



Canadian Broadcast Standards Council
Conseil canadien des normes de la radiotélévision

1996 / 1997 Annual Report

“Encouraging Excellence in Broadcasting”

P.O. Box 3265, Station D
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 6H8
telephone: (613) 233-4607
fax: (613) 233-4826
website: www.cbsc.ca
email: info@cbsc.ca

Table of Contents

1. Message from the National Chair	1
2. Gathering Momentum: Unprecedented Numbers of Canadians Help Shape Broadcasting	7
3. Summary of Complaints	32
4. National Chair and Regional Councils	37
5. Membership	41

Message From The National Chair

Decisions of the various Regional Councils continue to play the most central role in the CBSC's activities. Moreover, in 1996-97, as many decisions were drafted and released as in the three previous years of my chairship. They dealt with a broad spectrum of radio and television issues and provide, I believe, a useful policy perspective on what is, or is not, appropriate material for the Canadian airwaves. Freedom of expression is not, after all, unlimited. In Canada, we respect freedom of speech but we do not worship it. We understand that it is an *essential* value but one which must be weighed with Canadian society's other values. The CBSC decisions attempt to measure this balance for the benefit of broadcasters and their audiences. The Council's success in fulfilling this role has resulted from the willingness of Canada's broadcasters to accede to its conclusions. The Council has also been gratified by the CRTC's strong support of the one CBSC decision "appealed" to it this year by a listener not satisfied with the CBSC's conclusions.

A New Approach to Reporting

I am again pleased to report that more than 70% of the complaints received by the Council are resolved satisfactorily by the dialogue between the broadcaster and the complainant, without any need to bring the original complaint to the step of adjudication.

Prior to this fiscal year, the number of decisions the Council was called upon to render annually was generally manageable enough that we were able to report on the results in the year in which the decision was taken at the Regional Council level. Now, however, the number of decisions required each year has grown to such an extent that we will in future report the decisions that are *released* in a fiscal year rather than those decided at the meetings in the year at which the adjudications occurred. This also seems a more viable alternative since the decisions are immediately posted to the CBSC web site, which makes them instantly accessible to all Canadians and, indeed, to interested parties around the world. As usual, the reader-friendly presentation of those decisions for this past year can be found in the Annual Report in the section entitled "Gathering Momentum: Unprecedented Numbers of Canadians Help Shape Broadcasting".

CBSC on the Web

Last year's Annual Report introduced the CBSC web site, which had not yet been completed by the end of the 1995-96 fiscal year. At that time, we anticipated that it would include the Codes we administer, the decisions that arise from them, our news releases and our Annual Reports. It includes all of that and more but details will be provided in a new section to the Annual Report, "The CBSC Web Site - Worth a Detour", which we encourage you to look at. Suffice it to say that, in the ten months of this past fiscal year, there have been more than 165,000 "hits" and almost 675 megabytes of web site information "transferred" to visitors. Our web site visitors come principally from Canada and the United States, as one would expect, but they have also logged onto the site from 67 other countries at a rate of over 30 different countries each month.

The existence of the web site, which is the world's window on the CBSC and the uniquely successful self-regulatory structure established by Canada's private broadcasters, has given us the opportunity to revise the structure of our Annual Reports. Before the 1995-96 Report, each annual summary of activities was professionally designed and printed in limited quantities for distribution primarily to the CBSC's members, the CRTC and such other individuals as requested the document. The expense of the production prevented wider dissemination. Ironically, the advent of the web site has permitted the Council, at *lesser* cost, to publish the Report far more broadly, thereby making it instantaneously accessible not only to the private broadcaster members of the CBSC but also to the Canadian public and the world, all on a far more economical basis than before. It also means that fewer matters have to be addressed in the Annual Report. Instead of annually providing information on what the CBSC is, its component parts, its history, its Codes, its broadcast members, and its Regional Council members, that information can now be posted and accessed on a *permanent* basis. It also means that this Annual Report and those to follow can be

limited to what happened in the fiscal year reported on and what the National Chair is projecting for the coming year.

A Specialty Service Joins the CBSC

I have for several years anticipated in my Annual Message the expansion of the membership of the CBSC. This important change finally took place this year with the arrival of the first non-CAB member on the CBSC's roster. Vision TV, Canada's Faith Network, is a unique specialty service, mandated to present programming that reflects Canada's many faiths and religions and to promote understanding, tolerance and cooperation among cultures. As the first non-conventional television broadcaster to join, we believe that Vision has demonstrated its support for a self-regulatory organization that has, in the words of Vision's President and CEO, Fil Fraser, "dealt responsibly and fairly with complaints for the past six years." Moreover, Vision has entrusted the Council not only with the administration of the applicable CAB Codes but also with Vision's own *Code of Ethics* and *Violence Code*. The Council looks forward to the challenge represented by the arrival of the first specialty service in the CBSC fold and the new Codes it brings. We also anticipate the arrival of many other such services in the course of the first months of the 1997-98 fiscal year.

International Contacts

Our contact with international organizations has been maintained. We have been visited by scholars from Australia and Korea this year, as well as a large delegation from Telewizja Polska who, having been responsible for the creation of a code of ethics, wanted now to learn about the application of professional standards and ethical practices in the Canadian experience. In October, I spoke at the 1996 *National Media Literacy Conference* at UCLA in Westwood, California, and in April at another conference at the University of California at Santa Barbara entitled *V Is for Violence: Rating, Regulating and Rethinking Television* and had the opportunity on both occasions to exchange ideas and dialogue with leading American academic, business and political figures on the question of the V-Chip and Canada's solutions to the issue of violence on television. I was also invited to participate in the Annual Symposium of the Bertelsmann Foundation on Self-Regulation entitled *Coordinates for Tomorrow's Communications* in Gütersloh, Germany, with colleagues from around the world. It is clear that the Canadian private broadcasters' solution to this perceived international television dilemma is much admired globally.

A National Presence

Domestically, the CBSC was present as always at the Annual CAB Convention which was held in Edmonton. Our booth was enhanced by the presence of a computer accessing the CBSC web site which was opened to the public for the first time at the Convention. I also attended the British Columbia Association of Broadcasters Annual Convention at which there was a lively panel relating to the CBSC's conflict of interest decision involving CKNW-AM and the allegation that reporters from the station became involved in making a "political" complaint that generated news coverage. I also continued to sit *ex officio* at the meetings of the Classification Sub-Committee of the Action Group on Violence on Television (AGVOT) as the Canadian ratings system was finalized.

Never in the history of the Council have its services been so requested. This will no doubt remain true in the coming year, which will, as always, bring new demands on the level of decision-making. It will also, most of all, bring the CBSC the opportunity to expand its horizons with the administration of new members, new Codes, and a new ratings system. We look forward to that challenge and are grateful, as always, for the thoughtful and reasoned participation of each of the public and broadcast members of our Regional Councils in the development of the policy which is their charge.

RONALD I. COHEN
National Chair

1. The CBSC Web Site - Worth a Detour

In the CRTC Public Notice approving the existence of the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council, the Commission stated that the CBSC had three major areas of responsibility:

- to inform broadcasters with respect to emerging societal issues and suggest ways to deal with them;
- to administer codes of industry standards referred to it by the CAB; and
- to provide a means of recourse for members of the public regarding the application of these standards.

Since these all ultimately involved communication issues, a significant component of the CBSC's effectiveness necessarily related to the Council's accessibility. This is, of course, a two-way street, involving the accessibility of all Council information *to* the public as well as access to the Council's process of receiving complaints *from* the public.

The Internet: The Council's Two-Way Street

It became clear to the Council in the spring of 1996 that the burgeoning information highway might be its vital communications link to all of its constituencies. That prospect was, to some extent, dependent on the increasing accessibility of the Internet, or world wide web, to Canadians, whether at home, at school or university, or at the office. There was every indication that this was becoming the case, whether in terms of the media attention to the subject, the importance of convergence to the CRTC and business broadly speaking, the increasing presence of Internet addresses in television and print advertising, and the frequent use of e-mail addresses in personal communications.

The Council determined to create a user-friendly site with as much information as we could possibly post that would help Canadians and "visitors" from other countries to learn what self-regulation, the Codes, and CBSC decisions were all about. We also wanted to ensure that *all* other relevant documentation would be posted and that links to other useful sites would be present. Those were "outflow" issues but we were equally concerned about structuring a simple "inflow" mechanism, a method for consumers to be able to access the Council and to complain about a program at the press of a mouse button.

The Web Site: Its Outflow Structure

There were certain obvious elements to include for visitors to understand the role and function of the CBSC. Since some of these had previously been included in the Annual Report, a not easily accessible document (as has been pointed out in the National Chair's Message), it was clear that the existence of the site could actually make the Annual Report itself more efficient by having annually repeated information excised from the Report and *permanently* available on the web site.

Logically then, the first of eight "chapters" on the CBSC's Home Page is entitled "What Is the CBSC?". It contains background information on the Council, including the CBSC's component parts and its history, with appropriate hyperlinks to other sites and documents of relevance to the user.

The second "chapter" is entitled "What's New". As one would expect, the section contains press releases regarding matters which the Council assumes may be of interest to visitors to the site. These regularly include the press releases associated with the release of CBSC decisions but also extend to matters emanating from CRTC Public Notices, AGVOT (Action Group on Violence on Television) releases relating to the proposed television ratings system, news on television violence, the forthcoming hearings on commercial radio and so on. It is a useful check-in point for regular visitors to the site. Generally, information will remain posted for about three months, after which it is archived and remains permanently, if less obviously, accessible.

The third "chapter", the "Codes", provides the full text of each of the codes administered by the CBSC. In an effort to permit users a greater understanding of the CBSC's interpretation of the various Code provisions, many issues dealt with in past CBSC decisions are briefly noted following the clause to which they refer and are hyperlinked to the texts of the relevant decisions themselves.

In the fourth "chapter", the "Decisions", there is a list in reverse chronological order of the decisions rendered since July 1, 1993. It provides access by decision name only and the Council is currently working on an effective search engine which will ultimately provide users with access to relevant decisions by subject and key word.

The fifth "chapter", entitled "Canada Deals with Media Violence", consists of a brief history of the issue of the treatment of media violence in Canada. The Council believes that there is no other country which has developed a more effective and dynamic approach to the subject and this section walks visitors through the Canadian story with hyperlinks to relevant documents and other web sites throughout.

The "Annual Reports" make up the sixth "chapter". This Report will be the third posted on the web site, which will always provide the latest Annual Report plus archival access to the 1994-95 and 1995-96 Annual Reports for those who may find these of academic, historic, comparative or other interest.

The "Legal Links" "chapter" is of great importance. It provides visitors to the site with access to every statute, regulation or CRTC Public Notice, Notice of Public Hearing or Decision which is of relevance to anyone examining or studying the question of broadcast self-regulation in Canada, from the *Broadcasting Act* and *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, on the broadest level of relevance, through the Public Notices contemplating and establishing the CBSC and its Codes, to the Council's own submissions to the Commission on the subject of violence. We have even provided access to the American Center for Communication Policy's Annual Reports to the Congress on Television Violence.

There is also a button at the bottom of the Home Page, entitled "Links", which provides web site addresses for our broadcaster members as well as other organizations which we assume might be of relevance to visitors to our site. These include (as of September 1997) addresses for 90 radio members, 18 television members, the CRTC, other Canadian Government addresses, the CAB, the FCC, the Media Awareness Network and other self-regulatory bodies around the world. It will, needless to say, be a list which grows and changes as the Council learns of more addresses in an increasingly plugged-in world.

The Web Site: Its Inflow Structure

Listener and viewer complaints are the *raison d'être* of the Council's existence. The Council was created to respond to audience concerns and to administer a *uniform* set of standards which would come in time to be known to both the Canadian public and Canada's private broadcasters. In our early days, it would have been too much to expect that there would be any wide-spread familiarity with the CBSC, despite the public service announcements broadcast by our members on a run-of-schedule basis. It was apparent that the ultimate familiarity with the Council would come via the media and then only as the *acts* of the Council, its *decisions*, would come to be better known. In the end, a negative decision was ultimately the trigger for a sudden surge in the Council's emergence from well-kept secrecy to a public presence. Beginnings of this familiarity came with the two decisions relating to CFRB's *Ed Needham Show*, but the major catalyst was the decision in *CIII-TV re Mighty Morphin Power Rangers*, which received media attention across the country and in the United States.

The decision resulted in a growing percentage of complaints coming directly to the Council. These were principally mailed although some were faxed. There was still, however, no simple permanently accessible address until the web site was available. While the level of complaints flowing to the CBSC via this source has been small in the web site's first year (see the Overview at the beginning of Chapter 3), the figure will no doubt grow exponentially as more and more Canadians become familiar with the web site and the Council's work.

Web Site Statistics

The web site was launched at the Annual CAB Convention at the end of October 1996 but it was not until January that the site was listed on Yahoo and the other search engines. In all, there were 165,580 "hits" for the 10 month period. Of these, just over 154,000 occurred following the listing, which means that the monthly average of about 5,500 "hits" jumped to over 19,000 per month for the remaining 8 months of the year. Similarly, of the 674,077,847 bytes of data "transferred" during that time, the monthly figure leapt from just over 20 megabytes to nearly 80 megabytes for the period from January to the end of August.

The nationality of visitors was also intriguing. First, an explanation for those not familiar with the Internet. Most electronic visitors' addresses have an extension which permits the identification of the country from which the information search is being made. Thus "ca" denotes Canada, "fr" France, "uk" the United Kingdom, "jp" Japan, and so on. Other extensions, such as "edu" designate American universities, "mil" the U.S. military and so on. A few, such as "com" and "net", are found throughout North America and cannot readily be broken down between Canada and the United States. Finally, a not insignificant number of addresses cannot be resolved at all.

As one would expect, the bulk of the CBSC's web site visitors came from Canada. American visitors also arrived in large numbers. Thereafter, we were able to identify visitors from 67 other countries, of which the most regular habitués were, in approximate order by number of "hits": Australia, France, Japan, the United Kingdom, South Korea, Portugal, New Zealand, Malaysia and Germany, each of which sent seekers to the CBSC site every month from January on. Other frequent, but less consistent, visitors came from (in alphabetical order): Belgium, Brazil, China, Finland, Hong Kong, Ireland, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates.

While our statistics indicate locations on the web site which have been used, the analysis of the usage rates would require more resources than seem to be justified at this time. Broadly speaking, though, it appears that the Codes, the decisions, the Annual Reports (that for 1994-95 at least as frequently as that for 1995-96) and the What's New section appear to attract the most traffic, although electronic footprints have been left on the Links, Legal Links, Complaints and other pages. It is also gratifying to know that our decision to post AGVOT's Report to the Commission has resulted in considerable use of that document. Moreover, before the CRTC revised its own web site to include Public Notices issued prior to 1994, the CBSC had obtained electronic copies of these and posted them on our own site. They, too, have been frequently used.

Overall, it appears to the Council that the web site has already been of enormous value on numerous levels. First, the primary goal of making the Council better known to the public is continually being achieved, both directly and indirectly: directly, in the obvious sense that Canadians are visiting it; and indirectly, in the sense that the media, print and electronic, regularly refer to it as they prepare news stories and other journalistic pieces. They are then more familiar themselves with the Council and they are better able to convey more informative and more accurate stories to the public. In a kind of subsidiary way, it has also enabled the Council to become virtually transparent in its processes. All decisions, Codes, Annual Reports, relevant documents, press releases, member links and related materials are publicly available 24 hours per day at the convenience of those who wish to access the information.

Second, the CBSC's members, the broadcasters, are more rapidly able to be aware of the content of the Council's Codes and decisions and some, we have learned, refer to these decisions in responses to audience letters. Many, we are certain, are better able to nuance their own policies by referring to other stations' precedents.

Third, the Council itself has begun to receive complaints from persons who cannot fail to find the process extremely user-friendly. That pace will accelerate during the course of the second year of experience with the web site.

Fourth, the message that self-regulation works has gotten out to other countries, whose residents are learning what processes Canada has developed to uniformize broadcaster practices in the areas of sex role portrayal, violence on television, journalistic ethics and broadcast ethics generally.

The web site is a work-in-progress. As more information becomes available, it will be posted. If there are gaps or improvements to be made, users should not hesitate to let us know.

2. Gathering Momentum: Unprecedented Numbers of Canadians Help Shape Broadcasting

Canadians demand action: An upsurge in unusual and complex concerns

During the year 1996-97, the CBSC experienced an explosion in the number of decisions made public - from 16 decisions the year before, to 33 in 1996-97, equal to the number released in the three previous years combined. Canadians are feeling more and more comfortable with using the CBSC's complaints process in new and different ways to voice their concerns about the messages delivered over the country's airwaves. This year's complaints presented Council members with many complex and unusual situations, and some that opened new territory in the application and meaning of the industry's codes.

In 1996-97, the complaints that the Regional Councils heard fell into four broad categories:

Ethics and human rights

Canadians complained about the subject of a controversial movie and about name-calling.

Violence

Among complaints referred to regional councils, concern about violent programming that might be seen by children was foremost.

Sex-role portrayal

One Canadian wrote to express concerns about the portrayal of men in the media.

News and public-affairs programming

This year, many complainants were the "newsmakers," concerned about how they had been portrayed in news programs.

The CBSC also received a few "general" complaints that did not fall into any of the above categories and which were not the subject of requests for regional council rulings.

Ethics and human rights

A television viewer complained about the attitude toward Christians demonstrated in a controversial movie and a radio listener complained about a host's use of a slang term to describe police.

The Last Temptation of Christ: Hate-mongering or religious freedom?

A viewer in Abbotsford, British Columbia, wrote a letter to the CBSC to express outrage about the early-morning broadcast of the motion picture *The Last Temptation of Christ* on CHAN-TV, popularly known as BCTV.

Aired at 1:30 a.m., the film began with the large cautionary word "ADULT" on the screen and the following oral advisory:

Welcome to the Late Show. Our movie this morning is rated Adult and viewer discretion is advised. It's thought-provoking and controversial. It's a deeply felt drama on the speculation of the Life of Christ. Don't miss *The Last Temptation of Christ* starring Willem Dafoe coming up next.

The viewer, a pastor, questioned the standards of the station in his letter.

In the theatre the kids could not get to see its disgusting content, so we have it piped into our homes to slap us in the face. It is slanderous, hate-filled demented trash, the product of some people with serious head problems. It is not art, it is not entertaining, it has no social value, it is not instructional...it is GARBAGE!

The complainant went on to say that he had thought there were laws, such as the Human Rights Code, to protect people from "religious persecution and ridicule." Stating that these laws must only apply to "OTHER religions and races," the viewer wondered if it was "open season on Christians." The complainant requested that BCTV apologize publicly for "extremely bad taste."

The CBSC forwarded a copy of the letter to BCTV for reply. In the response, the station's Vice President, Programming, pointed out that "perhaps the greatest strength of television is the ability of the medium to promote thought and expression of different views and opinions." We are aware that some controversy surrounded the movie when it was released theatrically in 1988. We felt that, by telecasting the movie in a time period when it would be viewed primarily by mature audiences, that individual viewers would have an opportunity to consider and accept or reject its dramatic portrayals, concepts and principles.

The viewer was not satisfied with the station's response, and asked that the British Columbia Regional Council review the matter. On his ruling request, he added: "This 'film' does not belong on TV, in a theatre, or on video, and is also available in any video rental. I am pursuing this problem with the Human Rights Council to have them removed."

In reviewing the matter, the Regional Council members considered the complaint under the CAB *Code of Ethics*, which states that broadcasters should try to ensure that their programs contain no abusive or discriminatory material or comment based on religion. The Council members also referred to the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, and its "freedom of conscience and religion" clause, in making their decision. The Regional Council members reviewed the correspondence and viewed a videotape of the movie.

In making their decision, Council members noted that the complainant found the depiction of Christ questioning his faith and succumbing to temptation "utterly unacceptable, even hateful."

While members of the Council understand the complainant's profound disagreement with Paul Schrader's screenplay and Martin Scorsese's direction of the film and BCTV's broadcast of that creative collaboration, they believe that the freedom of these cinematic creators to express their view on such matters and the broadcaster's entitlement to air that film are fundamental in our society. Their careful viewing of the lengthy film has led none of them to consider that the film makers' approach was either flippant, casual or without respect. Nor do they find in the film any negative attitude toward either Christians or Christianity itself.

Council members also noted that the complainant's problem was obviously not with the broadcaster as much as the film itself and its availability in the cinemas as well as on videotape and television. Council stated that this opinion was "tantamount to censorship, plain and simple," and that it went beyond any question of what is appropriate for the airwaves.

Council members stated that the broadcaster "took extraordinary steps" to ensure that anyone who might be offended by the film would not be exposed to it-first by playing it very late at night, and second by alerting viewers with an advisory which was not required by any Code.

The Regional Council members agreed that the station did not breach the Code by airing the movie.

"Fuzz-traps" and German commands

A listener from Kelowna, British Columbia, wrote to the CRTC regarding an "insulting" commentary about the police he had heard on the local rock-music radio station, CKLZ-FM, also known as "The Lizard." Between songs, the announcer had made the following comments to warn listeners about a police radar trap:

...as always, the Lizard listeners keeping us abreast on what's happening in the world, Harvey and Ellis, fuzz-trap, uh-huh...better watch it if you're cruising up the highway through town right now. They're busting people, centre, left and right...it doesn't really matter, they're running out in the middle of the road. So, what I suggest you do is drop by your favourite donut shop, pick them up a six pack of crullers and some coffee and drop them off to the boys in blue who are out there doing their gig on a Sunday afternoon...and watch your speed, okay. We'll check Kelowna weekend weather, and coming back, *Achtung Baby*.

The complainant, a police officer, heard the commentary and became so angry that he phoned the radio station immediately to voice his displeasure. In his letter to the CRTC, he stated that he was told the comments were made "in the interest of humour."

My objection with the broadcast was with what seemed to me to be childish name calling, the insinuation that a donut and a coffee could buy a cop, and with all the negative connotations that accompany the word "Achtung."

In responding to the complaint, the station's Program Director suggested that the listener had misinterpreted the announcer's comments.

[The announcer] in no way insinuated that a donut and coffee could buy a cop. Rather, he suggested that it might be a kind gesture to purchase a treat for the police who were out doing their job...

The letter went on to explain that the words "Achtung, Baby" referred to the title of an album by the group U2, which the announcer was promoting, and not to the preceding conversation about the police. To this letter, the Program Director attached a transcript of the commentary in question.

In a letter to the CBSC, the listener reiterated his concerns about using the word "fuzz" to describe the police. He also stated that he did not feel he could have so completely misinterpreted the use of the word "Achtung," and asked to hear a recording of the broadcast in question.

In response, CKLZ-FM's Program Director forwarded a tape recording of the commentary in question, and stated in the accompanying letter that he did not have any problem with using the term "fuzz-trap."

"Fuzz" is defined in the dictionary as slang for policeman, or the police. I believe the term was even applied to a commercially available radar-detector called a "Fuzz-buster". Granted it is not a term that is often used on the air. The RCMP are generally referred to as the police, or the cops.

After listening to the tape, the complainant sent a final letter to CKLZ-FM, stating that he was still not satisfied with the station's response.

Using the reasoning that it [the term "fuzz"] is justified because it is in the dictionary still doesn't make it right. As an example, (and I apologize in advance because I am sure that you will find the use of the following word as offensive as I do, but I want to bring home the point) in your future news broadcasts dealing with the OJ Simpson trial you will be able to refer to "the black jurors" as "the nigger jurors." It's okay! It's in the dictionary!

While conceding that he had been wrong in interpreting the reference to donuts and coffee as a bribe, he stated that the strongest issue had to do with the reference to "Achtung baby" at the end of the conversation dealing with the radar operation.

You must agree that anybody listening to the radio that day, unless possibly they were a diehard U2 fan, would never have made that connection. The announcer discussed the police radar operation, said "achtung baby", and then a commercial began. No reference was made to the music which would follow the commercials. Only one person can say whether a slight was intended, but even if none was intended, one was made. It was said. And I object.

In response, the Program Director of CKLZ-FM wrote another letter to the complainant, assuring the listener that the comments in question "were not intended to be an insult," apologizing that his interpretation of the comments left him "infuriated," and stating that the station would continue to follow the codes of conduct set out by the CBSC.

The listener was not satisfied with the station's response and asked that the British Columbia Regional Council review the matter. In rendering its decision, the B.C. Regional Council reviewed all related correspondence and listened to the tape of the program in question. The Council members considered the complaint under the CAB *Code of Ethics*.

Regarding the use of the term "fuzz," the Council members noted that this was the first time a listener had complained about language used to describe an occupation. The members agreed that, to extend the meaning of Clause 2 of the Code to include occupation would require the "intervention of the codifiers."

The Council further recognizes that individuals in society will occasionally be offended by the use of a term or a word which has come into general usage and is not offensive to society as a whole. The CBSC believes that the word "fuzz" is such a case although it understands and respects the sensitivities of the complainant.

Concerning the use of the German word "Achtung" [Attention], the Council noted that the word alone is not offensive. Members agreed that the word's military usage and its association in the Canadian experience with Nazi atrocities in the Second World War may make it offensive, depending on the context in which it is used. The Regional Council attributed the complainant's concern to his lack of familiarity with the rock group U2's song entitled "Achtung, Baby" when he heard the announcer's comment; however, it did also acknowledge the "unfortunate juxtaposition" of the song and the speed-trap item.

Members concluded that lead-in to the song before the commercial was "absolutely normal," that the announcer had not intended to "cast any aspersion on the police," and that few other listeners would have made the same conclusion as the complainant. The Regional Council members agreed that CKLZ-FM had not breached the CAB *Code of Ethics*.

Violence

This year's complaints to the CBSC suggest that Canadians are concerned about children mimicking the depictions of violence they see on television.

A cleaver-wielding butcher

A viewer in Orono, Ontario, wrote a letter to Toronto's CFTO-TV to complain about an "appalling" commercial from Maple Leaf Meats aired by CTV during the broadcast of *Canada AM*.

The commercial's opening scene, set in a butcher shop and shot through the shop window, shows Frank the butcher waving a meat cleaver over a butcher's block and explaining how Maple Leaf trims their sandwich meat. "Let me give you Frank's number one rule: Never argue with a guy holding a meat cleaver. ... You can argue with me [he swings the cleaver into the block] but I don't think you should. [Frank smiles and winks at the camera.]"

In her letter, the viewer expressed her outrage about the commercial's message.

I felt sick just watching it. And my mind raced to all the 10 year old boys who might see this, and be negatively affected, or girls.

In the station's first response to the viewer's complaint, CTV's President and Chief Executive Officer noted that he had seen the advertisement many times. "The butcher is talking to the camera in a very good-natured convivial manner. I sensed no hint of threat in his tone." While saying he was sorry the ad offended the viewer, he mentioned that all ads are preapproved by an independent body, the Telecaster Committee, before going on the air, and that they must meet a carefully construed set of criteria. In a second letter to the viewer from CTV, the station's Vice-President of Corporate Communications reiterated the President's position.

The viewer was not satisfied with the station's responses, and asked that the Ontario Regional Council consider the matter. The Council members viewed a tape of the commercial, and reviewed all of the related correspondence.

In its decision, the Ontario Regional Council reaffirmed its jurisdiction over certain types of advertising complaints, such as those that fall within the scope of the *CAB Voluntary Code Regarding Violence in Television Programming*.

Referring to the Code, which prohibits gratuitous violence, Council members decided that, while there was an implied "threat" in the commercial, it was clearly not serious and could not be considered by anyone to be menacing. Nor was there any depiction of violence in the commercial.

Even if the actor playing Frank, the butcher, had not smiled and winked during the commercial, the Regional Council members do not believe that anyone would take the words he utters as menacing. If, by any chance, a 10-year-old had seen the commercial and been concerned (the hypothesis of the complainant), the Council would expect that a parental explanation would rapidly clear the air.

As a result, in the Council's opinion, CTV had not breached the industry's code on television violence.

Sex, violence and late-night TV

A viewer from Rothesay, New Brunswick, wrote two letters to the CRTC expressing her outrage and concern about the violence depicted in two television programs.

The first complaint related to the first episode of the television series *Millennium*, which the viewer had seen on CIHF-TV (MITV). The program involves a retired lawman who has a psychic ability to see criminal events when exposed to elements relating to the crime. In the letter, the complainant explained that she was offended by various scenes of "gratuitous, sadistic violence," which she was afraid would be seen by children because of its 10:00 p.m. time slot.

The opening scene was in a busy strip club with several big-breasted, scantily-clad strippers gyrating and performing for peep-show customers. The bikinis they wore were very small and barely contained breasts [*sic*].

While a stripper (who later will be murdered) performs for a customer she says to him: "you like to watch my body" and "Tell me what you want...". The killer, who is ranting about her going to hell, imagines blood running down the walls behind her and down her forehead. Then, flames begin to shoot up all around her. This is very disturbing and VIOLENT imagery - sex and violence. To watch a stripper wiggling around with vibrant, red blood oozing all around her and on her was deeply offensive. This kind of sick, sadistic imagery is unacceptable.

The viewer also complained that the warning message about the show's content was not audible.

The station's Program Manager responded by sending a letter to the viewer, stating that the scenes described in her complaint were "integral to the plot and were not gratuitous." The Program Manager also pointed out that the station had aired a viewer advisory before the telecast began, which had contained both a video and an audio message. According to the Program Manager, the "silent advisory" the viewer had referred to was one of two additional advisories that had followed the first two commercial breaks. The letter also pointed out that *Millennium* is deliberately scheduled for 10:00 p.m., which is "no longer considered to be children's viewing time" according to industry standards.

The viewer was not satisfied with this response, and asked the CBSC to have its Atlantic Regional Council review the matter. The Council members considered the complaint under Articles 1, 3, 5 and 7 of the CAB *Voluntary Code Regarding Violence in Television Programming*, as well as Article 4 of the CAB *Sex-Role Portrayal Code*. In reviewing the matter, the Regional Council members viewed a tape of the program in question and reviewed all of the correspondence.

While admitting that the imagery and editing of the program could cause fear or terror in adults, Council members agreed that the scenes containing violent elements were essential to plot and character development.

Such violence as occurs in the episode is central to the plot and character of the principal protagonist. Furthermore, the scenes complained of do not generally show the occurrence of violent acts as much as they do the *results* of the violent acts and, at that, the violence is not overplayed.

In the Council's view, the program did not contravene the industry's code on television violence, which prohibits gratuitous violence. Moreover, the program contained "scenes of violence intended for adult audiences." By scheduling the program at 10 p.m., MITV had respected the industry's 9 p.m. watershed hour after which violent programming for adults can be aired. The Council added that the viewer advisories provided by MITV were appropriate and fulfilled the station's obligations to inform viewers of the content they might be watching. As a result, the Council members agreed that MITV had not breached the industry's code on television violence.

Sadism and incest on prime-time

The same viewer sent a second letter to the CBSC to express her concerns about an episode of *The X-Files* entitled "Home" that she had watched on MITV. She characterized the television show as follows:

This show was extremely violent, sadistic and unacceptable for public viewing.

There was bludgeoning - an axe through a man's throat, another person impaled on a spear.

The viewer also expressed horror at scenes in which "three (3) men were having sex with their LIMBLESS MOTHER. They kept her strapped to a piece of wood under the bed."

Stating that she believed *The X-Files* is aimed at an audience that includes children, she said children "have a right to be free from this toxic media which pumps violence, sadism, senseless brutality and incest into their living rooms."

The CBSC forwarded a copy of the letter to MITV for reply. In her response, the station's Program Manager explained that the acts of violence were integral to the episode's plot, were not gratuitous, and "did not sanction, promote or glamorize violence."

In fact, the viewer did not actually see the clubs striking the sheriff and his wife, nor did they see the axe go through a man's throat. The person killed by a "spear" in his back was again not seen on-camera. The acts were implied through plot development, camera angles, editing, lighting and special effects techniques.

The Program Manager went on to say that she did not agree with the complainant's assessment that *The X-Files* was aimed at children, and noted that the program was aired at 10:00 p.m., after the watershed hour of 9:00 p.m. for adult programming.

The viewer was not satisfied with the station's response, and asked that the Atlantic Regional Council review the matter. The Council members considered the complaint under the CAB *Voluntary Code Regarding Violence in Television Programming*. Council members viewed a tape of the episode in question and reviewed all of the correspondence.

The Council stated that, while scenes not depicting violent actions may constitute violence, in the context of the episode, the Council felt that the "subject matter and scenes were relevant and appropriate to the program." They also agreed that airing the program at 10:00 p.m., well after the watershed hour, constituted appropriate scheduling, voicing "strong doubts" that the program was intended for children.

While the Council members agreed that the episode of *The X-Files* had not breached the provisions of the Violence Code, they did find that the station had breached the Code by not providing advisories for the viewers. In their decision, Council members provided a sample advisory that the station could have used in this instance. CIHF-TV was required to announce the CBSC's decision during prime time.

Giving a "hot foot" on a Sunday afternoon

A viewer in Toronto, Ontario, wrote to the CRTC to complain about a television show, *Etho Pou Ta Leme*, which aired on CFMT-TV on a Sunday afternoon. As part of its multicultural multilingual broadcast service, the station had aired the Greek-language show at about 12:30 p.m. About 52 minutes into the hour-long program, there was a short regular segment, called "Curious George." The viewer was concerned about a character in the segment giving another character a "hot foot" with a cigarette lighter.

The woman was laughing as though this was a really great prank. ... [T]his show was finishing at 1:30 p.m. in the afternoon on a Sunday ... which is prime watching time for kids. This little skit was not in the best of taste as far as condoning playing with open flames, and if it was on at 1:30 a.m. when it was not likely children would be exposed, I would think it only stupid instead of negligent and irresponsible.

In her letter, the viewer explained that she had spoken with the Marketing Co-ordinator at the station on the telephone, and was not satisfied with the conversation.

The station's Vice President and Executive Producer responded by stating that the station, after reviewing the segment, did not feel it had breached any provisions of the codes. Explaining that the program's audience was viewers "age 18 and up," the Vice President and Executive Producer stated that the program was "clearly identified as satire and is a parody of existing television programming."

We appreciate that humour is a highly subjective matter and we regret that the presentation of the content in question was unpalatable to you.

The viewer was not satisfied with this response, and asked that the matter be referred to the Ontario Regional Council for consideration. With her ruling request, the viewer enclosed a further letter to the CBSC in which she elaborated on the reasons for her dissatisfaction with the station's response.

Let me say first, it is true that "humour is a highly subjective matter", and I don't doubt that if taken in context the vignette could have been humorous. My objection to what I saw was not that it was or wasn't funny, but that because it was displayed as being funny and cute and, yes, especially humorous, it could be seen as something good or an allowable pastime or permissible to do or proper. Putting an open flame to any portion of clothing worn by another human being or any part of another human being's anatomy, is in my opinion, none of the above adjectives.

The viewer also stated that Sunday afternoon is a "family time," and that there must have been children under 18 watching the program. "I don't think I have to remind you that playing with lighters is not something parents want their young children to mimic."

In making their decision, the Regional Council members viewed a videotape of the program and reviewed all related correspondence. The members considered the complaint under the CAB *Voluntary Code Regarding Violence in Television Programming*, which states that children's programming must be careful with themes that might prompt children to imitate acts they see on screen, like using matches as playthings.

Council members noted that the program was clearly designed for an adult audience, and therefore did not violate the Violence Code. The overall 60-minute show *Etho Pou Ta Leme ...* was a public affairs program targeted at adults. While some children *might* be watching *Etho Pou Ta Leme*, the program was not directed at children and the segment in question was clearly a parody or satire of children's programming intended for the amusement of adults.

Despite their decision, the Council members did agree with the complainant's concerns about the program's timing. Members stated that it was "perhaps injudicious of CFMT-TV to have such a dangerous act visible by children at that time on a week-end."

Cruelty to animals featured on The Ricki Lake Show

A Hamilton, Ontario, viewer wrote a letter to the CRTC voicing her concerns about an episode of *The Ricki Lake Show* she had seen on CHCH-TV at 4:00 p.m., which she felt had been aired to "disgust" the viewing audience.

The broadcaster aired a viewer advisory before the episode began, stating that the program was intended for adult audiences. The episode, entitled "Help me, my friend won't stop hurting animals," featured a panel made up of a psychologist with the Humane Society of the United States, several admitted animal abusers and their friends or family.

The program's guests gave details about their experiences with animal abuse, including injecting mice with acid, killing a frog in a drill press, burning a cat's nose with a cigarette lighter, and dissecting a live dog. The host consistently condemned the actions of the abusers, and the psychologist pointed out that animal cruelty was a felony in 15 states. No one in the audience supported the abusers.

The viewer had this to say about the program:

What this show was doing was teaching influential young people how to commit a crime and how to torture defenceless animals. It is telling our population and especially our youth that if you have nothing better to do you should abuse an animal.

In his response to the complainant, the station's Executive Vice-President and General Manager explained that Ricki Lake is a well-known animal-rights activist, and that the station had felt that anyone who watched the program would "recognize the efforts that were made to present the issue of cruelty to animals, and those who commit such acts as despicable."

The entire tone and context of the program was that the people who admitted to committing these acts were seriously troubled personalities, and should seek professional help. The audience was, without exception, hostile to the views of the program guests and their questioning of the guests clearly indicated their scorn and contempt for the acts being described.

The viewer was not satisfied with this response, and asked that the CBSC's Ontario Regional Council consider the matter. The Council considered the complaint under the *CAB Voluntary Code Regarding Violence in Television Programming* and the *CAB Code of Ethics*. The Council members, after viewing a tape of the program in question and reviewing all of the correspondence, agreed that the program did not violate the provisions of either of these Codes.

While agreeing with the complainant that the animal abuse described on the show was "particularly unpleasant and discomfiting, if not also disgusting," the members stated that the media must deal with "both pleasant and unpleasant matters." The Council members agreed that animal abuse is a subject of a controversial nature, which the broadcaster was correct to air to help raise public awareness of the problem.

Concerning the question of violence against animals, members noted that no violence was actually shown. The Council did not agree with the complainant that the show constituted a "visual 'how-to' tool."

No viewer of the show could reasonably conclude that the program sanctioned, promoted or glamorized violence against animals. Not only was the host clear in her position against animal abusers, but her guest expert from the Humane Society also reflected that perspective. He even drew a link between animal abusers and serial killers of human beings, the implications of which are strongly negative in terms of the show's attitude toward animal abuse. Finally, it was quite clear from all of the audience interventions that there was not a single voice sympathetic to the abusive activities of guests on the show.

The Council members were pleased that the broadcaster had used a viewer advisory at the start of the program. However, they noted that a more explicit description of the nature of the program would have been more useful to viewers in deciding whether the show was suitable viewing for themselves and younger members of their families.

Sex-role portrayal

In a series of complaints, one individual asked whether men are being portrayed fairly on the airwaves.

"Persistent" complaints about discrimination against men

This year, the CBSC dealt with four separate ruling requests from the same Ottawa, Ontario, resident. All of the complaints dealt with gender issues, and specifically with discrimination against men, and all pertained to broadcasts on CFRA-AM radio in Ottawa.

Excluding men from making financial decisions

In a letter addressed to the CRTC, the listener complained that a 90-second feature program aired on CFRA-AM radio called *Family Fortune* had "deliberately excluded men." The program dealt with financial issues affecting women and their families. During the segment in question, the topic was "avoiding unnecessary interest charges" and the program gave advice on how to stay away from credit-card debt that could not be easily be paid off after the holiday season.

The complainant explained that he believed the program violated the CRTC policy on gender portrayal in family life.

In this programme, women were portrayed as the sole and exclusive decision-makers, a clear violation of your policy. ... This programme only portrayed women as the beneficiaries of this area of family life and portrayed only the financial needs of women. ... I contend that the expression "Women and their families" associates an inequitable male role with the exclusion of men from financial affairs in family life and as such is negative and stereotyped.

In his response, the station's General Manager explained that research shows that women have historically left financial decisions to men.

The program offers advice to women to empower them to begin to take responsibility for their own financial future.

Although the program focuses on issues important to women in Canadian society, the content does not exclude men. Many men also listen to this program. Men gain valuable insights into the issues women face in the financial world. We consider this an important benefit to the program.

The listener was not satisfied with this response and asked the CBSC's Ontario Regional Council to review the matter. The Council members listened to a tape of the program in question and reviewed all of the related correspondence. After considering the complaint under the CAB *Sex-Role Portrayal Code*, the Council members agreed that the program did not violate any provision of the Code.

Council members stated that they were unable to find "even a trace" of sexism in the approach to the subject in the actual broadcast; they indicated that the "subject matter and the terms used are absolutely gender neutral." The members surmised that the complainant's only objection had to be with the description of the program as "a program dedicated to the financial issues affecting women and their families."

The description of the program does not imply that the advice in question is not useful for others than the group to which the daily segment is directed. That it may be aimed at women in particular is no more sexist than is the aiming of boxing or wrestling or even less violent sports at a male audience. That it may be aimed at women in particular is no more discriminatory than targeting Saturday morning cartoons at children.

The Council agreed that the *Sex-Role Portrayal Code* dealt with the portrayal of persons in a broadcast, not the targeting of the show at an audience.

Are women the only victims of family violence?

In another letter, the listener complained about a public service announcement (PSA) from the Canadian Association of Broadcasters on family violence that had been aired on CFRA-AM radio in Ottawa. The script of the PSA, which featured five different women, read as follows:

At first, you may think that these women have nothing in common. But they do. They have all suffered at the hands of someone close to them. What begins with control, emotional and verbal abuse, often becomes physical violence. And every day the list grows longer. Don't let it continue. Have a plan for your safety and get help. Violence makes victims of us all. A message from Canada's private broadcasters.

The listener was upset that the announcement had referred to women as victims of violence and that the announcement had implied that the "cause of all violence in the family is men," which the listener believed was a violation of the CRTC policy on gender portrayal.

In this ad only women's needs are shown. The responsibility for violence, it is implied, is men's alone. This is unfair, biased, and ignores a large part of the problem: women's violence against children as well as men.

In reply, the station's General Manager explained that the station had been airing the announcement for many months to support awareness of family violence.

It is a well documented problem in our country and in our local community. We have reviewed the copy and are quite satisfied it does not violate the spirit or letter of the CRTC's policy on gender portrayal.

The complainant was not satisfied with the station's response, and asked that the CBSC's Ontario Regional Council consider the matter. In reviewing the case, the Council members reviewed all correspondence and listened to a tape of the PSA in question. The Council members agreed that it did not violate any of the provisions of the *Sex-Role Portrayal Code*. Members agreed that the PSA, while focussing on violence imposed by men on women, was a "fair, realistic and justifiable presentation" of one aspect of family violence.

The fact that a portrayal may have some negative implications does not mean that it will be in breach of the Code. For that result to occur, the portrayal must be unfairly or unjustifiably negative.

...

The Council further recognizes, however, that some male listeners who were not, themselves, violent, could be troubled by PSAs that left the impression that all men were violent. Council members are, however, more strongly of the view that fair-minded men and women will acknowledge that physical abuse is more often perpetrated by men on women than the other way round and that this PSA is *not* a depiction of the actions of all men or even most men.

In its decision, the Council members also noted that the station had responded fully to the complainant's concerns, even though the response had reflected "some frustration at being inundated by complaints of a similar nature from a single complainant."

Can a "futurist" speak for all men?

In a third letter, the listener wrote to the CRTC to complain about a broadcast on CFRA-AM featuring a futurist and his comments about men and women. In the "Dr. Tomorrow" short feature program, the futurist host, Frank Ogden, had this to say:

If you're a man who's having trouble adjusting to today's empowered women, let me ruin your day. In the United States, women own almost three million businesses. That's 25% of the total, generating around 100 billion in revenue. And they're often getting into new sunrise deals, not the sunset industries men are familiar with. For example, here in Canada, two of the largest corporations, General Motors and Xerox, are run by women. In the communications age, women have a huge advantage: intuition.

It's true that the computer is extending all human mental capacity. But women are doing more with it. Decisions in the future will be based on the latest information available, the perception of reality and intuition. Men aren't even in the same game with that ability but, in evolutionary times, those with even a 1% advantage will be the dominant survivors. Look for women to soon hold more than 50% of jobs and positions of power and influence.

In his letter, the listener complained that Ogden had implied that many men are sexist, and that men and women are not "intellectual or emotional equals."

No study shows women have instinct and men do not. No study shows that "instinct" determines business success. Rather, successful men and women both have the following characteristics: hard work, new ideas, persistence, experience and leadership skills, none of which are transmitted by instinct. Ogden insults women by implying that women are successful in business not because of individual merit, effort, or value, but because all women were born with some magical voodoo-feminist instinct that men can never hope to have. ... Ogden's "future" evidently does not include men in business.

In his response, the station's General Manager explained that the futurist's comments were "tongue-in-cheek, fair and good natured."

He was subtlety [*sic*] reminding men that technology and advances in the technological workplace are evening the playing field for everyone. All people will soon have an equal opportunity at success. He did *not* in any way, shape or form suggest that, as you charge, "... many or large numbers of men are sexist and opposed to successful women in business."

The complainant was not satisfied with this response, and asked that the CBSC's Ontario Regional Council review the matter. Members listened to a tape of the program in question and reviewed all related correspondence.

The Council stated that it felt the complainant had a "distorted" understanding of what the futurist said; he had interpreted the phrase "If you're a man who's having trouble adjusting to today's empowered women" to mean that "many or large numbers of men are sexist and opposed to successful women in business."

That is not Council's view of the statement at all. It is merely a rhetorical technique to set up a "straw man" to knock down. The statement is totally devoid of any quantitative connotation. Nor does the statement deny in any way that "Many men encourage and mentor bright, hardworking women." The Council does not agree that the foregoing comments "were a provocative and unfair portrayal of men's attitudes toward women."

Council members also stated that it was clear from listening to the text of the piece that the program did not claim to be "scientific" or statistically unassailable. The Council agrees that the item was simply an "opinion piece," which therefore could not be "either right or wrong."

The Council members also disagreed with the complainant's conclusion that the futurist believed the future "evidently does not include men in business." They surmised that "the complainant's misperception must flow from the disadvantage that all complainants suffer, namely, that a bit of programming goes by them without their having the precise words to play back and assess *carefully and accurately*." The members pointed out that Ogden had stated women in the United States owned 25% of businesses, "which clearly means that men own the other 75%."

The Council members agreed that the program did not violate any of the provisions of the CAB *Sex-Role Portrayal Code*.

"International Men's Day" ignored

In another letter addressed to the CRTC, the listener complained about a story on CFRA-AM radio's 5:00 p.m. newscast on International Women's Day, which read:

It's not a statutory holiday yet but today is International Women's Day and, as Angela Hicks tells us, women are patting themselves on the back. If you go by the numbers, you might still say every day is International Men's Day. Stats Canada reports women spend almost twice as much time taking care of the house and kids as men do. And for full time work outside the home, we earn an average of 72 cents on their dollar. Well, the YMCA-YWCA of Ottawa-Carleton thinks it's time to recognize the overlooked among us.

The complainant, who pointed out that he had organized International Men's Day in Ottawa for three years, stated that he found the story "offensive, unfair and violates just about every principle of your code on portrayal of men and women." He went on to say that CFRA had not reported on his International Men's Day activities, and that the station had "used this news broadcast to jeer at an unfunded grassroots day organized by men to portray positive images of masculinity."

The station's General Manager replied by stating that he had reviewed the broadcast and found that it had contained only factual information.

It was International Women's Week and the story and content reflected that. In no way was this story a violation of the CRTC's policy on gender portrayal. The story was a reflection of a "world scale" event of interest to a diverse group of men and women.

CFRA reports news of interest and concern to the community regardless of the gender of the newsmaker. Issues important to both genders are represented on CFRA in a fair and balanced manner each and every time.

The General Manager went on to suggest that the complainant's displeasure with CFRA's coverage of International Women's Day was "rooted in your involvement with an organization of International Men's Day."

The listener was not satisfied with this response, and asked that the CBSC's Ontario Regional Council review the matter. The Council members reviewed a tape of the program in question and read all related correspondence.

In making its decision, the Council considered the story under the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code*, which demands that broadcasters respect the equality of both sexes, and the *CAB Code of Ethics*, which ensures that news is represented with accuracy and without bias. Members assumed that the news story in question was not "seriously inaccurate." The Council also pointed out that the lack of reporting of International Men's Day was not relevant to the complainant's case.

It certainly must be true that not every special "Day" is reported on in the news and it would not be reasonable or possible for every broadcaster to report on every such day. ... The complainant does not, however, have an entitlement to complain about any lack of balance in the treatment of men's and women's issues on the simple basis of the comparison of between the treatment of the respective International Days.

Council members agreed that the report was a statement of facts that did not exploit or abuse men, and that "by reporting on a story highlighting women, the station did not discriminate against men, did not

select news in order to further or hinder one side of a controversial issue and did not exploit men." The Council members agreed that the broadcaster did not breach either of the Codes.

News and public-affairs programming

Viewer and listener concerns addressed to the CBSC are becoming more subtle and at the same time more controversial. In 1996-97, many complaints about news and public-affairs programs were from those who were the topic of the news stories. Also, Canadians were concerned about news reporters crossing the line and becoming the subject of their own news reports.

Reporting news versus making news

In March 1995, the B.C. Federation of Labour sent a letter to the CBSC complaining that CKNW-AM radio of New Westminster, British Columbia, had violated the *CAB Code of Ethics*. The Federation's President said that this violation had led him to believe that the station had a "bias against the Premier of the province and his government." He stated that CKNW's actions had "caused the public to question the station's journalistic integrity."

CKNW's political correspondent and Victoria bureau chief had raised a question about the action of then Premier Harcourt to the province's Conflict of Interest Commissioner, Ted Hughes. The question was whether the Premier was in either a real or a perceived conflict of interest because of contractual arrangements between the Government of the day and NOW Communications, an advertising agency run by a prominent New Democrat.

The Federation noted that the station had filed the allegations during a period in which broadcasting ratings were being measured, and that the reporter and the news director at the station had subsequently continued to report on and assign stories about the government.

Because of these actions, the Federation wrote that it believed the station had violated the *CAB Code of Ethics*, not only by creating news by filing the conflict-of-interest allegation with the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, but also by failing to ask Premier Harcourt directly if the substance of the allegation was correct and reporting on his response before filing the allegation.

They said that the station had presented only one side of the issue and had taken a position "identical to the position taken by the two major opposition political parties, the Liberal and Reform parties." Among other things, the Federation said that the station had approached the Liberal and Reform parties "to see if they were interested in filing the allegation," and had publicly misrepresented its decision to file the allegation.

The CBSC forwarded the complainant's letter to the station for reply. The Program Director responded to the complaint by stating that the station had presented the NOW Communications issue in its broadcasts in a "fair and balanced way."

Claims of bias against media are as old as media itself. Good journalists consider it their role to ask pointed questions about those in power, whoever they happen to be from year to year, and whatever their political stripes. Doing so might inspire those in power or their friends to cry "bias" when they happen to be on the receiving end of a pointed question, but the cry does not make it so.

The Program Director stated that, in this situation, it was important to consider the principle of freedom of the press.

That freedom includes the right to do what some might find unpopular. High journalistic standards should not be treated as a set of "don'ts" defined by one arbiter's values. It should embrace the larger importance of having the freedom to ask hard questions and make courageous decisions.

The B.C. Federation of Labour was not satisfied with the station's response, and asked the CBSC's British Columbia Regional Council to consider the matter urgently, because of the strong public interest in the outcome.

Usually, Regional Councils begin considering cases by discussing the broadcast that is brought into question by the complaint. For the first time, in this case, the Council was asked to rule on the off-air activities of one of its members. The Regional Council therefore reviewed the related correspondence only in making its decision. The members considered two issues: whether the broadcaster had been impartial in reporting the news, and whether the broadcaster was in a real or apparent situation of conflict of interest.

Impartiality in reporting the news

The Regional Council did not consider that CKNW had breached the CAB Code of Ethics provisions that deal with full, fair and proper presentation of news, or that demand fair treatment of all subjects of a controversial nature. The Regional Council members concluded that there were no newscasts that had not reported on the matters fairly, and that there had been no references to a broadcast which was inaccurate or biased.

The Council also noted that CKNW had not been editorial in its presentation of the news on any occasion. "If fault there is on the part of CKNW, the Regional Council concludes that it was not in the breach of either Article 6 or Article 7 of the CAB Code of Ethics."

Conflict of interest, real or apparent

Council members did agree that CKNW had violated Article 5 of the RTNDA *Code of Ethics*, which requires journalists to "govern themselves on and off the job in such a way as to avoid conflict of interest, real or apparent." By raising a question with the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, CKNW had put itself in an apparent conflict of interest.

By bringing a complaint to the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, Mr. Emerson and his employer, as broadcast journalists, involved themselves in a public position on the controversy; indeed they may be said to have created the controversy. The broadcast journalist's role is to investigate a matter and *report* it to the public, not to take a public stand on such an issue by bringing the matter to the Conflict of Interest Commissioner.

The Council members disagreed with a claim by the broadcaster that the reporter was not urging a result one way or the other, saying the reporter had not done so "on a lark."

The Council is prepared to give Mr. Emerson the benefit of the doubt by assuming that he considered that he had grounds for what he did. The Council equally believes that what he did constitutes a clear breach of the RTNDA Code's conflict of interest provision.

Concerning the broadcaster's suggestion that the report was an exercise in freedom of speech, the Council members asserted that CKNW had abdicated its vital societal role by not seeking the truth itself and reporting the facts as it found them, and instead "attempting to transfer its responsibility to the Commissioner."

CKNW was required to broadcast a statement outlining the Council's decision during peak listening hours.

The other side of NOW

In March 1995, a viewer in Campbell River, British Columbia, wrote to the CBSC to complain about "extremely biased reporting" of the "NOW Communications - Ron Johnston Affair" on CHEK-TV, BCTV and CBC. The news reports explained that the provincial government was not renewing its contract with NOW Communications. On CHEK-TV, the announcer had read the following:

NOW Communications will lose its \$550 per day retainer with the Harcourt Government as of the end of this month. The Premier says that contract has been reviewed and will not be renewed but he denies it's because of Opposition charges that NOW is too closely linked with the NDP. The latest revelation from the Liberals is that NOW was paid \$3500 to write and print a letter for the Premier.

The viewer complained that the story, while condemning the B.C. government for awarding 15% of its advertising budget to a party member, had not mentioned "the previous government's practise of having awarded 100% of such contracts to party supporters, as well as the practice of provincial Liberal governments in other provinces."

The CBSC forwarded the letter to CHEK-TV for reply. In his response, the station's News Director questioned the figures the complainant had used in his letter, saying there was no way to determine the percentage of communications contracts the previous government had awarded to companies with political affiliations.

I am highly skeptical that it could have been 100%. The practices of "provincial Liberal governments in other provinces" would be limited to the Maritimes and would not be considered a relevant factor in reporting on this incident.

The News Director stated that he had reviewed the news items in question, and that he could "find no evidence of bias in the coverage."

The viewer was not satisfied with the station's response, and filed a written request with the CBSC that the British Columbia Regional Council consider the matter. The Council members reviewed the case under the CAB *Code of Ethics*, which requires that news be represented with accuracy and without bias. The Regional Council reviewed the correspondence and viewed a tape of the newscast in question.

Regional Council members agreed that the news item itself was "straightforward." Council stated that it had surmised the complainant was concerned that the station had not gone far enough in providing balance by providing a historical context for any "issue of pork barrel politics."

That, though, is a part of the political cut-and-thrust and is thus the job of the political opponents, *not* the news reporting bodies, electronic or print. A news-gathering body may legitimately *choose* to research and tell such a tale but it is not *obliged* to do so every time. The absence of such context to a report does not imply an absence of balance in it.

In this case, Regional Council members agreed that the broadcaster had not violated the CAB *Code of Ethics*.

Is "gutter" language obscene?

A viewer from Surrey, British Columbia, wrote to the CBSC to complain about a sportscaster, Neil McRae, who had appeared twice on the same CHAN-TV (BCTV) early-evening newscast. During the two appearances, the sportscaster had discussed the management team of the Vancouver Canucks and, in expressing his opinion, had used the words "crap" and "ass."

In his letter, the viewer complained about the "constant use of gutter language" by the sportscaster, saying that his crude language was "completely unacceptable" and was "setting a very poor example" for young people.

The CBSC forwarded a copy of the letter to the station for reply. In the response, BCTV's Sports Director stated that he could appreciate the viewer's concerns about McRae's on-air statements, describing him as someone who "adds a controversial dimension to sports broadcasting." He assured the viewer he would pass on his concerns to the sportscaster.

The viewer was not satisfied with this response, and requested that the CBSC's British Columbia Regional Council consider the matter. The Regional Council reviewed all related correspondence and viewed the videotape of the newscast in question.

The Council members noted that the words the sportscaster had used, namely "crap" and "ass," were not obscene.

The words in question are not, in the view of Council, attractive, articulate or perhaps even appropriate to the airwaves. They may even be, to use the characterization of the complainant, "gutter or crude" language. They are not, however, in the view of the B.C. Regional Council, either obscene or profane, which is ultimately the test which the Regional Council must apply. To the extent that the question is one of taste rather than obscenity or profanity, the CBSC will not interfere with the broadcaster's choice.

Council members therefore agreed that the broadcaster had not breached the CAB *Code of Ethics*.

White supremacists and anti-racists

A viewer from Kamloops, British Columbia, wrote a letter to the CRTC to complain about the content of a news story that appeared on CFJC-TV's *TV7 News* broadcast. The four-minute story was about the newly established Kamloops Anti-Racism Group. The news anchor introduced the subject by saying "Its members say that you don't have to look very far to find the footprints of white supremacist activity," and used library footage of B.C. white supremacists. Two minutes into the story, the report stated that the first target of the anti-racism group was a Valleyview shop that allegedly catered to white supremacists. The story used excerpts of an interview with the store's owner.

The viewer protested that the story was "in the worst taste possible," because the subject matter had included a statement by a woman representing an anti-racist society, and had contained "deliberate & derogatory statements amounting to fear concerning a proprietor of a store in Valleyview."

In his response, CFJC-TV's News Director said he had no ethical problem with the way the story had been handled.

The story was very unbiased, the reporter did in fact not make any derogatory statements, and in my view, handled both the initial news release from the group and the follow up with the store proprietor in

very balanced fashion. The store owner was on camera several times during the story, discussing the issues, and offering his point of view.

The viewer was not satisfied with the station's response, and requested that the British Columbia Regional Council consider the matter. The Council members reviewed all related correspondence and viewed the videotape of the newscast.

Stating that there was no doubt the story was publicly important, Council members said the message of the report was to "remind viewers that white supremacists were not merely a distant phenomenon, which might *still* be worthy of the station's news department's attention, but also a *local* phenomenon."

The Council is of the view that the station presented a balanced news report. While it included footage of the shop's merchandise, targeting some particularly violent and provocative book titles, and the reference to the portrait of Adolf Hitler, which was no longer on the wall photographed, it also provided the opportunity for the store owner to give his point of view on those issues.

The Council considered that the story was presented in an objective and balanced fashion that conformed entirely to the *Code of Ethics* requirements.

Cats, dogs and balanced reporting

Two Toronto, Ontario, viewers of CITY-TV's *Pulse News* faxed a letter to the CRTC to complain about a news story the station had aired about the Toronto Humane Society's seizing of animals from the viewers' home.

CITY-TV began its coverage with the following:

Police have arrested a west-end couple after a raid of their home yesterday revealed some 70 dogs and cats living in filthy overcrowded conditions. Our videographer ... follows the story we broke last night.

The newscast included footage of the couple and the exterior of the building in question. It summarized the story by reporting that police had charged the couple with two counts of causing unnecessary cruelty to animals and one count of fraud, and concluded by saying that police were considering laying other charges. The final section of the news report was essentially a public-awareness piece, informing viewers about the activities of animal-welfare organizations.

In their letter, the viewers stated that the seizure was part of the Humane Society's "fund-raising drives," that fraud charges were pending against the Society and the Metro Toronto Police, and that CITY-TV had sold its news story to other stations in the Toronto area. The viewers described the Humane Society as an "arrogant, harassing group of powerless civilians," and the news story about the seizure as "biased."

This was not good investigative journalism since my side was never established. The message was clear: "sinister couple charged with cruelty to animals." ... WE WERE NOT ASKED FOR OUR SIDE OF THE STORY. OUR CHARACTERS WERE VICIOUSLY SLANDERED TO ASSIST THE T.H.S. [Toronto Humane Society] FUNDRAISERS. [Emphasis in original letter.]

CITY-TV's Director of News Programming responded with a letter outlining the events of the news story. He said that the assignment editor had sent a camera to the viewer's residence to record the search and seizure. The reporter, he said, had interviewed the arresting officers about the condition of the residence and the nature of the charges, and the staff at the Toronto Humane Society about the welfare of the animals. The Director stated that the reporter had attempted to interview the owners of the house, but one avoided the camera crew, while the other was in police custody.

There was absolutely nothing misleading about our report. Our story was centred on the information provided to us by the authorities in question. ... I can assure you we have every intention of following this story through the courts, and I promise, as in all our stories ... [you] will be given ample opportunity to speak to our cameras directly.

The Director also took issue with various allegations the viewers had made in their original letter of complaint, and clarified that CITY-TV had not sold the story to anyone, had no knowledge of any form of fund-raising, and that no charges of fraud had been laid against the police or the Humane Society.

The viewers were not satisfied with this response, and asked that the CBSC Ontario Regional Council consider the matter. The Regional Council members reviewed all of the correspondence and viewed a tape of the newscast.

Council members considered the complaint under the CAB *Code of Ethics* and the RTNDA *Code of (Journalistic) Ethics*.

The Council members had no difficulty with the station reporting the arrest of the individuals. In addition, Council members considered that, in not interviewing the parties charged by the police, the broadcaster has done nothing "improper or out of the ordinary."

It must be remembered that the reporting of an arrest is not the equivalent of the reporting of two or more sides of a controversial issue. In the latter case there is an obligation on the broadcaster to present the *various* points of view fairly. No such obligation exists in the simple reporting of a non-controversial news event, which is what an arrest is. If there is any counterpoint to the arrest itself, it is provided by the rules of the criminal justice system. There is necessarily attached to every arrest a *societal* presumption of innocence which is, in a sense, the counterpoint or balance to the news of the arrest itself.

The Council members agreed that the broadcast in question did not breach either of the Codes, stating that any sensationalism "arose *out of the story itself* and not from the station's reporting of it."

Privacy in your own backyard

A viewer in Kelowna, British Columbia, wrote a letter to the CBSC complaining that members of a CHBC-TV news crew had not respected his and his family's privacy when they entered his backyard and "secretly" videotaped him through the kitchen window of his home.

An earlier story that had aired on the station's newscast, about a couple who had purchased a home from the complainant which they later learned had a dry well, began with information about their lawsuit in the B.C. Supreme Court and their attempt to collect the award of \$14,000 from the complainant.

The story in question, which used videotape footage shot through the kitchen, including a short interview with the complainant, described the lack of success the plaintiffs had had in collecting the judgment amount. The reporter had visited the defendant's home to interview him and had been refused a formal interview.

The complainant's letter detailed the events that occurred after the news crew arrived "on my outside deck" and videotaped the family.

The greater concern here is: Are television news reporters allowed to enter upon private property, unannounced and uninvited, secretly peer inside a Canadian citizen's home and freely video whatever he or she want to, and then broadcast these images publicly?

The CBSC forwarded the letter to CHBC-TV for reply. In his response, the station's News Director acknowledged that the camera crew had arrived on the complainant's private property, and that they had had a conversation through the kitchen window. However, he denied the allegation "that all the while our photographer had been "secretly" taping the activities of you and your family." He went on:

...when you ask if it is our station policy to enter onto private property to conduct interviews, I suppose I shall have to say yes. In fact, we operate this way as a matter of routine, however, I must add a caveat to this by stating it is further our policy that when our crews are asked to leave, they do so immediately. ... In this sense, we are no different that any other person entering upon your private property, be they door to door salesmen, Girl Guides, United Way Volunteers, etc.

The viewer was not satisfied with this response, and asked that the CBSC's British Columbia Regional Council consider the matter. The Regional Council members viewed a tape of the program in question and reviewed all of the correspondence.

The Council members considered the matter under the RTNDA *Code of Ethics*. In terms of the invasion of privacy, the members noted that the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* provides no absolute right to privacy for Canadian citizens. When no notice is given that access to property is prohibited, as in this case, the Council members agreed that there was no invasion of privacy.

In fact, the complainant did not appear the least bit angered or concerned by the presence of the film crew on his property. He did not indicate any problem with this issue in his letter of July 15. Nor would the Regional Council be overly sympathetic with such a concern. In their view, if news organizations were required to make an appointment every time they wanted to get a story, they would be effectively handicapped, if not muzzled. It should also be noted that, in this particular case, the broadcaster was seeking the other side of a story for which it had, until then, only obtained the plaintiff's point of view. If anything, the defendant was being given the chance to present his own perspective on the issue.

Council members noted that the interview was not "elicited on any clandestine, misleading or fraudulent basis." The camera crew was not hiding in his backyard, but was "in the open."

Council members also discussed court proceedings, and agreed that the right to privacy ends when an individual becomes "a party to court proceedings."

In the absence of a judicial order to the contrary, the CBSC considers that all court proceedings and their outcomes are *public* by their nature. ...

In the matter at hand, the story began and ended as a news item with an element of informed analysis. The piece alerted members of the public to the dangers of purchasing a house with undisclosed structural problems and the potential perilous consequences, even where a wronged buyer is found justified in his or her claim by the court.

Council members, while expecting the complainant to feel "sensitive at *being* the example," stated that it does not make his complaint valid; "his complaint was that there was coverage of the incident *at all*."

Council members agreed that the story was one "the broadcaster was entitled to tell," and decided that the newscast had not breached the RTNDA *Code of Ethics*.

Journalism at the edge

Two viewers from Maple Ridge, British Columbia, wrote a letter to the CRTC complaining about the "malicious, one-sided and destructive coverage" of the Ridge Meadows Recycling Society, which had

appeared on two CHAN-TV newscasts. The complainants were both members of the Society's senior management.

The Society is a not-for-profit organization that hires physically and mentally challenged people to work in its recycling facility. A CHAN-TV reporter and crew had filmed mentally challenged employees working outdoors, and interviewed a Ridge Meadows official and an individual who had signed a memo alleging abuse of handicapped employees. In the first newscast, the news anchor introduced the item this way:

There are serious and disturbing allegations tonight against a non-profit society that runs a recycling facility in Maple Ridge. The plant employs a number of physically and mentally challenged workers but accusations by former employees of cruel treatment have brought the Social Services Ministry into the picture.

In a second newscast, the reporter interviewed another Ridge Meadows official and discussed the finances of the Society, suggesting that there was some financial mismanagement in the salaries the Society paid to its staff and in the sources of the organization's funds.

In the letter to the CRTC, the Society's Executive Director said that the news crew had arrived with no prior notification and had not been authorized to film the mentally challenged employees. The Executive Director added that the reports seemed to have been intended to smear the "reputation for vision and humanity upon which the Society was founded" by alleging financial irregularities that were unfounded.

The reference to financial irregularities based on a term deposit balance of \$176,000 is misleading and libelous. The report infers that the Society amassed these funds from the \$641,000 received from different levels of government during 1995. In fact this money was accumulated over 15 years. Further the reference to government **grants** is incorrect and misleading. The society **contracts** with government to provide services.

The reporter states that the \$94,497 increase in wages in 1995 was attributed to a 12% increase in administrative wages. In fact the \$94,497 represents a 2.5% increase for all staff and the additions of 7 full and part time positions. At no time did the interviewer ask for the reasons why there was an increase in 1995 over 1994. The message conveyed is clearly designed to discredit and malign.

The complainant said these points showed the station presented only "one-sided coverage" as truth, and that no attempt at balance had been made.

In his response, the station's Vice President/News Director explained that the issues of mistreatment of employees and financial mismanagement on the part of Ridge Meadows were of public interest and were legitimate to examine in a news broadcast. He noted that the employees were filmed at some distance and could not be identified individually. He also noted that the Society had, in both newscasts, been invited to respond to the allegations. He indicated that, in his opinion, the Society's point of view had been presented fairly and adequately.

Members of the Society were not satisfied with this response, and requested that the CBSC's British Columbia Regional Council consider the matter. At the same time, the Society's Director of Off-Site Programs sent an explanatory letter, saying that the allegations in the newscast that the Mayor of Maple Ridge corroborated the financial concerns about the Society were incorrect. She enclosed a letter from the Mayor stating that he was unaware of any specific financial concerns associated with the Recycling Society.

The CBSC also received a letter from the Society's Director of Finance and Personnel and the Plant Supervisor, responding to BCTV's reply and explaining how the news crew had approached them "in an aggressive way."

After reviewing the tape of the newscasts and examining all related correspondence, the Regional Council members decided that CHAN-TV had not breached the CAB *Code of Ethics* or the RTNDA's *Code of (Journalistic) Ethics*. The Council did note, however, that in some respects, the newscasts were only on the "edge of acceptability."

The Council affirmed that news crews cannot gather the news "by appointment" for every report they prepare. Such an expectation would have had the effect of muzzling the ability of the reporter to present this issue of public interest. The Council added that viewers could not have identified the mentally challenged individuals who appeared in the reports in the brief time they had appeared on camera, and that there was a "compelling interest" in using these unidentified images to illustrate the story. However, the Council members were "somewhat troubled" by the reporter's ultimately unfounded suggestions of financial mismanagement.

The reporter had implied that the Society received government grants for its financing, when in fact it received payment for services rendered as a result of its contract with the local government. He also incorrectly extrapolated, from the Society's budget, that overall salary increases of 12% had been misrepresented by the Society as being merely 2%, reporting this error through what the Council considered was a "sarcastic and apparently unwarranted comment." This presentation did not, in the Council's view, meet the standards of telling the story fairly, comprehensively and accurately, but it did not breach the industry's Codes on ethics and journalistic practices.

It is not, and cannot be, that every inadvertence or inappropriate comment will fall afoul of the various broadcaster Codes. This is a case where they do not but where the Council would have wished that the broadcaster had been further from the edge.

A young death in a small town

A listener from Kings County, Nova Scotia, wrote a letter to CKEN-AM radio to express dismay over a "malicious and unforgivable" newscast that reported the death of the listener's relative. The text of the first broadcast read as follows:

A young Kings County woman who was involved in a fatal accident about a year and a half ago has lost her own life in another fatal accident. New Minas RCMP have identified nineteen year old [...] of Canning as the victim of Friday afternoon's single car accident just outside Canning. [She] was involved in another accident in June of 1994 when she ran over a Kentville man who had fallen off the back of a motorcycle. It was never determined whether [he] died from the fall or from being run over. But police determined charges weren't warranted in that accident.

A second broadcast had this to say:

A young Canning woman who endured more than her share of tragedy has been identified as the victim of an accident late last week. Nineteen year old [...] was the lone occupant of a car that went out of control and crashed on Highway 358 just outside Canning Friday afternoon. [She] was cleared of any wrongdoing in a fatal accident in Kentville a year and a half ago. Her car struck a man who had fallen off the back of a motorcycle. But police determined she wasn't at fault.

The complainant was concerned that the report, which aired just before the deceased's funeral, brought up the earlier accident to "smear and humiliate the name of an innocent young girl just to make a news story more dramatic." The girl had never been charged in the earlier accident, and her name had not been released at the time because of her age.

The question the family is asking is why was that all brought up and announced along with the accident which took her life? The way it came across the radio is that she finally got what she deserved.

...

Since when does a news reporter have the right to deliberately exaggerate a death report to such a point that it becomes more important than the loss of an innocent life? We request the parties be held responsible for their actions.

The station's Director of Operations, responding to the listener's letter, replied directly to the deceased's parents. She apologized for the grief the family had suffered and stated that the station had not intended to be malicious. She stated that the news stories had not implied that the girl "finally got what she deserved," and that nothing in the stories had been exaggerated.

The facts of this story are not in dispute and what we did was to report the facts. The reason for bringing up the first accident was to point out the tragedy your daughter dealt with in her short life.

The airing of the story just prior to the funeral was a matter of bad timing. It was simply a coincidence that police released her name just before the funeral, the time of which the news department had no prior knowledge.

The girl's parents wrote to the CBSC to express their dissatisfaction with the station's response, asking that the CBSC refer the matter to its Atlantic Regional Council for consideration. The Council members reviewed an audiotape of the broadcast in question and read all related correspondence.

In their deliberations, Council members discussed the dignity and privacy of the victim and her family versus the station's need to report on the victim's earlier accident. In general, members were not troubled by the station's treatment of the family or the victim in terms of dignity or privacy.

They were concerned, however, with the station's reporting of the victim's past accident. Council members pointed out that the previous accident had never been mentioned in other media, and that the station reported on information that was not publicly known about the victim.

The Council is of the view that, in reporting on the previous accident, the broadcaster presented irrelevant (although accurate) information that had the effect of harming the feelings, if not the reputation of the family of the deceased and the deceased herself. Pointing out the earlier accident was, at the very least, insensitive and, in any event, not necessary to put the story into perspective and, at worst, it was irrelevant and prejudicial. The Council in fact finds that there was no supportable purpose for suggesting a link between this private citizen's involvement in the past accident and the one that led to her death. The Council does not consider that the ironic twist to the fate of the young woman is a sufficient justification for the reporting of the earlier accident.

Council members agreed that, by airing the past information, CKEN-AM had breached the CAB *Code of Ethics*. The station was required to air an announcement to that effect during peak listening hours.

Not cricket

A representative of a group called Sri Lankans in Ottawa South wrote to the CBSC to express the "bitter disappointment" that Sri Lankan cricket fans were suffering because a program on CFMT-TV, entitled *South Asian Newsweek*, had concentrated on negative issues when reporting the Sri Lankan cricket team's World Cup win.

The story, the last in the line-up of the program, began by noting that Sri Lanka had won the Cricket World Cup after beating Australia in the finals. The story then focussed on the fact that one semi-final match between India and Sri Lanka had become a "riot, literally" when fans in Calcutta had forced the

match to be called off. The news anchor stated that "India would have lost anyway, but this made the defeat even worse."

The videotaped segment then began, explaining how the Indian cricket team and its fans were being condemned for their actions during the semi-final match. The reporter stated that "those inside the stadium could not stomach an Indian upset by the Lankans and began throwing bottles on the field and lighting fires in the stands." The story went on to explain how sports fans had held a rally to protest the "despicable" actions of the fans.

The complainant had this to say about the news story:

This was a great achievement for us Sri Lankans not only to the cricket enthusiasts, but to all Sri Lankans who share patriotic feelings about our motherland! We have found that the SOUTH ASIAN NEWSWEEK will always give much publicity to the rest of the countries like India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and so on in the region. But any news from Sri Lanka has been negative publicity.

The letter went on to accuse the program of "encouraging terrorist activities and violence in another country" by publicizing a certain activist group's demonstrations. The letter included a petition with 17 signatures. A later letter to the CBSC further explained the "danger involved in this L.T.T.E. terrorist group operating in Sri Lanka, and gaining public sympathy by using the broadcasters like the South Asian Newsweek."

The CBSC forwarded a copy of the letter to CFMT-TV for reply. In her response, the station's Vice-President and Executive Producer explained that the news program in question was "designed to reveal the fact without prejudice." She said that the story was reported "as quickly as our schedule would allow on a weekly program."

We also reported on the events that surrounded the forfeit by India of the semi-final game and the behaviour that caused such an unusual thing to occur at any world championship. We assure you that we did not broadcast in an unbalanced manner, intentionally or otherwise, nor do we have any intended prejudice in our editorial coverage.

The viewer was not satisfied with the station's response, and asked that the CBSC's Ontario Regional Council review the matter. The Council members reviewed a tape of the program in question, and also reviewed all correspondence.

The Council members agreed that the program in question, "far from presenting a negative or unfair portrayal of Sri Lankans," presented a factual and positive account of the Sri Lankan victory in World Cup cricket. The members noted that, in this case as in previous cases considered by the CBSC, the complainants' expressed concern was with the way the news story was covered.

The CBSC has, on several occasions, dealt with the treatment of a story when the station has not dealt with the matter in the way in which the complainant would have wished.

...

What all of these concerns have in common is that the broadcaster will have made a choice not shared by one or some members of its audience.

...

The bottom line is this. As long as the reporting does not *breach* the standards established in the various industry Codes, the broadcaster is free to tell the story the way it wishes to.

Members noted that part of the complaint dealt with the station's overall news coverage of Sri Lankan events and issues. The members agreed that the Council could deal only with the specific program mentioned by the complainant, and not with CFMT-TV's news coverage in general.

The second part of the complaint suggested that the Sri Lankan victory in World Cup cricket was an opportunity for CFMT-TV to broadcast some positive news about Sri Lanka, but that CFMT-TV had missed that opportunity. The members of the Regional Council felt that, on the contrary, CFMT-TV's depiction of the Sri Lankans was "quite positive" and credited the team for its victory. Thus, Council members agreed that, even in the context of the specific news report, there was "balance" and fair presentation of the story. Members agreed that the station had not breached the *CAB Code of Ethics*.

3. Summary Tables of Complaints

1. Overview

In 1996/97, the CBSC received 262 complaints.

- Of these, it actually handled 214, or 82 %, since 48 fell within the mandates of the CAF, the CTSC, or a non-member broadcaster.
- The CBSC, nonetheless, responded to all the complaints including those sent elsewhere.
- While most complaints arrived by mail or fax, nine came by the new CBSC facility, e-mail.

2. Region

Of the 262 complaints received, the majority dealt with Ontario broadcasters.

Region of Complaint				
Region	Radio	Television	Not specified	Total
Atlantic	3	22	0	25
Quebec	1	44	1	46
Ontario	24	72	4	100
Prairie	5	43	1	49
BC	7	28	2	37
Not specified	0	4	1	5
TOTAL	40	213	9	262

3. Radio and Television Complaints

Of the 214 complaints handled by the CBSC,

- 36 dealt with radio programming (17%)
- 170 dealt with television programming (79%)
- 8 could not be determined (4%).

4. Language of Program

Of the 214 complaints handled by the CBSC,

- 152 dealt with English-language programming (71%)
- 13 dealt with French-language programming (6%)
- 4 dealt with third language (ethnic) programming (2%)
- 45 did not provide enough information to be language classified (21%)

Language of Program								
Language	Radio		Television		N/D		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
English	31	86	120	71	1	13	152	71
French	1	3	11	6	1	13	13	6
Other	4	11	0	0	0	0	4	2
Not Specified	0	0	39	23	6	75	45	21
TOTAL	36	100	170	100	8	100	214	100

Note: In several cases, the complainants did not provide complete information regarding program language, type and/or source.

5. Source of Program

Of the 214 complaints handled by the CBSC,

- 83 dealt with Canadian programming (39%)
- 44 dealt with foreign programming (21%)
- 87 could not be so classified (40%)

Source of Program						
Source	Radio		Television		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Canadian	33	92	50	29	83	39
Foreign	1	3	43	25	44	21
Not specified	2	6	77	45	87	40
TOTAL	36	100	170	100	214	100

Note: In 8 of the unspecified source complaints, the complainants did not disclose whether their concern was about television or radio programming

6. Type of Program - Radio

Of the 36 radio complaints,

- 9 dealt with public affairs programming (25% of radio complaints)
- 9 dealt with open line programming (25% of radio complaints)
- 6 dealt with informal discourse or conversation (17% of radio complaints)

Type of Program - Radio			
Type of Program	# of Radio Complaints	% of Radio Complaints	% of all Complaints
Public Affairs	9	25	4
Open line	9	25	4
Informal Conversation	6	17	3
News	4	11	2
Advertising	3	8	1
General	3	8	1
Music	1	2	1
Other spoken word	1	2	1
TOTAL	36	100	17

7. Type of Program - Television

Of the 170 television complaints,

- 38 dealt with drama or comedy programming (22% of television complaints)
- 35 dealt with news programming (21% of television complaints)

- 35 dealt with children's programming (21% of television complaints)

Type of Program - Television			
Type of Program	# of TV Complaints	% of TV Complaints	% of all Complaints
Drama/comedy	38	22	18
News programming	35	21	16
Children's programming	35	21	16
General	29	17	14
Advertising	23	14	11
Human interest	5	3	2
Sports	4	2	2
Public Affairs	1	1	1
TOTAL	170	100	80

8. Codes and Clauses

Often, a complaint will refer to more than one code or clause. Thus, the number of complaints considered under the codes and clauses can appear to exceed the number of letters received by the CBSC.

CAB Code of Ethics

Most of the complaints received under this code concerned the presentation of news and related programming or human rights.

In 1996/97, 65 complaints dealt with this code, 28 in radio and 37 in television.

CAB CODE OF ETHICS Clause	Radio #	TV #	Total #
News	18	27	45
Human Rights	19	6	25
Advertising	2	3	5
Controversial Public Issues	2	2	4
Children's Programming	0	1	1
Religious Programming	0	1	1
TOTAL	41	40	81

CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code

Most of the complaints considered under this code related to the question of the exploitation of women, men and children. Several complaints focussed on the inaccurate portrayal of men.

SEX-ROLE PORTRAYAL CODE Clause	Radio #	TV #	Total #
Exploitation	2	15	17
Diversity	0	1	1
Changing Interaction	1	0	1
TOTAL	3	16	19

RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics

Most of the complaints considered under this news-oriented code dealt with distortion or sensationalism, irrelevancy of reporting, and privacy issues.

RTNDA CODE OF ETHICS Clause	Radio #	TV #	Total #
Distortion/sensationalism	3	11	14
Irrelevant information	3	10	13
Respect for privacy/dignity	2	7	9
Accuracy/comprehensiveness	2	7	9
Conflict of Interest	0	1	1
Politeness of journalists	0	1	1
TOTAL	10	35	45

CAB Voluntary Code Regarding Violence in Television Programming

Most of the complaints considered under this code concerned gratuitous violence, the lack of viewer advisories and the scheduling of programs (before or after the "watershed" hour of 9 p.m.).

TV VIOLENCE CODE Clause	TV #
Content	19
Scheduling	9
Viewer Advisories	8
News	4
Violence in Sports Programming	2
Violence Against Animals	1
Violence Against Women	1
TOTAL	44

Vision TV Code of Ethics, Standards and Practices

Vision TV joined the CBSC in 1997 and one complaint was received. It dealt with English language television programming and the issue of discrimination/racism.

General Complaints

In addition, the CBSC handled a number of general complaints not related to a particular code or related to the broad issue of television violence

General Complaints	Radio & TV #
TV violence	44
Program selection	16
Advertising	14
Sexual Content	7
Children's issues	6
Humour/comedy	4
Other	27
TOTAL	124

Adjudicated Complaints

Of the 107 code relevant complaints, 34 (32%) have already gone or are scheduled to go to Regional Council adjudication and 72 (68%) will not require Regional Council adjudication as they were resolved at the level of broadcaster and complainant discourse. A request for Regional Council adjudication was outstanding for one of the remaining complaints.

4. National Chair and Regional Councils

National Chair

Ronald I. Cohen was named National Chair of the CBSC on June 23, 1993 and began his term on July 1. A film producer and lawyer by profession, Mr. Cohen was the founding Chairman of the Academy of Canadian Cinema and Television in 1979. He served in that role for four years and remains Special Advisor to the Board. For several years he was a member of the Board of Directors of the Consumers' Association of Canada and later acted as Counsel and then as Senior Counsel to Quebec's Commission of Inquiry into Organized Crime. Mr. Cohen has been a Director of the Banff Television Foundation and other organizations. He is the author of *Quebec Votes: An Analysis of Quebec Voting Patterns in Federal Elections*; *The Regulation of Misleading Advertising: A Comparative Approach*; and *The Constitutional Validity of a Trade Practices Law for Canada*; and is nearing completion of *Sir Winston Churchill: A Bibliography of His Published Writings*, which will be published by Cassell in London in 1998.

B.C. Regional Council

Erin Petrie, a broadcaster representative, has chaired the B.C. Regional Council for two years. As Vice President of Okanagan Radio Limited, Ms. Petrie works with eleven of the company's radio licensees. She is the current past President of the B.C. Association of Broadcasters, and presently serves on both the Radio Board and as Treasurer of the Executive Board of the CAB. Ms. Petrie also sits on the B.C. Minister's Advisory Council on Information Technology and served as the Chair of the Radio Advisory Board of British Columbia Institute of Technology's broadcast program. As important as her nineteen years of radio industry experience are her two sons Alex, 11 and Geoff, 15, and time spent skiing, camping and playing tennis with her family.

Robert Mackay, public representative, ended his term this year. He is associate counsel with the Vancouver office of the national law firm Gowling, Strathy and Henderson. Mr. Mackay has extensive advertising and marketing experience with Procter and Gamble Canada, McKim/Benton and Bowles Advertising Ltd., and Scott Paper Ltd. He also serves on the B.C. Council of Advertising Standards Canada.

Monica Becott is retiring from her position on the B.C. Regional Council this year. During her seven years at the Council she served as Vice-Chair. A past City Councillor in Prince George, Ms. Becott was Chairman of Regional District of Fraser Fort George, and served on the Prince George Town Centre Business Association, the B.C. Gaming Commission and the B.C. Heritage Trust.

Gordon Vizzutti, who had been a member of the B.C. Regional Council since 1990, continued as a broadcaster representative for most of the current fiscal year. He is a member of the Radio Television News Directors Association of Canada (RTNDA) and, during his term on the Council, served as News Director at CHBC-TV in Kelowna.

Catherine Murray retired from the Regional Council as a representative of the public this year. An Associate Professor of Communication at Simon Fraser University, Dr. Murray has written and spoken widely on broadcasting and telecommunications issues. Prior to joining Simon Fraser University, Dr. Murray was Vice-President, Media and Telecommunications at Decima Research, and taught as a sessional lecturer and assistant professor at Toronto's York University. She is a member of the Board of Owl Communication, B.C. Film, and the Vancouver International Film Festival, and is a Director of the WTN Foundation on Training and Research.

Susan Brinton ended her term with the Regional Council as a broadcaster representative this year. She had been the Western Director of Canadian Productions for CanWest Global and works at CKVU-TV. A member of the CAB's Joint Societal Issues and Trends Committee, the B.C. Motion Picture Association,

and Canadian Women in Communications, Ms. Brinton has been active in film and television production in Vancouver since 1987.

Prairie Regional Council

Sally Hall continues to Chair the Prairie Regional Council. A long time consumer advocate and representative of the public, Sally served as President of the Consumers' Association of Canada in both Manitoba and Alberta before becoming National C.A.C. President for four terms. She is also a volunteer public representative on a variety of civic, provincial and national boards and committees and in 1995 was presented with the Canada Volunteer Medal of Honour at a ceremony in Ottawa.

Daryl Braun is the News Director of Golden West Broadcasting Ltd. He joined the Prairie Regional Council in 1993 as a broadcaster representative. A member of the Radio Television News Directors Association (RTNDA), he is the former Radio Director for the Prairies. He is also a former Chairperson for the National Editorial Committee of *Broadcast News*.

Carol Armit ended her term as a public representative on the Prairie Regional Council. She is an independent media consultant with offices in Winnipeg and Regina. A past President of the Winnipeg Press Club, Ms. Armit was a reporter for the *Winnipeg Free Press* and the *Ottawa Journal*, and formerly worked at CJOB Radio in Winnipeg.

David C. Ward (Kiviat) also ended his term as a public representative on the Prairie Regional Council. A lawyer practising in Edmonton, Mr. Ward was recognized in 1981 as Canada's first Inuit law school graduate, and in 1983 as Canada's first Inuit lawyer. He also served as an Alderman in Edmonton. Mr. Ward was a *pro bono* legal counsel for the Edmonton Multicultural Caucus and for the Canadian Boxing Federation.

Ontario Regional Council

Al MacKay continues as Chair of the Ontario Regional Council. A broadcast and communications consultant, Mr. MacKay was intimately involved in the development, by the pan-industry Action Group on Violence on Television (AGVOT), of the Canadian television classification system and ratings icons. A 28-year veteran of the broadcast industry, Mr. MacKay was Vice-President and Station Manager of Ottawa's CJOH-TV before establishing his own firm. He has taught broadcast journalism at Carleton University and Algonquin College; is a founding board member of the Media Awareness Network; and is the Ottawa columnist for *Electronic Times Report*.

Robert Stanbury, a public member of the Ontario Regional Council, serves as its Vice-Chair. He is a lawyer with the Hamilton firm of Inch, Easterbrook and Shaker. A former Chairman and CEO of Firestone Canada Inc., Mr. Stanbury was a Member of Parliament from 1965 to 1977 and held cabinet portfolios in Citizenship, Communications and National Revenue. He is a member of the Nunavut Arbitration Board, the Canadian Council of Administrative Tribunals, and the International Commission of Jurists.

Meg Hogarth continues to serve as a public representative. A media consultant and cultural activist, Ms. Hogarth was Executive Director of MediaWatch, the national organization monitoring the portrayal of women and girls in the media, for four years. A past President of the Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists, (ACTRA), she was active in federal and provincial policy and legislative matters including status of the artist and copyright issues, public funding of cultural agencies, and regulation. Ms. Hogarth served on the Board of TVOntario from 1991-97, during which time she chaired its Programming Committee.

Taanta Gupta serves on the Ontario Regional Council as a public representative. Prior to joining the Ontario Council, Ms. Gupta served on the B.C. Regional Council. Ms. Gupta is currently the Director of Customer Contact Communications at Cantel. She was the Executive Director of the Rick Hansen Fellowship Programme at the University of British Columbia, and has worked as General Manager of the

Satellite Radio Network. She has also worked as a news reporter on Parliament Hill and as News Director for CKWX-AM/CKKS-FM in Vancouver.

Paul Fockler represents broadcasters on the Ontario Regional Council. He began his career in broadcasting in 1955 in Toronto; he later became an owner and operator of several northern Ontario radio stations. Currently, Mr. Fockler works in Regulatory Affairs for Shaw Radio in Barrie. A past President of the Central Canada Broadcasters Association, Mr. Fockler volunteers on several community organizations, including the United Way.

Madeline Ziniak continues on the Regional Council as a broadcaster representative. She is Vice-President and Executive Producer at CFMT International and serves on the CAB's Joint Societal Issues and Trends Committee. In addition, Ms. Ziniak is the Chair of the Communications Committee of the Canadian Advertising Foundation's Race Relations Advisory Council; the Executive Director of the Canadian Ethnic Journalists' and Writers' Club; and a Director of the Canadian Scene Foundation.

Quebec Regional Council

Pierre Audet continues as a public member on the Quebec Regional Council. Formerly President of Montreal advertising agency FOUG Réseau DMB&B, he has also worked as Creative Director and Senior Vice-President of the BCP advertising agency. He is also a sessional lecturer on social marketing at a number of universities.

Yvon Chouinard continues as a broadcasting member on the Regional Council. He began his career in broadcasting in 1967 and has held numerous positions in programming, sales and management. Currently Mr. Chouinard is the Executive Vice-President of Power Broadcasting. A past Director of the CAB, Mr. Chouinard has served as a Director of the Radio Marketing Bureau, BBM, MusicAction and the Association canadienne de la radio et de la télévision de langue française.

Jocelyn Deschênes retired his position on the Quebec Regional Council where he served as Chair. He is the Director of External Productions at Télé-Métropole and was a film producer at Communications Claude Héroux International. He holds degrees in Film Studies, Art History and Comparative Literature. He has served on the Board of Directors of the Festival des grandes écoles de cinéma and of MusicAction.

Luc Harvey ended his term with the Quebec Regional Council as a representative of the broadcasters. Prior to becoming the Executive Vice-President of Communications Claude Héroux Inc., where he is also a television and movie producer, Mr. Harvey was the Programming Director for Cogeco Television Stations in Sherbrooke.

At the end of the fiscal year, two broadcaster positions were vacant.

Atlantic Regional Council

Paul H. Schurman continues to chair the Atlantic Regional Council as a broadcaster member. Formerly President and General Manager of CJRW Radio in Summerside, Mr. Schurman was President of the Atlantic Association of Broadcasters. He was named to the Order of Canada and the P.E.I. Sports Hall of Fame. He is also in the CAB Broadcast Hall of Fame.

Zoe Rideout is Vice-Chair of the Atlantic Regional Council. Active in a number of community volunteer groups, Ms. Rideout serves as President of the Greater Moncton Association of Community Living and is the Chair of the Greater Moncton "We Care for Kids" telethon. She co-chaired the 1992 Task Force on Universal Suffrage.

Carolyn Thomas is a public member on the Regional Council. She has worked for the Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission since 1973 and is the Chairperson of the Provincial Advisory Committee for Race Relations. Among her former and present memberships are the Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women, and the Black Professional Women's Group of Nova Scotia.

Roger Augustine also represents the public on the Atlantic Regional Council. He served as Chief of the Eel Ground Indian Band from 1980 to 1996, and as President of the Union of N.B.-P.E.I. First Nations from 1988 to 1994. Mr. Augustine is currently President of Black Eagle Management Enterprises and Black Eagle Construction. He has received the Medal of Distinction from the Canadian Center on Substance Abuse in both 1993 and 1994; Miramichi Achiever of the Year in 1996; and was appointed as co-chair of the Center for Indigenous Environmental Resources based in Winnipeg.

Kaye MacAulay continues as a broadcaster member of the Regional Council. She is continuity writer and traffic director at CFSX in Stephenville, and was also a co-host of an afternoon program at the station, where she has worked since 1971.

Carol McDade is past Chair of the Atlantic Regional Council, and is currently a broadcaster member of the Regional Council. Ms. McDade is News Director of CanWest Global Television in Halifax. Prior to joining Global, she was a writer, producer and co-anchor of ASN's late edition newscast; she has also worked in radio in Halifax and Sydney.

5. Membership

In 1996/97, CBSC membership was 90% of all CAB members. The table below gives CBSC membership by member stations, as well as CBSC membership as a proportion of all CAB members. Call letters of all CBSC members are also listed below.

	Radio		Television		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Atlantic	33	100	5	100	38	100
Quebec	44	92	14	88	58	91
Ontario	101	88	16	89	116	89
Prairie	79	84	19	100	99	87
British Columbia	59	88	7	100	66	89
TOTAL	316	89	61	94	377	90

Newfoundland

CFCB CFGN CFLW CFSX CHVO CJYQ CKCM CKIX-FM CKXX VOCM VOCM-FM

P.E.I.

CHTN CJRW

Nova Scotia

CFAB CFRQ-FM CIEZ-FM CIGO CIHF-TV CIOO-FM CJCB CJCB-TV CJCH CJCH-TV CJFX CJLS
CKAD CKBW CKDY CKEN CKPE-FM CKWM-FM KIXX/CFDR

New Brunswick

CFBC CHSJ CIHI CJCJ CJMO-FM CJYC-FM CKCW-TV CKHJ-FM CKLT-TV

Quebec

CFAP-TV CFCF-TV CFCM-TV CFDA CFER-TV CFGL-FM CFIX-FM CFJO-FM CFJP-TV CFKM-TV
CFKS-TV CFLO CFLP CFMB CFQR-FM CFTM-TV CFVD-FM CFVM CFZZ-FM CHAU-TV CHEM-TV
CHEY-FM CHIK-FM CHLN CHLT CHOE-FM CHOM-FM CHRL CHRM CHVD CIGB-FM CIKI-FM CIMF-
FM CIMO-FM CIQC CITE-FM CITF-FM CJAB-FM CJDM-FM CJMF-FM CJMM-FM CJPM-TV CJRC
CKAC CKGM CKLD CKMF-FM CKMI-TV CKOI-FM CKRS CKRT-TV CKSH-TV CKTF-FM CKTM-TV
CKVL CKVM CKYK-FM Réseau TVA

Ontario

CFBG-FM CFBK-FM CFCA-FM CFCL-TV/CITO-TV CFFX CFGX-FM CFHK-FM CFJR CFLG-FM CFLY-
FM CFMK-FM CFMO-FM CFMT-TV CFMX-FM CFNY-FM CFOB CFPL CFPL-FM CFPL-TV CFRA
CFTO-TV CFTR CHAM CHAS-FM CHAY-FM CHCH-TV CHEX-TV CHEZ-FM CHFI-FM CHML CHNO
CHNR CHOG CHRE-FM CHRO-TV CHUC CHUM CHUM-FM CHUR-FM CHVR CHWO CHXL-FM CHYC
CHYR-FM CIAM CICX-FM CICZ-FM CIDR CIGL-FM CIGM CIII-TV CILQ-FM CIMJ-FM CIMX-FM CIQB-
FM CIQM-FM CIRV-FM CITY-TV CIWW CJBK CJBQ CJBX-FM CJBZ CJCL CJCS CJET CJEZ-FM
CJLB-FM CJMJ-FM CJMR CJMX-FM CJOH-TV CJOY CJQM-FM CJQQ-FM CJRL CJRQ-FM CJSD-FM

CJSS CJTN CJXY-FM CKAP CKAT-FM CKBY-FM CKCB CKCO-TV CKDK-FM CKDO CKDR CKGB
CKGE-FM CKKL-FM CKKW CKLC CKLH-FM CKLW CKNC-TV/CICI-TV CKNR-FM CKNX CKNX-FM
CKNX-TV CKNY-TV/CHNB-TV CKOC CKOY CKPR CKPR-TV/CHFD-TV CKPT CKQM-FM CKRU CKSL
CKTY CKVR-TV CKWF-FM CKWS-TV CKWW CTV Network

Manitoba

CFAM CFAR CFWM-FM CHIQ-FM CHMI-TV CHSM CHTM CIFX CITI-FM CJAR CJKR-FM CJOB CJRB
CKDM CKJS CKLQ CKMM-FM CKMW CKND-TV CKX CKX-FM CKX-TV CKY CKY-TV

Saskatchewan

CFMC-FM CFMM-FM CFQC-FM CFQC-TV CFRE-TV CFSK-TV CFSL CFWF-FM CHAB CHMX-FM
CIZL-FM CJFB-TV CJGX CJME CJNB CJSL CJSN CJVR CJWW CJYM CKBI CKBI-TV/CIPA-TV CKCK
CKCK-TV CKOM CKOS -TV/CICC-TV CKRM CKSW

Alberta

CFAC CFCN-TV CFCW CFFR CFGP-FM CFMG-FM CFRN CFRN-TV CFRV-FM CHAT CHAT-TV CHED
CHFM-FM CHLB-FM CHQR CHQT CHR B CIBQ CICT-TV CIRK-FM CISA-TV CISN-FM CITL-TV CITV-
TV CIZZ-FM CJCA CJCY CJOC CJOK CJPR CJXX CJYR CKDQ CKER CKGY CKIK-FM CKNG-FM
CKRA-FM CKRD CKRD-TV CKRY-FM CKSA-TV CKSQ CKTA CKWA CKYL CKYX-FM

British Columbia

CFAX CFBV CFFM-FM CFJC CFJC-TV CFLD CFOX-FM CFTK CFTK-TV CFUN CHAN-TV CHBC-TV
CHEK-TV CHNL CHOR CHTK CHWK CICF CIFM-FM CIGV-FM CILK-FM CIRX-FM CISL CISQ-FM
CIVH CJAT CJCI CJFW-FM CJIB CJJR-FM CJMG-FM CJNL CJOR CJVB CJVI CKAY CKBD CKBL-FM
CKBX CKCQ CKCR CKEK CKFR CKGF CKGR CKKC CKKN-FM CKKQ-FM CKKS-FM CKLG CKLZ-FM
CKMA CKNW CKOR CKOV CKPG CKPG-TV CKQR CKRV-FM CKSR-FM CKTK CKVU-TV CKWX
CKXM CKXR CKZZ-FM