the complainant with the following:

Thank you for your letters of December 6, 1997 and January 6, 1998 to our News Director, Derwyn Smith. I regret the delay in answering the first letter sooner. We were occupied by the press of other business.

The expression deadbeat dad was used by Ken Shaw on Wednesday, December 3, 1997, in a CFTO News promotional tape which occurs within the CTV News.

In the actual story, which ran on CFTO local news at 11.30, the term deadbeat parents were [*sic*] used. This expression is accurate, given the presence of some, although not many relatively speaking, of women among those parents who have not paid proper support of their children.

The term deadbeat dad is not, in my view, comparable in any way with the kind of racial epithets mentioned in your letter. Accurately applied, it defines men who have not paid support where they should have paid it.

It is a term which, in my opinion, casts no reflection on any man who has paid support, as you evidently have done.

Further Complainant-Broadcaster Correspondence

Following the broadcaster's response, the complainant wrote a subsequent letter to the Vice President of News and Public Affairs. In his letter dated January 27, 1998, the complainant stated the following:

Thank you for your response dated January 9, 1998 to my concerns regarding the promotional spot where Ken Shaw alluded to defaulting support payers as "deadbeat dads".

To clarify, my concern was not with the story aired on Nightbeat News which (correctly, in my view) alluded to defaulting support payers as "deadbeat parents". My concern was with the promotional spot aired during CTV news at approximately 11:20 PM wherein Ken Shaw referred to defaulting support payers as "deadbeat dads".

Your comment that "not many relatively speaking" support defaulters are women cannot possibly justify the propagation and dissemination of such a negative, gender-specific stereotype. I am unsure of your source of the "not many" pseudo-statistic, could you please quantify:

1. Precisely how many, support defaulters there are of each sex relative to support obligors; and
2. At what threshold does it become improper to utilize such inaccurate, gender-specific generalizations and stereotypes?

Your letter acknowledges that "accurately applied, it defines men who have not paid support where they should have paid it". I agree that it might be used in specific instances to describe specific support defaulters, but in the story broadcast, there were defaulters of *both* sexes. In our society, there are defaulters of *both* sexes. To describe either of these groups using a gender-specific term such as "deadbeat dads" in [*sic*] inaccurate, unfair and smacks of tabloid sensationalism.

In reading the CBSC material which you kindly provided, I notice that "broadcasters must keep tapes of all radio and television programs for a short time after they air." I am unsure what constitutes "a short time", but I hereby request that you ensure that the tapes of the broadcasts in question not be destroyed until this matter is resolved.

I also remark that "it is important that you [the viewer] let us [CBSC] know if you have a complaint about a specific program within 3 weeks of the date it aired.

I have concerns that, if I proceed with a CBSC complaint, my concerns will be dismissed on the basis of delay. I also have concerns that:

1. your response is dated January 9, 1998, a full 5 weeks after my complaint was faxed to you;
2. your response was in an envelope post-marked (actually meter marked) January 14, 1998, a full 5 days after the date of the letter inside;
3. your response did not arrive in Stoney Creek until January 23, 1998, a full two weeks after it was dated and coincidentally 4 days after I re-faxed my first two letters.

I'm certain you can understand how it must look from my point of view as if CFTO News is stalling and delaying.

My thanks for your prompt attention to these concerns.

On January 28, 1998, the Vice President of News and Public Affairs responded to the complainant's letter dated January 27, 1998, with the following:

To reply to your further letter with respect to the use of the term deadbeat dads, it's self evident to me that many more men are in default of support payments than women.

It's a truth that's clear to me based on my life experience. If statistics prove me wrong, I will stand corrected. As I tried to say in my previous reply, the use of the term deadbeat dads in the context of both men and women represents an error of omission with respect to women.

That's no doubt why the editors of the program in question changed the term to deadbeat parents. But the term deadbeat dads applies accurately by definition to men who improperly do not pay support payments. And this point arises because I would not, to ensure that our right of freedom of expression in the news is not carelessly or improperly abridged, ever give a guarantee that the term would never be used again. With respect to the CBSC and what it might entertain, I recommend that you contact the Council and inquire, or make a complaint if you wish. If the Council accepts the matter, and finds that CFTO News has violated one of its codes, it will perforce have written regulation with respect to broadcasters which voluntarily accept its jurisdiction. I do however hope, with respect to your concerns about the timing of our reply, that you will accept my assurance that we have answered and responded to your concerns in absolute good faith.

Complainant's Letter to the CBSC

On January 27, 1998, the complainant faxed all the correspondence between himself and CFTO-TV to the CBSC offices. Following the CBSC's response, the complainant requested, on February 8, that the CBSC refer the matter to the appropriate Regional Council for adjudication. With his request, the complainant added the following:

Enclosed please find my completed Ruling Request with regard to this file.

I hope it is clear that my complaint is with regard to the promotional tape aired during the CTV News at approximately 11:20 PM wherein Ken Shaw referred to support defaulters as "deadbeat dads". I have no complaint with regard to the news story itself, only with the promotional tape.

I do not believe further correspondence with [the broadcaster] will bring us any closer to resolution. I am having a great deal of difficulty with what appears to me to be a great deal of equivocation and circumlocution on his part.

My position is that the use of "deadbeat dads" to describe a group or a sub-group which contains both dads and moms is inaccurate, unfair and discriminatory reporting.

My position is that to describe such a group in gender-neutral terms does not abridge anyone's freedom of expression as [the broadcaster] seems to imply in his January 28, 1998 letter.

[The broadcaster] and I seem to be in agreement that the term "deadbeat dads":

Accurately implied, it defines men who have not paid support where they should have paid it. ([Broadcaster], January 9, 1998)

might be used in specific instances to describe specific support defaulters ([Complainant], January 27, 1998)

applies accurately by definition to men who improperly do not pay support payments. ([Broadcaster], January 28, 1998)

although he seems loathe to admit the term was incorrectly used in the promotional tape.

[The broadcaster] and I also seem to be in agreement regarding the term "deadbeat parents":

[...] is accurate, given the presence of some, although not many relatively speaking, of [sic] women ([Broadcaster], January 9, 1998)

the story aired on Nightbeat News which (correctly, in my view) alluded to defaulting support payers as "deadbeat parents" ([Complainant], January 27, 1998)

That's no doubt why the editors of the program in question changed the term to deadbeat parents ([Broadcaster], January 28, 1998)

Given that we are in such accord regarding the usage of the respective terms, it is difficult to comprehend why there is so much difficulty on [the broadcaster] part in acknowledging the impropriety of describing a mixed-gender group (which by definition has a single, unmistakably negative attribute) in terms of one gender. Although he comes close to acknowledging the impropriety of the term in his January 28, 1998 letter:

[...] the use of the term deadbeat dads in the context of both men and women represents an error of omission with respect to women.

He declines to undertake any remedial steps, fearing that his "right of expression in the news" might be "carelessly or improperly abridged". I do not see that the use of the term "parents" to describe a group containing mothers and fathers to be an abridgment of any right of expression.

I believe, on the contrary, that such careless misuse of "dads" to be in contravention of Clause 2 of the CAB Code of Ethics:

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, marital status or physical or mental handicap.

I also believe it to be in contravention of Clause 6:

[...] ensure that news shall be represented *with accuracy and without bias*.

I further believe it to contravene Clause 15:

Recognizing that *stereotyping images can and do cause negative influences*, it shall be the responsibility of broadcasters to exhibit, to the best of their ability, a conscious sensitivity to the problems related to sex-role stereotyping, by refraining from exploitation and by *the reflection of the intellectual and emotional equality of both sexes* in programming.

I further believe it to contravene Article 4 of the Sex Role Portrayal Code (Exploitation):

Negative or degrading comments on the role and nature of women, men or children in society *shall be avoided*.

I further believe it to contravene Article 5 of the Sex Role Portrayal Code (Non-sexist Language):

Broadcasters shall employ language of a non-sexist nature in their programming, by *avoiding*, whenever possible, *expressions which relate to only one gender*.

It is evident in the replies of [the broadcaster], that his gender bias is referentially transparent and that, in the argot of feminism, "he just doesn't get it". Having read some of his justifications

[...] it's self evident to me [...]

It's a truth that's evident to me based on my life experience.

it becomes clear that he is unwilling to consider the reality that such broad-brush generalizations are inaccurate, unfair and demeaning. Under the "Guidance" section of Article 5 of the Sex role Portrayal Code (Non-sexist Language) it explains:

Such language may perpetuate attitudes or representations of persons which tend to attribute particular roles and characteristics on the basis of their gender, without taking them into consideration as individuals.

I would add that not only does such language perpetuate such attitudes, it can also serve to generate and propagate such attitudes.

I would also register my complaint with regard to the time taken to address my concern. My original complaint (December 5, 1997, although it was mis-dated as November 5), a second missive on January 6, 1998, and a further retransmission of both letters on January 19, 1998 all preceded the receipt of [the broadcaster] first response. That response was dated January 9, 1998, but was not received until January 23, 1998. The date on the postage meter mark on that envelope was January 14, 1998. The second response was eminently timely.

I am also resentful of his (mis)attributing to me "racial epithets". There was a single epithet which I feel (and which [the broadcaster] evidently does not feel) to be equally hateful and degrading as the term used by Ken Shaw and which I used to try to convey in terms that CFTO might appreciate, the extent of my indignation.

The Broadcaster's Final Letter of Response

When the CBSC requested the logger tapes from CFTO-TV, it also forwarded a copy of the complainant's February 8, 1998 letter. The Vice President of News and Public Affairs responded to this letter on February 23, 1998. With his response, he attached an article from the Saturday Star entitled "Firms to hunt deadbeat dads". His letter was as follows:

The Canadian Broadcast Standards Council has been good enough to send me a copy of your letter dated February 8, 1998.

I would like to say that the issue for us is not whether some women, or many women, have defaulted on or refused to pay support payments. It is whether the expression Deadbeat Dads has any place in news coverage at all, or whether it ought to be banned from the air in Canada.

I have taken it from your letter to [the CFTO News representative] that you believe that it should be banned. You called it a "hateful sobriquet" and you compared it to the term "nigger."

In your later letters you take the position that my acknowledgment that this usage was an error of omission is not satisfactory to you. I can assure you that I regret this error of omission as I regret all errors occurring in the *news*.

But I cannot agree with your statement that this is a hateful sobriquet and I will not guarantee, as you have clearly asked, that it be banned forever. It appears to me to be a widely-used journalistic expression, broadly accepted in the community.

I do not find it discriminatory (except on moral grounds) nor does it stereotype men as a whole, nor does it comment negatively on the role of all men, nor is it sexist anymore than an expression such as "cad" or "womanizer" which describes generally unacceptable conduct as committed by a man, or men.

I recognized that this is a very sensitive matter for you. But I would ask you to reflect on the importance of our ability to speak freely without being censored by state-of-mind objections, in matters where no individual or group is being criticized unfairly.

THE DECISION

The CBSC's Ontario Regional Council considered the complaint under Clauses 2 and 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* as well as Clauses 2 (in part) and 5 of the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code*. The texts of these clauses read as follows:

CAB Code of Ethics, Clause 2 (Human Rights)

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, marital status or physical or mental handicap.

CAB Code of Ethics, Clause 6 (News)

It shall be the responsibility of member stations to ensure that news shall be represented with accuracy and without bias. The member station shall satisfy itself that the arrangements made for obtaining news ensure this result. It shall also ensure that news broadcasts are not editorial. News shall not be selected for the purpose of furthering or hindering either side of any controversial public issue, nor shall it be designed by the beliefs or opinions or desires of the station management, the editor or others engaged in its preparation or delivery. The fundamental purpose of news dissemination in a democracy is to enable people to know what is happening, and to understand events so that they may form their own conclusions.

Therefore, nothing in the foregoing shall be understood as preventing news broadcasters from analyzing and elucidating news so long as such analysis or comment is clearly labelled as such and kept distinct from regular news presentations. Member stations will, insofar as practical, endeavour to provide editorial opinion which shall be clearly labelled as such and kept entirely distinct from regular broadcasts of news or analysis and opinion.

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.

CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code, Clause 2 (Diversity)

[b] Television and radio programming shall portray all persons as supporting participants in family, home management and household tasks. Women and men should participate on an equitable basis in organizing such family activities as health care and financial matters, encompassing a wide range of responsibilities and decision-making roles.

Guidance: The interpretation of this provision depends to a large extent on individual experience and beliefs, and is therefore open to discussion. For example, in one family, the sharing in all chores and responsibilities related to family and home may be on a 50:50 basis, while in another, it may mean that one partner contributes as the wage-earner while the other offers an equitable contribution as home manager, performer of domestic tasks and/or caregiver to spouse and children.

[c] Television and radio programming shall respect the principles of intellectual and emotional equality of both sexes and the dignity of all individuals. Television and radio programming should portray women and men as equal beneficiaries of the positive attributes of family or single-person life. Women and men should perform in a range of occupations and function as intellectual and emotional equals in all types of thematic circumstances. This should be the case for both work and leisure activities requiring varying degrees of intellectual competence.

Guidance: Women and men should be portrayed as working toward a comfortable existence through mutual support, both economically and emotionally, and in both public and private spheres. Despite the problems of societal systemic discrimination, television and radio programming should reflect an awareness of the need to avoid and overcome discrimination on the basis of gender.

CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code, Clause 5 (Non-Sexist Language)

Equality of the sexes must be recognized and reinforced through the proper use of language and terminology. Broadcasters shall employ language of a non-sexist nature in their programming, by avoiding, whenever possible, expressions which relate to only one gender.

Guidance: Sexist language is language that unnecessarily excludes one sex or gives unequal treatment to women and men. Such language may perpetuate attitudes or representations of persons which tend to attribute particular roles and characteristics on the basis of their gender, without taking them into consideration as individuals. Examples of non-sexist language are the use of occupational titles such as “fire fighter” instead of “fireman” and avoiding the exclusive use of masculine words in making general references, e.g. “synthetic” instead of “man-made”. Broadcasters should refer to the *CAB Guidelines for Non-Sexist Language* for further assistance.

The Regional Council members viewed a tape of the program in question and reviewed all of the correspondence. The Council considers that the program in question does not violate either of the Codes mentioned above.

General Acceptance of the Phrase

The complainant states that “deadbeat dads” is a term which is as offensive as the racial epithet which he has proffered as an example in his letter. The Council respectfully disagrees. Unlike the one-word epithet which he has suggested and numerous other equally ugly and unpalatable appellations (which he did not), the Council believes that this phrase is self-circumscribing and does not cast aspersions on fathers in general or child-support paying fathers in particular. The term clearly emphasizes the *deadbeat* characteristic of those who flout judicial orders. It applies, it is true, only to *dads* of that bent, but its emphasis is undeniably on those dads who disrespect their responsibilities. That a responsible father may feel somewhat uncomfortable when hearing the phrase is as understandable as is the analogous sentiment which a man who, having never assaulted a woman, may feel when hearing of violent crimes committed by men against women. The utterly innocent man, however, has no personal association with either group of events and ought, intellectually, to be able to easily separate himself from those whose behaviour is questionable. Accordingly, while the Council recognizes that the term is clearly *discriminating*, and there is an issue to consider for this reason alone, it does not consider that the term is necessarily *discriminatory*.

The fact that the term makes a distinction on the basis of sex, does not mean that it should be banned outright. Moreover, discriminatory comment, even when coined as a “catchy” phrase, may at times be acceptable. As stated in *CFUN-AM re the John and JJ Show (Immigration Policy)* (CBSC Decision 97/98-0422, May 20, 1998):

It could not be every instance of discriminatory comment which would be found to be in breach of the “human rights” provision of the *CAB Code of Ethics* for, in a technical sense, every statement regarding an identifiable group is *discriminatory*. As this Council put the point in *CFTO-TV re “Tom Clark’s Canada”* (CBSC Decision 97/98-0009, February 26, 1998):

Early on, the Council recognized that Clause 2 of the CAB *Code of Ethics* requires a weighing of competing values. In *CHTZ-FM re the Morning Show* (CBSC Decision 92/93-0148, October 26, 1993) the Council noted that “it must balance the right of audiences to receive programming which is free of abusive or discriminatory material ... with the fundamental right of free speech in Canadian society.” The application of this balancing act in various CBSC decisions evolved into an “abusiveness criteria”; i.e. the establishment of a “test” whereby a comment must not merely be *discriminatory* to constitute a breach of Clause 2, it must be *abusively* so.

The Council does not consider the phrase “deadbeat dads” used in this context to be abusively discriminatory *per se*, so as to be contrary to Clause 2 of the CAB *Code of Ethics*.

The Council does agree that the phrase conveys a stereotypical image of defaulting *male* child support payers. Moreover, it believes that the term is probably used both for profound and shallow reasons. While the Council is not a fact-finding or research-oriented body, its representative members are entitled, indeed, *expected*, to be able to make certain judgments which appear reasonable on their face. In this case, they do believe that, on the profound level, the media (print and broadcast) use the term because they have come to expect that *most*, but surely not all, defaulters are men. On the shallow level, they believe that the term used to describe this state of anticipated reality is also attractive to broadcasters because of its alliterative nature. Even if one assumes that the statistical basis for the phrase “deadbeat dads” is *correct*, it does not mean that it should be used indiscriminately. Indeed, it is the view of the Regional Council that the term should be used with discernment and only when the term appropriately describes the group in question (see the section below on the use of the phrase in this case). The implication in this view of the Council is, of course, that there are circumstances in which the term *may* be used with impunity.

The complainant referred to many provisions of the various Codes administered by the Council in his complaint. One of these was Clause 5 of the *Sex-Role Portrayal Code* which refers to Non-sexist Language. While the Council does not dispute that the phrase is “sexist” in the purest sense of the word, it does not consider that it is one that is targeted by Clause 5. In the Council’s view, Clause 5 deals with inadvertent/historical references to gender in language whereas Clause 2 of the *Code of Ethics* is the more appropriate choice to deal with a complaint concerning a word or phrase which has an *intended* discriminatory component. The Council notes that Clause 5 states that “Broadcasters shall employ language of a non-sexist nature in their programming, by avoiding, *whenever possible*, expressions which relate to only one gender.” [Emphasis added.] Arguably, when the gender reference is *intended*, i.e. the commentary is meant to be discriminatory, it is not possible to avoid the use of the sexist language and therefore Clause 5 cannot apply.

Use of the Phrase in the Promo in Question

Having concluded that an outright ban of the phrase is neither required nor desirable, the Council now turns its attention to the question of whether the phrase “deadbeat dads” was used appropriately in this case. The Council easily concludes that it was not. This conclusion has been facilitated by the broadcaster’s early recognition that “the use of the deadbeat dads in the context of both men and women represents an error of omission with respect to women.” The Council notes that these were not just words used by the broadcaster in its correspondence. The principle was put into action right away; CFTO-TV corrected its mistake by using the phrase “deadbeat parents” in the actual news report, as acknowledged by the complainant himself.

In the circumstances, while the Council agrees with the broadcaster that an “error of omission” has occurred, it does not consider that a finding of a breach of Clause 6 of the *Code of Ethics* is warranted in the circumstances. Where an honest error occurs which is not of major proportion and is corrected quickly, the CBSC will not, in the absence of other material considerations, find a Code breach. Examples can be found in the following cases. In *CFRA-AM re the Mark Sutcliffe and Lowell Green Shows* (CBSC Decisions 9697-0083, 0084 and 0085, May 7, 1997), the Ontario Regional Council said:

Of the principal issues raised by the complaint, the first relates to the identification of Mr. Nicholls as “Jamaican”. This occurred to a much less significant extent than has been suggested in the letter of complaint. The characterization of Mr. Nicholls as “Jamaican” did not last for more than 30 minutes of the first of the three programs being reviewed here. It appears to have been an honest error and one which, in any event, was corrected by Mr. Sutcliffe himself as quickly as the information [that Mr. Nicholls was St. Lucian] became available to him. It does not constitute a breach of either the CAB or the RTNDA *Codes of Ethics*.

The Council interpreted the meaning of “errors will be quickly acknowledged and publicly corrected” in *CITY-TV re CityPulse (Neighbourhood Drug Bust)* (CBSC Decision 96/97-0216, February 20, 1998). In that case, the broadcaster acknowledged that it had made a “sloppy generalization” in reporting that a drug bust had occurred in Parkdale, when in fact it had occurred elsewhere in the West End of Toronto. The Council found that the statement was made inadvertently and that the inaccuracy was not so significant as to constitute a breach of the Code. It further stated:

The complainant argued that “the error should be corrected publicly in accordance with Article 2 of the *RTNDA Code of Ethics*.” The Council’s interpretation of the Article 2 terminology “quickly acknowledged and publicly corrected” does not match that of the complainant who appears to be seeking an “on bended knee” solution by the broadcaster. This is not, in the view of the CBSC, the goal of this RTNDA provision. The broadcast medium does not favour the use of retractions given its fast pace and constant evolution of the news in multiple daily newscasts. While an error in the print media has a long lasting effect, the impact of an error in the broadcast media is far more ephemeral. After all, television newscasts are regularly repeated throughout the day and, except for the 28-day logger tape retention required by the CRTC and the CBSC, are not generally publicly archived by anyone. The Council does not believe that it would be unfair to observe that,

whether for space storage or other reasons, broadcast reports are not considered to have the archival value of the print media, which all “live” forever in original or microfilmed formats in the National Library and many other libraries in Canada and around the world. It is that permanence which in part results in the need for an equally permanent retraction process.

Retractions are, as one might expect, of a very different nature and serve a different purpose in the electronic arena. They are less frequently required than in the print media for the reasons given above. In the view of the Council, *acknowledgment* would probably only be required in the event of a matter of great moment and widespread effect. The more important goal of Article 2 is the “publicly corrected”; this was accomplished. Nor was there any need to *repeat* the previous mistake in making the correction; the broadcaster’s job is just to present the information *correctly*. Moreover, the textual revision was done “quickly”, as envisaged by the other adverb in the sentence. Accordingly, the Council is of the view that CITY-TV’s actions *vis-à-vis* the inaccuracy noted by the complainant were entirely appropriate and sufficient.

The Council does not consider that the broadcaster could have moved more rapidly than it did to put the matter right in this case; the finding of a breach is not warranted in the circumstances.

Broadcaster Responsiveness

In addition to assessing the relevance of the Codes to the complaint, the CBSC always assesses the *responsiveness* of the broadcaster to the substance of the complaint. In this case, the Council considers that the broadcaster’s commitment to resolving the issue was reflected in the voluminous correspondence which it had with the complainant to try to explain its point of view and to deal with the issues raised by the complainant, even though they did not see eye to eye on the resolution of those matters. The responses addressed fully and fairly the issues raised by the complainant, despite their differing conclusions. Nothing more is required.

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