



Canadian Broadcast Standards Council
Conseil canadien des normes de la radiotélévision

2004 / 2005 Annual Report

(For the fiscal year running from
September 1, 2004 to August 31, 2005)

“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

	Page
1. Message from the National Chair	1
2. Ethnocultural Outreach Project	5
3. Decisions Released in 2004/2005	8
4. Summary of Complaints	23
5. Adjudicators	30

1. MESSAGE FROM THE NATIONAL CHAIR

In the 2003–2004 Annual Report, I commented on the stark contrast between the Canadian and American approaches to the treatment of potentially offensive broadcast content. In this report, I would like to simply concentrate on the success of the Canadian experiment.

COMPLAINTS AND DECISIONS

The 2003–2004 year was an “extremely active year”. The 2004–2005 year has been a *record* year. Complaints continue to flow into the Council at a rate of about 2,000 per annum but, in 2004–2005, there were no major “complaint hogs”. As a result, far more *different* matters were brought to the attention of the CBSC than ever before. (Statistics relating to those complaints are provided in Section 4 of the Annual Report.)

On the decision side, though, the numbers have *soared*. In 2004–2005, the overall total was 125, made up of 36 Panel decisions and 89 of the Secretariat’s summary variety. The latter benefit from being quick but thorough responses on issues previously dealt with sufficiently often by CBSC Panels that there is no need to convene yet another Panel meeting to tread the same territory. Equally importantly, while increasing its output, the Council has actually sped up its productivity by reducing the length of time it takes to deliver its decisions. (Details of the decisions taken and of the summary decision process are provided in Section 3 below.)

APPRECIATION OF THE REGULATOR

In large measure, the success of the self-regulatory system is reflected in its effectiveness in the eyes of the Government regulator, the Canadian Radio–television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC), which, after all, forwards a significant portion (in fact, nearly all) of the complaints it receives about CBSC members to the Council for resolution. For this reason, it is worth quoting a statement by the CRTC Chairperson in his speech to the Ontario Association of Broadcasters this past year.

But in the heated public debate that followed [some CRTC] decisions [on abusive comment], it wasn’t mentioned that most complaints related to the content of radio and television broadcasts never have to be dealt with by the Commission at all. This, again, is to your credit as broadcasters, because you, together with the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council, operate an effective system of self-regulation with regard to content. I agree with Ronald Cohen, the National Chair of the CBSC, who has said that self-regulation works in Canada because broadcasters “live in and care about the communities to which they broadcast, [and] because they believe in the principles and standards that they themselves have created.” I commend you and the CBSC for continuing to ensure that self-regulation remains strong and credible in Ontario, as it is throughout Canada.

ETHNOCULTURAL OUTREACH

Canada is more and more the reflection of its manifold multicultural and multilingual communities and the CBSC ensures that its process and standards are extended into those communities. Indeed, it is fair to state that the Council's print and electronic resources epitomize that outreach. Linguistically, information about the CBSC and the Code provisions that we use on a continuing basis is published in brochure form and on our website in Amharic, Arabic, Armenian, Chinese, Cree, Croatian, Czech, Dari, Dutch, Farsi, German, Greek, Hindi, Hungarian, Inuinnaqtun, Inuktitut, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Macedonian, Mohawk, Ojibwa, Pashtu, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Sinhala, Somali, Spanish, Tagalog, Tamil, Turkish, Ukrainian, Urdu and Vietnamese, as well as English and French. Our hope is that Canadians of all backgrounds, cultures, nationalities and language preferences have both a visual and a practical sense that this is a website, and a Council, that recognizes, belongs to and serves *all* Canadians. (A more detailed report of the Ethnocultural Outreach Program is provided in Section 2 below.)

OTHER FORMS OF OUTREACH

It is a mark of the service rendered by the Council that there are queries from, and interviews with, the media on many broadcast subjects, not all of which result from CBSC decisions. Interest comes from Canada, to be sure, but often from the United States and media still farther abroad. Included in this category, among others, were the BBC, *Broadcaster Magazine*, Canadian Press, CBC, Channel M, CHQR, *Dose*, *Extra*, the *Halifax Chronicle-Herald*, the *Journal de Montréal*, the *Journal de Québec*, CFCF-TV, CHQR, CIGV-FM, CJOB, CKLW, *Martlet* (Victoria), the *National Post*, the *Ottawa Citizen*, *Pulse Niagara*, the *Southern Voice* (Atlanta), the *Thunderbird* (the UBC School of Journalism magazine), and the *Toronto Star*.

Each year I have invitations to speak at colleges and universities around the country. These opportunities reflect a growth in academic familiarity with the notion of

broadcast ethics. It results that students in communications, broadcasting, journalism and related fields are learning, as early as their first year, that Canada's private broadcasters have established a set of standards which they have agreed to apply to every minute of the content they air. To introduce the subject, instructors and professors ensure that their course syllabuses reflect both the existence of codes and the self-regulatory system created to enforce them.

Students learn about the private broadcasters' commitment to the process, the "why" of how such a voluntary system can deliver. And their interest in the lectures, manifested in their classroom questions and challenges, indicates that they "get it". Happily, I have found that the students share the morality and the fundamental values reflected in the codified standards. Despite the (as one would expect) outspoken nature of the large groups of students to whom I lecture, I rarely, if ever, encounter voices shrilly exclaiming the unchallengeable supremacy of freedom of expression or the "we don't need anyone else to decide what we can watch" attitude sometimes encountered elsewhere. The students seem to share the CBSC's perspective that there is a range of social values which deserve recognition, consideration and enforcement. In short, Canada is benefiting from the emergence of a cadre of young professionals well-grounded in the area of broadcast ethics.

During the course of the year, I also appeared before the Ontario Panel on Justice and the Media and met, as the CBSC does annually, with the Jeanne Sauvé interns in the program established by Canadian Women in Communications. I also reported to the Annual Meeting of the Western Association of Broadcasters and attended the Annual Convention of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters in Ottawa. Important connections also arose with colleagues from other parts of the world. While in Israel, I had the opportunity to meet with Giora Rosen, the Ombudsman of Channel 2. Prof. Sunette Lötter, one of the Commissioners of the Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa (BCCSA), met with me when she

visited Canada. There has in fact been a link of many years between the BCCSA and the CBSC and I was fortunate to be invited to speak at the Second BCCSA Conference on Broadcasting Content Regulation in Johannesburg, at which I met colleagues working on or with similar councils in New Zealand, Australia, Germany, Zambia, Great Britain, Slovakia and, of course, South Africa, as well as Jeff Cole, the Director of the Center for the Digital Future at the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Southern California. What is striking is the broad similarity of complainants' concerns on four of the world's continents. What is rewarding is the sense from colleagues elsewhere in the world that the Canadian system *works*.

THE WEBSITE

The CBSC's website is the world's window on the Canadian self-regulatory system. As such, it is naturally constantly available to complainants, researchers and other interested parties all day every day. Not only is it our most efficient method of communicating information, its use grows daily. In two years, "hits" have more than doubled, first from 200,000 to nearly 300,000, now 445,000, per month, for a total of nearly 5.4 million per year. The total website sessions increased from an average of almost 24,000 (more than 66,000 pageviews) to nearly 31,000 per month (more than 91,000 pageviews). The website includes a complaints form, a body of FAQs (frequently asked questions), all CBSC decisions, annual reports, Codes, Code annotations, lists of member stations, networks and services (with links to their web sites), corresponding links for other bodies both Canadian and international, relevant documents galore, biographies of Panel Adjudicators, and so on. Plus, as noted above, a thorough explanation of what we do and our most important Code provisions in 40 languages.

WHAT'S NEXT?

Our goals in the coming year are severalfold. On a broad basis, we aim to accelerate our processing of files and decisions yet further.

We are also striving to produce more useful documentation on the CBSC for the benefit of the public and the industry. Our first such project will be a set of Annotated Codes, digesting all of the 362 Panel decisions rendered by the Council from day one through the end of this fiscal year. The second will be a new public service announcement for radio and television broadcast. Third, we are hoping to produce interpretive bulletins, to serve as guidelines for broadcasters in compact form, regarding Code-related issues.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Although, by its output, the CBSC appears to be a large organization, it is in fact compact and efficient. It is indeed dependent upon the dedication, enthusiasm and commitment of its staff and volunteers. This year has, in fact, been marked by remarkably consistent output despite potentially difficult transition. For the first half of the year, Dina Salha, our Broadcast Analyst, and Ann Mainville-Neeson, our long-serving Executive Director, delivered legion services as always. Ann's nearly seven years in her post left their mark in every corner of the Council. When they left, the structure changed to some extent. John MacNab became the Executive Director and Teisha Gaylard returned to the CBSC after an absence of a couple of years, becoming our new Director of Policy. They all benefited from the dedication of the other team members, Nicole Lafrance, our Complaints Officer, and Burhaan Warsame, the CBSC Ethnocultural Outreach Project Officer. To them goes my immense appreciation.

Canadian television and radio audiences generally owe the volunteer Adjudicators, both from the industry and the public sides, a vote of thanks. They play an important role in objectively, thoughtfully and carefully assessing the content in every decision they render. They earn everyone's gratitude with every adjudication. So do the private broadcasters themselves. Despite the fact that the system is truly voluntary, the broadcasters fund the process and respect the rulings, even though the decisions do not always go their way. Nor, of course, do they always go the way individual complainants

would like to see them go. But the broadcasters are the ones who support the Council's existence, in every way. They deserve some roses thrown their way in recognition of that unflagging commitment.

RONALD I. COHEN

National Chair

2. ETHNOCULTURAL OUTREACH AND POSITIVE PORTRAYAL INITIATIVE

The fundamental goal of the CBSC's ethnocultural outreach initiative is to ensure that the Council's good works extend to *all* Canadians by reaching out to all Canadian communities in their languages of comfort. Whether they have concerns about what they see on television or hear on the radio, the CBSC and its broadcaster members believe that all Canadians should know what the broadcasters' own goals are. The issue is not a negative matter; it is a positive one. It is not related to problems on the airwaves but rather an appreciation or understanding on the part of all Canadian audiences of what they are entitled to expect on those airwaves.

In the 2004–2005 fiscal year, we have extended the range of languages in which the CBSC information is available, arranged for continuous feedback and evaluation of different aspects of the initiative, and strengthened contacts with ethnocultural media and community organizations. All this activity is part of our continuing efforts to raise community awareness of, and accessibility to, Canadian private broadcaster standards and the effective self-regulatory process that we administer.

EXPANDED OUTREACH TOOLS

The Ethnocultural Outreach and Positive Portrayal Initiative has reached a milestone this year in terms of the number of languages in which we reach out to Canadians. The CBSC brochure, the Public Service Announcements (PSAs) in print format and web pages are now available in 40 languages, making the CBSC a leading institution in the business of purveying information to Canadians in their languages of comfort.

Multilingual Brochures:

To ensure that more linguistic communities know about Canada's broadcast codes, we have added eleven new languages to those in

which the CBSC brochure is now available. Four of them – Amharic, Armenian, Farsi and Mohawk – were translated in the last fiscal year but not printed until this fiscal year. The translation, editing, proofreading and printing of the remaining seven – Croatian, Dutch, Hungarian, Macedonian, Romanian, Serbian and Sinhala – were all done in this fiscal year.

The new languages, like the earlier choices, were selected on the basis of demographic data, the level of community members' proficiency in either of the two official languages, and the quantity of radio and television programming broadcast in the selected languages. The availability of the new brochures was announced on a broad basis to community groups and other contacts in our outreach database. Continuous mailings to a number of target audiences are also planned to place the CBSC's multilingual brochures in as many hands as possible.

Multilingual PSAs:

The content of the print PSA has been updated this year to reflect new CBSC information, including the fact that the CBSC brochure is now available in 40 languages. The updating affected the text of the PSA in the 29 languages in which it has already been available. At the same time, the updated PSA has been translated for the first time into the 11 new languages. The new version of the print PSA, which comes in the usual three convenient sizes, will soon be available for placement in ethnocultural community publications across the country. It will replace the current version which continues to appear in a number of ethnocultural community publications, informing readers of the availability of the multilingual brochures.

Multilingual Web Pages:

We have posted new web pages for the 11 new languages. And we added the full text of the English and French brochures in response

to requests from web visitors. We have also drawn the attention of web visitors to the fact that they can order print copies of the brochures free of charge simply by calling or emailing us. Not surprisingly, we have received a significant number of orders through the website. All the multilingual web pages, each with its own introductory section and the full brochure text in PDF format, can easily be found in the "Other Languages" section of the CBSC website.

EVENTS AND PRESENTATIONS

This year the CBSC has been very active in attending a number of outreach events to exchange ideas and inform new audiences about the CBSC Ethnocultural Outreach and Positive Portrayal Initiative. The events included diversity and media-related gatherings organized by various government and non-governmental institutions, including Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC), the Canadian Studies Association, OMNI Television and others. In terms of grassroots outreach, though, the most significant series of events that we attended this year was organized by the English as a Second Language (ESL) Department of the Ottawa-Carleton Catholic School Board as part of its annual "Education Week" celebrations, which brought together adult ESL students, teachers and school administrators over four days of cultural activities. More than 20 ESL schools or training sites across the Ottawa region and nearly two thousand people participated in the events.

The CBSC mounted an exhibit (complete with an attractive and imposing roll-up display unit, kit folder, brochures and PSA posters) at all four events with the objective of connecting with, and informing, citizens and landed immigrants about the CBSC in general and the multilingual outreach project in particular. Our goal in connecting with the adult ESL students took into account the fact that, on top of not being proficient in either of the two official languages, they were also, as newcomers, likely to be unfamiliar with the CBSC and broadcaster aims.

At each event, the Manager of our outreach initiative answered queries and distributed brochures to both students and teachers, some of whom have since been in touch to order more brochures. In addition, we have distributed the complete outreach project kitfolder to Ottawa-Carleton Catholic School Board principals and other staff.

The four-day events also attracted many community organizations and service providers who set up their own booths to disseminate their information. This has given the CBSC an additional opportunity for outreach since event exhibitors included resource centres that were themselves interested in obtaining CBSC multilingual brochures in large quantities for members of the diverse communities they serve.

The Ottawa-Carleton Catholic School Board events were so successful for the CBSC that we have since started adding contact information on all other School Boards and similar institutions into our outreach database. We plan to share CBSC information with them so that they can in turn pass it on to their contacts, who will be as interested in knowing about broadcasting goals and their entitlements as all Canadians.

OTHER LINKS WITH AUDIENCES

In addition to connecting with audiences at outreach events, we have continued with our regular mailouts and follow-up phone and email contacts with ethnocultural media and community groups. Those connections are meant to either inform audiences of the CBSC role or to seek their feedback in order to evaluate how we are doing.

To connect with audiences requires both being in tune with their issues and knowing about the important events in their communities' lives. Consequently, we have continued to embrace topical issues and current events as opportunities for linking with Canada's diversity of audiences to advise them of the self-regulatory process created by Canada's private broadcasters.

Consider the following recent and important example. At a recent meeting with Prime

Minister Paul Martin, Canadian Imams issued a statement calling for collective action and partnership to “encourage Canadian Muslims to become more engaged in civil society and public life, thereby creating a greater sense of enfranchisement and ownership.” The CBSC quickly sent letters to national Muslim organizations explaining the broadcast codes, the self-regulatory process, and how Canadian Muslims can be more engaged as radio listeners and/or television viewers. We have taken a similar approach (of acting through current events) with a number of other communities as part of our continued efforts to encourage ordinary Canadians to assume an effective voice in matters pertaining to portrayal and other issues in broadcasting.

The CBSC is encouraged by its success in informing all Canadians about its role in broadcasting. Recently, in one of our informal surveys, we asked a group of audiences who received our multilingual brochures whether the CBSC information had made a difference to them as audiences; 86% of them responded that they now follow radio and television programming with more interest and understanding. And that is where and how our outreach program hopes to succeed.

3. DECISIONS RELEASED IN 2004/2005

In order for one of the roughly two thousand complaints the CBSC receives annually to result in a decision, the complainant must submit a Ruling Request or other indication of dissatisfaction with the broadcaster's response to the initial complaint. The satisfaction with that broadcaster dialogue is generally high but, when a Ruling Request is received, the CBSC Secretariat then must determine whether a formal Panel adjudication or a Summary decision is the appropriate solution in the circumstances.

The CBSC released a record total of 125 decisions (of both varieties) this year, compared to 102 in 2003/2004. Thirty-six of those decisions were Panel Decisions and 89 decisions were Summary Decisions.

PANEL DECISIONS

Panel Decisions are generally called for when the issue raised in the complaint is one that has not previously been addressed by the CBSC or when the issue has been found in the past to result in a Code breach.

Panel Decisions involve a formal adjudication by one of the CBSC's regional or national Adjudicating Panels, which are composed of representatives from both the broadcasting industry and the general public. Adjudicators read all correspondence relating to the complaint from both the complainant and the broadcaster, review the challenged broadcast, and meet to discuss the merits in order to make their determination. Panel Decisions are made public by the CBSC on its website with notice of their posting via an accompanying media release.

Summaries of the 36 Panel Decisions released in 2004/2005 are provided below, divided into Television and Radio Programming and then subdivided based on the main issues treated in each decision.

Television

Twenty-five of the Panel Decisions released in 2004/2005 dealt with television broadcasts, compared to 22 in 2003/2004. They treated issues such as the appropriate presentation of news; scheduling of coarse language, sexual scenes and violence; sanctioning violence; as well as discriminatory remarks in news broadcasts and religious programming.

All the News That's Fit to Air

The Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB) *Code of Ethics* contains one provision relating to the accuracy and fairness of news broadcasts (Clause 5) as well as another relating to the full, fair and proper presentation of news, editorial and commentary (Clause 6). The *CAB Voluntary Code regarding Violence in Television Programming* provides guidelines about the presentation of violent and disturbing scenes in news and public affairs programming (Article 6.0), while other articles deal with violence in other types programming, such as sports. The Radio Television News Directors Association of Canada (RTNDA) *Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* deals only with news and public affairs reporting and journalistic conduct. It is those Codes and Code provisions that are generally applied to complaints involving news.

This year, in the context of news, the CBSC dealt with complaints about the treatment of interview subjects, appropriate terminology and the coverage of violent situations. Those decisions are summarized immediately below.

The CBSC also rendered decisions regarding discriminatory language used in news reports under the Human Rights clause of the *CAB Code of Ethics* but those are summarized under the heading "Discriminating Viewers Disapprove of Discrimination" (at pp. 15-16).

Counting his Pennies

Accuracy and balance of the news story and invasion of privacy were the issues raised by the complainant in *CHEK-TV re News Report (Landlord-Tenant Dispute)* (CBSC Decision 03/04-0712, October 14, 2004). The story reported on a dispute between a landlord and tenant. It focussed on the fact that the landlord had paid a Tenancy Arbitrator-ordered settlement to the tenant in pennies only. The complaint came from the landlord who felt that the story had not adequately presented his side of the conflict. The landlord also complained that the report included video footage of him taken without his knowledge and despite his request that he not appear on camera. The British Columbia Regional Panel concluded that the news story was not inaccurate and that the landlord had been given an opportunity to provide his point of view. The Panel did conclude, however, that the report had violated the landlord's privacy since it had included surreptitiously-obtained footage of him and "the information provided in the on-air interview would readily have been unearthed without the use of hidden recording devices."

Careful with our Children

A different set of circumstances involving the treatment of an interview subject was at issue in *CITY-TV re CityPulse at Six News Report* (CBSC Decision 04/05-0933, April 19, 2005). A news report, which explained that a man had been charged with possession of child pornography and other sex crimes, included a photograph of the man, his name, civic address and previous places of employment. It also featured an interview with the man's young son, whose image was digitally blurred. The boy responded to questions from the reporter, which elicited little more information than the fact that his father had gone to jail. The complainant wrote that it was unethical to interview a child in these circumstances. The Ontario Regional Panel concluded that the broadcaster had violated the child's privacy since it had "provided all essential information that would have enabled any viewer to put together [the child's]

identity and address". It also concluded that the broadcaster had failed to demonstrate the "special sensitivity" required of it "when dealing with children" since the boy was vulnerable and the comments he made in the interview added no useful information.

Geography and Culture: Different Places?

Accuracy and appropriateness of terminology were dealt with in *CTV Television and CTV Newsnet re news reports (ghettos and concentration camps in Poland)* (CBSC Decision 04/05-0380 and -0672, December 15, 2004). Two separate news reports about issues relating to World War II referred to a "Polish" ghetto, in the one case, and a "Polish" concentration camp, in the other. The CBSC received a number of complaints that expressed concern about the use of the adjective "Polish" since that adjective left the impression that the camps had been created and operated by the Polish people when, in fact, they had been run by the Nazis and were only located in Poland. The broadcaster initially argued that the adjective was simply a geographical indicator, but subsequently agreed to change its policy regarding the use of this national adjective. The National Specialty Services Panel ruled that the use of the term "Polish" in that context was both inaccurate and improper. It stated that such national adjectives do "exten[d] well beyond simply geographical application" to include "an ethnographic or cultural connection"; qualifiers such as "in occupied Poland" or "in Nazi-occupied Poland" should be used instead in order to be accurate.

No Thanks for this Message

A sports announcer's comments were the subject of *CHEX-TV re Sportscast* (CBSC Decision 03/04-0926, October 22, 2004). The station's sportscaster was commenting on an incident that had occurred at an Ontario Hockey League game. Addressing the members of the local hockey team, he stated that "when somebody takes a cheap shot at [...] your team, somebody has to and should've [...] deliver[ed] a message and I think you know what I mean by that." A viewer complained that the comments

promoted violence. The Ontario Regional Panel considered that the remarks were not in breach of the *CAB Violence Code* because it was not clear that the announcer was advocating action that was outside the sanctioned limits of the sport, but the Panel did consider that he had nevertheless sent an improper message to the local team's young players, in violation of the *CAB Code of Ethics*.

Editing Choices: Not There for a Reason

Violence in news was also at issue in *CTV Newsnet re a News Item (Hostage Murder in Riyadh)* (CBSC Decision 03/04-1817, December 15, 2004). The report, about the alleged murder by a terrorist group of an American living in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, showed footage of an Arabic website that claimed to describe the murder. After the news anchor warned that "Viewers should be aware that this story contains graphic video," the report showed a short, blurry, erratically-shot video clip that included the sound of a man pleading for his life, the sound of a gunshot and a body falling to the ground in the distance. A viewer complained about the violent imagery of this clip. The National Specialty Services Panel noted that the *CAB Violence Code* requires broadcasters not only to use appropriate judgment when reporting disturbing stories but also not to sanitize reality. The Panel concluded that CTV Newsnet had demonstrated reasonable judgment in the presentation of the clip since "there was not blood or other physical manifestation of the terrible event" and the anchor had advised viewers of the nature of the footage.

Careful What You Report: It Could Endanger Someone

Coverage of a violent event of a different sort was the subject of *Global Television re Global National (Kidnapping Report)* (CBSC Decision 03/04-0324, December 15, 2004). The news program reported on the case of a woman who had gone missing, having allegedly been kidnapped by her estranged boyfriend. Following the presentation of some background information on the case, the

reporter informed viewers that the woman had just been sighted at a convenience store where she had asked the clerk to telephone for help. The broadcast included scenes of the store's interior and exterior. A viewer wrote a letter of complaint, expressing his concern that the broadcast had endangered the woman's life since her kidnapper could have learned of her attempt to escape while the attempt was in progress. This was the first decision in which the CBSC applied the provision of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* regarding the reporting of criminal activities in progress. The National Conventional Television Panel agreed with the complainant that the broadcast had inappropriately endangered the life of the individual who was the subject of the report.

"Watch" Your Language

Under Clause 10(a) of the *CAB Code of Ethics*, broadcasters must not air coarse language that is intended for adult audiences outside of the Watershed hour period, which runs from 9:00 pm to 6:00 am. In previous decisions, the CBSC had determined that the f-word and variations thereof would be classified as "intended for adults only" and thus could not be broadcast before 9:00 pm or after 6:00 am. This year, the CBSC's National Specialty Services Panel encountered four complaints about the broadcast of the f-word prior to the Watershed; in all four cases, the broadcaster was found to be in violation of the Code. As well, in one case the broadcaster failed, in its viewer advisories, to mention that the program also contained sexual material; it was found in breach of the *CAB Code of Ethics* provision regarding viewer advisories. In two of the cases, the broadcaster also violated the requirement in the *CAB Violence Code* to display a classification icon at the beginning of the broadcast for at least 15 seconds.

I Could Have Sworn We Were Having Fun

Bravo! re the movie Kitchen Party (CBSC Decision 03/04-0928, December 15, 2004) involved a movie about a group of teenagers having a house party, while a parallel plot involved their parents having their own dinner

party. The movie was broadcast at 2:00 pm and contained numerous instances of the f-word as well as “cocksucker”, “prick”, “shit” and “asshole”. A viewer complained that this was inappropriate language for an afternoon broadcast. The National Specialty Services Panel agreed and found the broadcast in violation of the *CAB Code of Ethics*.

Ordinary Language?

A similar situation arose in *Bravo! re the movie Ordinary People* (CBSC Decision 03/04-1187, December 15, 2004). That movie was about a family coping (with great difficulty) with the death of one of its members. A viewer complained that the multiple uses of the f-word were unsuitable for this 11:30 am broadcast. Following CBSC precedents, the National Specialty Services Panel concluded that the f-word should not have appeared unedited in the pre-Watershed broadcast. The Panel also noted that the broadcaster did not display the 14+ classification icon for a sufficient length of time.

Imperfect Timing

Coarse language and explicit sexual content were the complainant’s concerns in *Bravo! re the movie Perfect Timing* (CBSC Decision 03/04-1719, December 15, 2004). The movie was a sex comedy that contained scenes of nudity and sexual activity and numerous instances of the f-word and its derivatives. It was broadcast at 2:00 pm. The National Specialty Services Panel determined that both the sexual scenes and the coarse language rendered the movie “intended for adult audiences” and thus should only have been broadcast after 9:00 pm. It also found the broadcaster in violation for failing to mention the sexual content in the viewer advisories and for failing to air the 18+ classification icon for the required length of time.

Is This Any Way to Talk about a Classic Film?

Coarse language was also the complaint in *Bravo! re the film RKO 281* (CBSC Decision 04/05-0584, July 20, 2005). *RKO 281* was a dramatized account of Orson Welles’ making

of the feature film *Citizen Kane*. The film was broadcast at 2:00 pm and contained a number of instances of the f-word and other coarse language. The National Specialty Services Panel ruled that the film should not have been broadcast with the language unedited before 9:00 pm.

Sexing Up the TV

Under Clause 10(a) of the *CAB Code of Ethics*, broadcasters must not air sexually explicit material that is intended for adult audiences outside of the Watershed hour period, which runs from 9:00 pm to 6:00 am. Clause 11 of that Code also requires that broadcasters provide viewer advisories alerting audiences to the sexual content of the program, while Article 4 of the *CAB Violence Code* requires broadcasters to display a classification icon at the beginning of the broadcast for at least 15 seconds.

Complaints about sexually explicit programming also often suggest that such content is exploitative or degrading. The CBSC examines such complaints under Article 4 of the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code for Television and Radio Programming* which deals with exploitation. It has been the CBSC’s long-standing position that scenes of sexuality are not necessarily exploitative or degrading since the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code* was not intended to prevent the depiction of consensual adult sexuality or to prevent dramatic plotlines which may involve violent sexuality.

Seven of the Panel Decisions released this year dealt with complaints about sexual content. In all of those cases, the Adjudicating Panels determined that the scenes of sexual activity were not problematic since the programs were scheduled after the Watershed hour and did not exploit men or women. In six of the cases, however, the Panels concluded that the viewer advisories provided in the broadcast were insufficient and in five of the cases the classification icon was not displayed for the required amount of time. One case also involved a broadcaster’s failure to provide correct logger tapes of the challenged program, which is an important

responsibility of CBSC membership. Details of those decisions are as follows.

Jade Not Semi-Precious for all Viewers

A feature film's adult themes were examined in *CITY-TV re the feature film Jade* (CBSC Decision 03/04-0382, October 22, 2004). A viewer complained that the movie, a murder mystery with a sexual theme, which included scenes of sexual activity, violence and coarse language, was "obscene" and did not belong on a conventional television station at all. Although the Ontario Regional Panel concluded that the film was sexually explicit, it pointed out that such content is permissible after the 9:00 pm Watershed hour. Even though the broadcaster respected the scheduling requirement in this case, CITY-TV was found in violation of the Codes for its failure to broadcast the 18+ classification icon for a sufficient length of time and to provide detailed information (in both audio and video form) about the adult nature of the film in all of the viewer advisories.

Sexual Content: An Up-Lifting Experience?

Another movie with explicit sexual scenes and violence was the subject of *Bravo! re the movie Up!* (CBSC Decision 03/04-0930, December 15, 2004). The Russ Meyer film recounted the story, with some satirical flavour, of an unusual murder in a small town in which a group of voluptuous young women faced ongoing sexual harassment and rape at the hands of the community's male residents.

The movie contained sexually explicit scenes featuring male and female nudity and different sexual positions. There were also two rape scenes. A viewer sent a detailed letter of complaint listing the scenes that concerned her. The National Specialty Services Panel agreed with the complainant that this type of program was not appropriate for all audiences but noted that the broadcaster had thus correctly scheduled the broadcast at 11:45 pm. Although the sexual scenes were quite graphic, they were nonetheless permissible for broadcast since there was neither a "degrading nor dehumanizing aspect associated with" the sexual activity and since "there is no rule that rape, like any other crime of violence, cannot

be shown on television screens." The Panel concluded, however, that the display of the 18+ classification icon was insufficiently long and that the viewer advisories failed to mention the violence and sexually explicit content present in the film.

When Is Mature Fare Fair?

Another Russ Meyer movie was the source of the complainant's concern in *Bravo! re the movie Beneath the Valley of the Ultra-Vixens* (CBSC Decision 03/04-0817, December 15, 2004). With the cartoonish tone characteristic of Meyer films, this movie told the story of a housewife who became a stripper and frequent user of sex toys. There was considerable male and female frontal nudity and scenes of sexual acts throughout the film, which was broadcast at midnight. A viewer complained about the sexually explicit nature of the film and questioned its suitability for a specialty service that is offered in a package with other channels rather than as a stand-alone service. The National Specialty Services Panel pointed out that "[s]tyles of programming that include elements of violence, nudity, sexuality, coarse language, scariness and other mature themes are acceptable fare on all stations and services, including conventional and specialty programming undertakings, provided that certain conditions are met." These conditions include scheduling programming at appropriate times and the provision of viewer advisories and classification icons. While the Panel was able to ascertain that the broadcaster had appropriately scheduled this program in a post-Watershed time slot, it was unable to assess if adequate viewer advisories and classification icons had accompanied the film, since the broadcaster had inadvertently conserved incorrect tapes. On this account, the Panel found the broadcaster in violation of its CBSC membership requirements to retain logger tapes.

When Sexual Activity Makes Broadcasters Blue

The sexual nature of a film was the subject of *TQS re the Bleu Nuit movie Mission de charme* (CBSC Decision 03/04-0976, February 10,

2005). The late night movie, which told the story of a woman who worked as a striptease dancer, contained numerous scenes of erotic striptease performances, as well as sexual activity involving male and female nudity. The complainant suggested that this type of content was inappropriate for broadcast on a conventional television station because it was offensive, promoted unsafe sex and was susceptible of being viewed by children. Following previous CBSC decisions, the Quebec Regional Panel determined that the sexually explicit nature of the program did not render it exploitative of either gender. The broadcast was correctly scheduled after the Watershed hour of 9:00 pm but the station violated the Codes by failing to display the 18+ classification icon for the appropriate length of time and omitting viewer advisories coming out of every commercial break during the first hour of broadcast.

Out-of-Home Improvement

Sexual explicitness and representation of women were the issues dealt with in the decisions *TQS re three episodes of Kama Sutra* (CBSC Decision 03/04-1233, February 10, 2005) and *TQS re the Bleu nuit movies Le journal de désirs and Hôtel Exotica* (CBSC Decision 03/04-1236, February 10, 2005). The episodes of *Kama Sutra* told the fictional story of a couple who visited an expert in the erotic arts with the goal of improving their sex life. The movie *Le journal de désirs* was about the ability of journal passages to ignite the sexual passions of visitors to a legendary château, while *Hôtel Exotica* recounted a couple's visit to a hotel where sexual fantasies became reality. All of the broadcasts included many scenes of nudity and sexual activity. A viewer complained that the programs were "unduly sexually explicit" and gave the impression "that all women have lesbian intentions" or "are all nymphomaniacs". The Quebec Regional Panel disagreed with the complainant in both decisions. The Panel cited CBSC jurisprudence which had determined that sexual explicitness did not necessarily amount to exploitation. It agreed that the programs were sexually explicit but they were not unduly so given their late evening time

slots (11:30 pm, 11:46 pm and midnight) and did not present women in the manner suggested by the complainant. The Panel did, however, conclude that the broadcaster had failed to display the 18+ classification icon for the required length of time and had neglected to air viewer advisories in both audio and video format coming out of every commercial break.

"Sock" It to 'Em, Ed

The behaviour of the sarcastic cigar-smoking puppet Ed the Sock offended a viewer in *CITY-TV re an episode of Ed the Sock!* (CBSC Decision 03/04-1814, March 11, 2005). In an episode of the comedy variety program (broadcast at midnight) entitled "A Day in the Life of an Adult Website", Ed the Sock visited the offices of a sexually explicit website and interviewed some of the women who worked there. The episode contained a number of scenes featuring scantily-clad and topless women, as well as sexually suggestive content. A viewer complained that the program exploited women. The Ontario Regional Panel disagreed, pointing out that nudity alone does not amount to exploitation or degradation. The Panel observed that the female models featured in the episode "fully expected that their bodies and appearance would be the focus of attention" and that Ed's comments were "generally complimentary vis-à-vis the women" rather than degrading. The Panel did, however, conclude that not all of the viewer advisories broadcast during the episode provided sufficiently detailed information about the adult nature of the content.

"Killer" TV Programming

The CBSC administers the *CAB Voluntary Code Regarding Violence in Television Programming*. That Code addresses issues such as gratuitous violence, sanctioning or promoting violence, scheduling of violent content intended for adult audiences, violence in sports programming, violence in news and public affairs programming and violence directed against specific groups, including women. Under Article 1.0 of the *CAB Violence Code*, broadcasters must not air

material that contains gratuitous violence (“gratuitous” is defined as content that is not relevant to the plot, theme or character development of the program). Under Article 3.0, broadcasters shall not air scenes of violence intended for exclusively adult audiences outside the Watershed hour, which runs from 9:00 pm to 6:00 am (that rule applies as fully to advertisements and promotional spots as it does to other programming). They are also required to air viewer advisories alerting audiences to the violent content and to display a classification icon indicating the intended audience age group. Article 7.0 prevents the promotion or glamorization of violence against women, particularly in a sexual context.

In addition to the Panel Decisions that dealt with violence in news broadcasts (described above in the News section, at pp. 8–10), the CBSC released three other decisions which treated questions of violence in television programming. Each of the decisions was judged on the basis of different provisions of the *CAB Violence Code*. In one, the broadcaster was found in violation of Article 7.0 for a metaphor with violent sexual connotations, although the overall representation of women in the program was not considered exploitative under the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code*. In another, the violent scenes in a dramatic program were not found to be in violation of Article 1.0, although the Adjudicating Panel determined that the adult nature of the violent scenes required a higher classification rating. In the last, which involved a commercial for a horror movie, the Panel decided that the scenes were intended for adults and thus should not have been broadcast during an afternoon time slot. Those three decisions are described here.

Joking about Violence against Women: A Risky Decision

Violent imagery and representation of women were the complainant’s concerns in *CITY-TV re an episode of Ed’s Night Party* (CBSC Decision 03/04–0516, October 22, 2004). Hosted by puppet Ed the Sock, the program frequently features discussions of a sexual nature and scantily-clad women. On the episode in question, Ed and his co-host were

discussing the sexual prowess of red-headed women. Ed stated, “Red on the head; fire in bed” to which his co-host responded “I’ve heard they [bleep] like you’re stabbing them.”

The Ontario Regional Panel concluded that the remarks did not exploit women since “it is a statement that could be applied to either men or women”. The Panel did, however, conclude that the “stabbing” reference violated the code provision regarding violence against women because “there is an undoubted connection drawn between violence and sexual activity.” The Panel pointed out that the humorous context of the remarks did not excuse them. It also found that the episode required more detailed viewer advisories describing the precise nature of the content.

Hard Content Requires Commensurate Classification

The violent scenes and coarse language of one episode of a drama series set around a group of investigative journalists were at issue in *CTV re The Eleventh Hour (“Hard Seven”)* (CBSC Decision 03/04–1738, December 15, 2004). The episode (broadcast at 10:00 pm), which followed two of the reporters as they gathered information for their stories, included scenes of a suicide by hanging, a prison rape and a shooting. It also contained instances of the f-word and was rated 14+. The National Conventional Television Panel agreed with the complainant that the violence was “graphic and brutal” but determined that it was not gratuitous since it was relevant to the plot. The broadcaster appropriately scheduled the episode after the Watershed hour and included adequate viewer advisories. The Panel determined, however, that the episode should have been rated 18+ due to the graphic nature of the violence and frequent use of extremely coarse language.

Chucky: Too Cleaver by Half before the Watershed

Violent and scary scenes in a horror movie advertisement were the subject of *CIII-TV (Global Television) re an advertisement for the movie Seed of Chucky* (CBSC Decision 04/05–0567, April 19, 2005). The commercial was

for the most recent instalment in the series of Chucky horror films about an evil doll that comes to life. The advertisement began with images of Santa Claus carrying his pack. These were followed by a rapid montage of images from the film, which included scenes of people screaming, close-ups of Chucky's menacing face and a bloody cleaver coming through a wall. The commercial was aired at 5:39 pm. The Ontario Regional Panel concluded that the commercial contained scenes of violence intended for adults only and thus should only have been broadcast after 9:00 pm.

Discriminating Viewers Disapprove of Discrimination

The CBSC addressed concerns about discriminatory remarks against various groups in five Panel Decisions relating to television broadcasts this year. Under Clause 2 (Human Rights) of the *CAB Code of Ethics*, broadcasters must not air programming that contains abusive or unduly discriminatory material which is based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability. It has long been the CBSC's position, however, that it is not the mere *mention* of one of those categories that will breach the Human Rights clause; the comments must, in effect, be negative generalizations about the group and/or be extremely harsh and insulting. In some cases, Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*, which requires the full, fair and proper presentation of news, opinion, comment and editorial, is also applied. Clause 8 (Religious Programming) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* also obliges broadcasters to ensure that religious programs are not used to convey attacks on identifiable groups.

These five decisions dealt with viewer concerns about discrimination on the basis of sex, religion, political position and sexual orientation. Three of the decisions involved newscasts and two involved religious programs. In the three decisions involving news, the Adjudicating Panels did not find a breach of the Human Rights clause; in one case, however, the Panel nevertheless

concluded that the comment was unfair under Clause 6. In another case, the Panel pointed out that political position is not a protected category under Clause 2 but the broadcaster was found in violation of its responsibility of membership in the CBSC for its failure to conserve tapes of the challenged broadcast. In the two cases involving religious programs, the broadcasters were found in violation of the Human Rights and Religious Programming clauses for abusive comment on the basis of sexual orientation. The CBSC also released Panel Decisions involving discriminatory comments made on radio (they are summarized in the Radio section on pp. 18–19).

Rapid Correction of Unsupportive Terminology

Gender discrimination was the complainant's concern in *CHAN-TV re a News Report (Child Support Defaulters)* (CBSC Decision 03/04–0712, October 14, 2004). The subject of the news broadcast was the Ontario Government's difficulty in tracking parents who default on their child support payments. In the teaser and introduction to the piece, the news anchor used the term "deadbeat dads", while the term "deadbeat parents" was used in the story itself. A viewer complained that the term "deadbeat dads" was sexist. The British Columbia Regional Panel found that the use of the term "was unnecessary and unfortunate" but that it was "immediately corrected in the story itself" and, therefore, the broadcast did not breach any Code provision.

Unbalanced Religious Identification

Religious discrimination was the complaint in *Global Television re Global National "Decision Canada 2004" Election Coverage* (CBSC Decision 03/04–1747, March 2, 2005). Global broadcast live coverage of the call of the June 2004 federal election. A text crawl at the foot of the screen provided brief facts about the election and the Canadian political system and some of the captions gave information about the federal party leaders. While the biographical details about the Liberal and NDP leaders mentioned their ages,

family situation and political standing, the information about the Conservative leader mentioned only his age and the fact that he was an “evangelical Christian”. A viewer complained that this was “religious bigotry” for two reasons. First, religious affiliation was irrelevant to the election call and, second, it was unfair not to provide similar details for all of the leaders. The National Conventional Television Panel determined that the information was neither abusive nor unduly discriminatory since the label “evangelical Christian” is not necessarily negative; however, the Panel agreed with the complainant that religion was not material to the report about the election call. Consequently, it found the use of the phrase “unbalanced and inappropriate”.

Redneck Not over the Redline

Discriminatory remarks in a sports news commentary were at issue in *TQS re Le Grand Journal (Michel Villeneuve Commentary)* (CBSC Decision 03/04-1949, February 10, 2005). In discussing the controversy surrounding Canada’s choice for flag-bearer at the Olympics, the commentator observed that a newspaper columnist had objected to the choice because the athlete had supported Quebec sovereignty. He called that columnist a “redneck”. A viewer complained that this term was racist. Due to a technical problem, the station was unable to provide logger tapes of the broadcast but it was able to provide a written transcript of the commentary, which enabled the CBSC to rule on the substance of the complaint. The Quebec Regional Panel found the broadcaster in violation of its CBSC membership requirements for its failure to retain tapes. With respect to the use of the term “redneck”, however, the Panel observed that it could be “considered a disparaging or derogatory term for people with politically conservative opinions” but it did not violate the *CAB Code of Ethics* since “political affiliation” is not a protected category under the Human Rights clause.

Abusively Anti-Gay Sermonizing Not On

Discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation was raised with respect to a religious program in *CITS-TV re John Hagee Today (“Diamonds for Successful Living”)* (CBSC Decision 04/05-0177, April 19, 2005).

In a televised sermon, American Pastor John Hagee criticized the United States school system for eliminating all elements of Christianity and being too liberal on issues related to sexuality. He then stated that homosexual lobby groups were using the school system to “brain-wash” and “recruit” children. The Ontario Regional Panel determined that Hagee’s criticisms of the school system were entitled to be broadcast but that his comments about the “gay agenda” were abusive and unduly discriminatory and conveyed an attack on an identifiable group.

More Excessive Anti-Gay Comments by a Televangelist

A similar situation arose in *OMNI.1 re an episode of the Jimmy Swaggart Telecast* (CBSC Decision 04/05-0097, April 19, 2005). American televangelist Jimmy Swaggart stated his objection to same-sex marriage and complained about politicians who fail to take a definitive stand on the issue. He then went so far as to say that if a man ever looked at him in a romantic way, he would “kill him and tell God he died” and that any politicians who support same-sex marriage “oughta have to marry a pig and live with him forever.” The Ontario Regional Panel concluded that those remarks contravened the Human Rights clause and the Religious Programming clause of the *CAB Code of Ethics*, since “as a religious figure, [Swaggart] can be presumed to set an example for his community. It would, therefore, be easy for someone to infer that this might be the proper way for a Christian [...] to respond to homosexuality.” The Panel also commended the broadcaster for having aired an apology for the remarks shortly after the original broadcast.

Radio

Eleven of the Panel Decisions released in 2004/2005 involved radio programming (compared to 14 in 2003/2004). The issues

dealt with were coarse language, discriminatory language and generally inappropriate comments. Where the decision treated more than one issue, it is discussed under the subject that appeared to be of primary concern to the complainant.

Listen to that Language

Clause 9(c) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* is the Code provision applicable to complaints about coarse language on the radio. It requires broadcasters to ensure that their programming does not contain unduly coarse and offensive language. In three decisions this year, the Adjudicating Panels applied the CBSC precedents which established that the broadcast of the f-word on English-language stations during daytime and early evening periods will constitute a breach of that provision. The Quebec Regional Panel also rendered a decision about coarse language in a French-language broadcast and determined that a particular phrase was in breach of Clause 9(c) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* when broadcast during the day as well as Clause 6 of that Code when used as an insult against an individual.

Gratuitous Coarse Language

The use of the f-word by a guest on a morning show concerned a listener in *CFNY-FM re the Show with Dean Blundell (David Carradine Appearance)* (CBSC Decision 03/04-1305, October 22, 2004). The hosts of the show interviewed actor David Carradine on his role in the *Kill Bill* films. At the beginning of the interview, at 8:36 am, Carradine flippantly uttered the f-word, with the apparent intention of “stirring the pot”. The Ontario Regional Panel decided that the use of that coarse word on morning radio was in contravention of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. The Panel also expressed dissatisfaction with the broadcaster’s initial response in which the station had denied that the word had been used.

Too Early even if Not Gratuitous

The presence of the f-word in a live interview was also at issue in *CFGQ-FM (CKIK-FM) re a*

live Tragically Hip concert and interview (CBSC Decision 03/04-1850, November 1, 2004). In a special live broadcast, the Canadian rock band The Tragically Hip performed a concert and answered questions from the host and audience members. In his response to a question about his favourite Tragically Hip lyrics, the lead singer used the f-word. The comment was broadcast at approximately 8:50 pm, which the Prairie Regional Panel found to be in violation of the *CAB Code of Ethics*.

Changing Standards?

A song containing the f-word was the subject of *CHOM-FM re the song “Locked in the Trunk of a Car” by the Tragically Hip* (CBSC Decision 04/05-0324, April 4, 2005). That unedited song contained one instance of a variation of the f-word which was broadcast at 3:15 pm. Following the CBSC’s jurisprudence on that issue, the Quebec Regional Panel found the broadcast in breach of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. The Panel did observe, however, that “[f]ormerly unacceptable language gradually but invariably insinuates itself into more common usage [...]. That is likely the case with respect to the f-word and its derivatives [...]. Some of those forms are more aggressive and some are more benign but all are undoubtedly extremely offensive to certain sectors.”

Adding Insult to Injury

The issue of coarse comments in a French-language broadcast was also dealt with this year in *CJRC-AM re an interview by Daniel Séguin on L’Outaouais ce matin* (CBSC Decision 03/04-2082, April 14, 2005). Beginning at approximately 7:00 am, the host conducted an interview with the owner of another radio station which had been denied the renewal of its licence in part due to the language its hosts had used on air. In the discussion of freedom of expression, Séguin informed his guest that he supported the CRTC’s decision to shut the guest’s station down because it had not obeyed the rules. Séguin then twice told his guest to “envoyer chier” (“fuck off” in English). The Quebec Regional Panel concluded that Séguin was

entitled to voice his opinion on the controversial topic being discussed but that the phrase “envoyer chier” constituted unduly coarse and offensive language and was an inappropriate personal attack on his guest.

Discrimination on the Dial

As in television cases, complaints about discriminatory comments made on radio are examined under Clause 2 (Human Rights) of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. As noted in the Television section above, it is not the mere mention of one of the identified categories in Clause 2 that will constitute a violation but, rather, the comments must amount to negative generalizations about a group and/or be extremely harsh and insulting. Criticism of a group based on its political actions is generally not problematic; nor are *lightly* mocking remarks about an identifiable group.

A total of four of the radio-related decisions released this year examined questions of discrimination, two on the basis of religion and the other two on the basis of race/nationality. The Adjudicating Panels found a breach of Clause 2 in one of those cases because a host extended his predominantly political commentary to insult a particular religious group. In another case, comments about the Catholic Church were deemed to merely represent a viewpoint opposing the Church’s stand on same-sex marriage, though the broadcaster was found in violation of its responsibility of responsiveness for failing to provide any response to the complainant. In a third case, a parody featuring an aboriginal character, the Panel determined that the content did not reach the level of abusive comment. In the final decision, which involved a song about the “white man”, the Panel concluded that the lyrics constituted a legitimate political criticism of white imperialism and were thus not in violation of Clause 2, but that the song did promote violence contrary to Clause 9(a) of the Radio Programming provision which prohibits the sanction, promotion or glamorization of violence. More information about those Panel Decisions is provided immediately below.

Intolerant of Intolerance

The host of an open-line radio program was accused of racism by the complainant in *CKAC-AM re an episode of Doc Mailloux* (CBSC Decision 03/04-0453, February 10, 2005). The topic of the episode was Canada’s immigration policies. The host expressed the view that immigrants to Canada should integrate better into Canadian society and not insist on retaining aspects of their culture. For the most part, his comments referred to all immigrants rather than any one particular racial or ethnic group. At one point, however, he did describe Sikhs as a “gang of bozos”. The Quebec Regional Panel determined that, “by virtue of the principle of freedom of expression, he is entitled to speak against the prospect of wide-ranging immigration.” It followed that the host’s general comments on the subject did not violate the Human Rights clause; however, his specific comments did violate that clause because “the host is entitled to espouse his chauvinistic intolerance until such time as his disrespect leaks into individual races and nationalities, as it did when he referred to the Sikhs as ‘a gang of bozos’ (translation).”

Political Perspectives on Religious Matters Acceptable even if Critical

Religious discrimination was also at issue in *CHWO-AM re an episode of Durant’s World* (CBSC Decision 04/05-0447, May 24, 2005). In an editorial about the Supreme Court of Canada’s review of same-sex marriage, a radio host expressed his support for extending the definition of marriage. He also stated that he had left the Catholic Church because they would not accept his lesbian daughter. A listener complained that the remarks were discriminatory against Catholics. The Ontario Regional Panel concluded that the broadcast merely criticized the Catholic Church’s policy on homosexuality; it was “not at all discriminatory, much less unduly discriminatory” against all Catholics in general. The broadcaster in this case had

failed to respond to the complainant at all, for which it was found in violation of its responsibility of membership in the CBSC regarding responsiveness to audience members.

A Lyric Too Far

Offensive song lyrics were the subject of *CJKR-FM re the song "Kill All the White Man" by NOFX* (CBSC Decision 04/05-0612, June 2, 2005). The punk song contained lyrics such as "The white man come to pillage my village" and "He rape all my people as he rape my country." The frequently-repeated refrain was simply "Kill all the white man". A listener complained that this song was "needlessly offensive, racist and sexist". The Prairie Regional Panel decided that the song did not violate the Human Rights clause because it was a political commentary critiquing historical white imperialism. The Panel did find, however, that the repetition of the phrase "Kill all the white man" as a suggested retaliation for historical wrongs, sanctioned and promoted violence contrary to Clause 9(a) of the *CAB Code of Ethics*.

A Painful Parody

A discriminatory parody raised concerns in *CKTF-FM re a parody on Les Grandes Gueules* (CBSC Decision 04/05-0763, July 19, 2005). In a parody based on the television commercials for Lakota arthritis pain relief products, the hosts of a radio program pretended to interview the "Lakota Indian" in the advertisement. They "questioned" him about his career and the products advertised. During the course of the "interview", they referred to his "fat barefoot wife", the suggestion that he would be eating "hot owl" for dinner, and that he was a "welfare bum with feathers" (translations). A listener felt that the comments were racist and promoted stereotypes. The Quebec Regional Panel concluded that the parody did not breach the Human Rights clause. The Panel added that it "readily understands the offence found by the complainant" in some of the expressions used during the parody but it concluded that the segment made fun of the commercials rather than of Aboriginals in general.

Full, Fair & Proper Perspectives

The CBSC also encountered complaints about inappropriate comments of various sorts during radio broadcasts. Although those complaints did not raise issues that could be treated under any of the above categories, they could be examined under Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* regarding the full, fair and proper presentation of opinion, comment and editorial. Three such complaints resulted in Panel Decisions. The subjects of those decisions were, respectively, an editorial about the court ruling in a child pornography case, a parody based on a tragic death, and insulting remarks made about the Governor-General. The first case resulted in a breach of Clause 6, the second did not (although there was a dissenting viewpoint) and the third could not be adjudicated (as to substance) because the station had failed to retain logger tapes of the broadcast. Details of those decisions follow.

Do Not Focus on the Judge's Family

An editorial about a court decision was examined in *CILQ-FM re John Derringer's "Tool of the Day"* (CBSC Decision 02/03-1465, February 10, 2004). In his daily editorial, a radio host commented on a sentence handed down by a judge in a child pornography case. The commentator expressed his opinion that the sentence had been too lenient and that the judge was a "disgrace" to the Canadian justice system. He asserted that convictions for child pornography in other countries are much harsher and that, for things to change, it would "have to happen" that one day it would be the judge's children or grand-children who were victims of child pornography so that this particular judge would see the error of his ways. The complaint came from the judge's ex-wife who was concerned that, by airing the judge's name and suggesting that harm be done to his children, the broadcaster had put her family in danger. The Ontario Regional Panel acknowledged that the host was legitimately permitted to express his

point of view on this legal topic but that he had inappropriately extended his criticism of the judgment to include the promotion of violence against the man's family. The Panel also found a Code violation for the host's inaccurate ex-aggeration of the penalties found in other countries and for the personal attacks on the judge.

On-the-edge Parody

Making light of a tragic situation was the issue in *CJKR-FM re a morning show parody (Osborne 24)* (CBSC Decision 03/04-0393, November 1, 2004). The hosts of a radio morning show broadcast a parody that was inspired by a recent news story about a body that had been found behind the wall of a bar in Winnipeg's Osborne Village. The parody borrowed elements from the action television program *24*. The segment featured a muffled voice asking for help from behind a wall and a respondent repeatedly misunderstanding what the voice was saying. The majority of the Prairie Regional Panel discussed the delicacy of using tragic events as a springboard for humour but concluded that, in this instance, the comments had not gone too far, in part because the event involved an individual unknown to the public rather than an identifiable group. Two members of the Panel, however, dissented on the basis that the parody made fun of a recent, local tragic event and would therefore have been painful for the community.

Logger Tapes Essential to the Adjudication Process

Insults targeting a political figure raised the concern of the complainant in *CJAD-AM re an episode of the Tommy Schnurmacher Show (logger tapes)* (CBSC Decision 03/04-0089, April 5, 2005). A listener complained that the host of an open-line radio program had insulted the Governor-General of Canada, using language that promoted hatred and contempt. The Quebec Regional Panel was unable to rule on the substance of the

complaint because the broadcaster had failed to retain copies of the logger tapes of the program in question. The Panel therefore found the broadcaster in violation of its responsibility of membership to conserve tapes of its programming when requested by the CBSC.

SUMMARY DECISIONS

Summary Decisions are issued to the complainant when the matter raised in the complaint is one that has been addressed by the CBSC in previous decisions and an Adjudicating Panel has determined that the point at issue does not amount to a Code violation. Summary Decisions do not involve a formal Panel adjudication. Instead, the CBSC Secretariat reviews all correspondence relating to the complaint from both the complainant and the broadcaster and watches or listens to the challenged broadcast. A Summary Decision explains why the matter did not require a Panel adjudication and cites previous CBSC Panel Decisions which found no Code breach for similar programming. Summary Decisions are not made public; a letter is sent to the complainant with a copy to the broadcaster in question. The CBSC issued a total of 89 Summary Decisions in 2004/2005.

The greatest number of those Summary Decisions involved English-language television broadcasts. In the vast majority of cases, the language of complaint was the same as the language of the broadcast, although sometimes, particularly in the case of third-language programming, the complainant wrote to the CBSC in a language other than that of the program which was the subject of the complaint. The CBSC's Summary Decision is always in the language that the complainant used in the original complaint. A break-down of the language of the broadcasts that resulted in Summary Decisions follows.

Language and Medium of Complaints that Resulted in Summary Decisions

Language		English	French	Other	Total
Medium	Radio	20	3	-	23
	Television	54	10	2	66
	Total	74	13	2	89

Hot Topics in Summary Decisions

Summary Decisions released this year dealt with a number of different issues. The most common complaint was the broadcast of sexual content. Twenty-four of the Summary Decisions released this year addressed that concern. A Summary Decision was issued in those cases because, although some of the programs were indeed sexually explicit, the broadcaster had aired the program after the 9:00 pm Watershed hour and provided appropriate viewer advisories and classification icons, as required by the Canadian Association of Broadcasters' (CAB) *Code of Ethics* and *Violence Code*. The CBSC Secretariat issued similar Summary Decisions for complaints relating to violent programming, when those programs were correctly broadcast after the Watershed hour with adequate advisories and classification icons.

Another subject examined in a number of Summary Decisions was discrimination based on sexual orientation. Since same-sex marriage was a hot political topic this past year, it was mentioned in various types of programming, including public affairs, open-line and religious programs. In cases where individuals merely stated their objection to same-sex unions rather than uttering abusive comments against homosexuals as a group, the CBSC Secretariat found no breach of the

Human Rights clause of the *CAB Code of Ethics* and was able to issue a Summary Decision. In cases involving comments about other identifiable groups, having concluded that the comments were not unduly negative about the group as a whole, the CBSC Secretariat saw no need for the complaint to be adjudicated by a CBSC Panel.

Some complainants who filed Ruling Requests complained about inaccurate information provided in news reports or other information programs. Such complaints also often suggested that these inaccuracies created unfair or biased presentations of the topic being discussed. Accordingly, they were examined under the *CAB Code of Ethics* provision relating to news and the Radio Television News Directors Association (RTNDA) *Code of (Journalistic) Ethics*. Summary Decisions were issued in many of these cases because, upon review, it was evident that the broadcaster had provided the facts available at the time and had presented multiple sides of the issue, even if it was not as thorough an examination as the complainant would have liked.

The remaining Summary Decisions addressed concerns about other issues. The table below provides statistics on the number of Summary Decisions that treated each of those concerns.

Issues Raised in Complaints that Resulted in Summary Decisions

Issue Raised in Complaints	Number of Complaints*
Viewer Advisories	2
Bad Taste	2
Biased/Unfair/Imbalanced Information	9
Classification/Rating	1
Coarse Language	4
Conflict of Interest	2
Unfair Contest	2
Discrimination Based on Disability	2
Discrimination Based on Ethnicity	4
Discrimination Based on Gender	2
Discrimination Based on Nationality	5
Discrimination Based on Race	2
Discrimination Based on Religion	7
Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation	10
Exploitation of Children	2
General Improper Comments/Content	7
Inaccurate News or Information	8
Journalistic Conduct	1
Invasion of Privacy	2
Degrading Representation of Women	3
Scheduling	15
Sexual Content	24
Subliminal Advertising	1
Treatment of Callers to Open-Line Programs	1
Violence	11

*Some complaints raised more than one issue, so the total may exceed 89.

4. SUMMARY OF COMPLAINTS

OVERVIEW OF CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

In 2004/2005, the total number of complaint files opened by the CBSC was 1,924. While there were no huge numbers of complaints attached to any program, some issues drew a significant number of complaints, most notably the following examples: the use during news broadcasts of the descriptor “Polish” to designate Nazi ghettos and concentration camps located in Poland (84 complaints, two Ruling Requests and a Panel Decision); the arrival of the television show *Sex and the City* on conventional television in Canada (39 complaints, two Ruling Requests and two Summary Decisions by the CBSC Secretariat); and the commentary of a Quebec television personality who compared the labour practices of Wal-Mart to the Nazi government in the pre-World War Two period (37 complaints, four Ruling Requests and four Summary Decisions by the CBSC Secretariat).

- Of the 1,924 complaint files opened in fiscal 2004/2005, the CBSC actually handled 1,526 or 79.3%; 243 files were referred to Advertising Standards Canada (ASC), three to the Cable Television Standards Council (CTSC), and 152 to the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) (of these 152 files, 122 related to non-member broadcasters and 30 dealt with issues which did not fall within the parameters of the Codes administered by the CBSC).
- The CBSC, nonetheless, responded to all the complaints including those sent elsewhere for ultimate resolution.
- This year, the CRTC forwarded 1,013 complaints to the CBSC (52.7% of the total number of complaint files opened in 2004/2005). Only two complaints were forwarded from other agencies this year (0.1% of the total complaint files). The CBSC received 909 complaints directly (47.3% of the total complaint files opened this year).
- The overwhelming majority of complainants chose e-mail as their favoured method of communication this year. E-mailed complaints accounted for 1,764 files (91.7% of the total complaint files opened in 2004/2005); regular mail and faxed complaints trailed behind at 134 complaints (7.0%) and 23 complaints (1.2%), respectively.
- In addition, as in previous years, the CBSC received “general correspondence” from people seeking, for example, general information about the Council and its Codes or contact information for a broadcaster. This year, had such correspondence been classified in the same manner as standard complaints, it would have added a further 58 “files” to the total.

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPLAINTS BY MEDIUM AND ADJUDICATING PANEL

Every complaint is, upon receipt, attributed to the Adjudicating Panel that would deal with it, if it went through the full CBSC adjudication process. The following table shows the distribution of complaints by medium and Adjudicating Panel.

Of the 1,526 complaint files handled by the CBSC,

- 383 dealt with radio programming (25.1%);
- 1,122 dealt with television programming (73.5%);
- 21 dealt with general concerns about broadcasting or could not otherwise be categorized (1.2%).

<u>Region of Complaint (Adjudicating Panels)</u>				
Adjudicating Panel	Radio	Television	N/A	Total
Atlantic	10	10	0	20
Quebec	101	224	2	327
Ontario	153	225	6	384
Prairie	64	52	1	117
B.C.	54	85	5	144
National Conventional Television	--	103	--	103
National Specialty Services	--	406	--	406
Non-determined	1	17	7	25
TOTAL	383	1,122	21	1,526

Notes:

- 1) The vertical "N/A" axis includes complaints concerning matters other than radio or television programming, such as cable bills or satellite reception.
- 2) The region of complaint origin is determined by the location of the broadcaster unless the concern relates to matters which must be dealt with by one of the National Panels (principally resulting from the national nature of the broadcaster identified in the complaint). When complaints received by e-mail provide only the complainant's e-mail address and where no other clues as to the appropriate region are provided in the complaint, it is categorized as non-determined.

LANGUAGE OF PROGRAM

Of the principal categories of the 1,526 complaint files handled by the CBSC,

- 1,171 complaints dealt with English-language programming (76.7%);
- 310 dealt with French-language programming (20.3%).

SOURCE OF PROGRAM

Of the principal categories of the 1,526 complaint files handled by the CBSC,

- 1,005 complaints dealt with Canadian programming (65.9%);
- 320 dealt with foreign programming (21.0%).

Language of Program

Language	Radio		Television		N/A		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
English	277	72.3	890	79.3	4	19	1171	76.7
French	94	24.5	216	19.3	0	0	310	20.3
Third Language	11	2.9	7	0.6	0	0	18	1.2
Non-determined	1	0.3	9	0.8	17	81	27	1.8
TOTAL	383	100	1122	100	21	100	1526	100

Source of Program

Source	Radio		Television		N/A		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Canadian	356	93.0	648	57.7	1	4.8	1005	65.9
Foreign	11	2.9	308	27.5	1	4.8	320	21.0
Non-determined	16	4.1	166	14.8	19	90.4	201	13.1
TOTAL	383	100	1122	100	21	100	1526	100

TYPE OF PROGRAM – RADIO

The CBSC classifies the type of programming of its complaints in a non-exclusive manner, *i.e.* allowing for a program to be classified under more than one category. While this provides more useful information to readers, the sum of the radio complaints in the chart below, if given, would naturally exceed the actual number of radio complaints received in 2004/2005.

Of the 383 radio complaints,

- the overwhelming majority dealt with informal discourse / open-line programming, namely, a total of 264 complaint files (68.9% of all radio complaints).

<u>Type of Program – Radio</u>			
Type of Program	# of Radio Complaints	% of Radio Complaints	% of All Complaints
Advertising	42	11.0	2.8
Comedy	0	0	0
Contests	35	9.1	2.3
Education (Human Interest)	0	0	0
Infomercial	3	0.8	0.2
Informal Discourse / Open Line	264	68.9	17.3
Music	29	7.6	1.9
News and Public Affairs	22	5.7	1.4
Promos	11	2.9	0.7
Religion	2	0.5	0.1
Sports	4	1.0	0.3
Undetermined	18	4.7	1.2
Non-applicable	3	0.8	0.2

Notes:

- 1) While the CBSC's non-exclusive categorization of programming results in some duplication, the percentage of complaints in each category is, nevertheless, calculated on the basis of the actual number of complaint files concerning radio programming (383). Accordingly, the sum of the percentages would, if totaled, of course, be greater than 100%.
- 2) This percentage is based on the total number of complaint files handled by the CBSC (1,526). Accordingly, the sum of the percentages would, if totaled, of course, be greater than 100%.

TYPE OF PROGRAM – TELEVISION

As explained in the immediately preceding section, the CBSC classifies the type of programming of its complaints in a non-exclusive manner. You should refer to that explanation to understand the percentages provided in the chart below.

In 2004/2005, the primary concerns with respect to television programming were:

- News and public affairs, with a total of 387 complaints (34.5% of all television complaints);
- Drama, with a total of 117 complaints (10.4% of television complaints);
- Education / Documentary, with a total of 111 complaints (9.9% of television complaints).

<u>Type of Program – Television</u>			
<u>Type of Program</u>	<u># of Television Complaints</u>	<u>% of Television Complaints</u>	<u>% of All Complaints</u>
Advertising	52	4.6	3.4
Animation	17	1.9	1.1
Children's Programming	15	1.3	1.0
Comedy	29	2.6	1.9
Contests	7	0.6	0.5
Drama	117	10.4	7.7
Education / Documentaries	111	9.9	7.3
Fantasy / Science Fiction	1	0.1	0.1
Talk Show / Variety	75	6.7	4.9
Movies	53	4.7	3.5
Music	22	2.0	1.4
News and Public Affairs	387	34.5	25.4
Promos	44	3.9	2.9
Reality Programming	40	3.6	2.6
Religion	66	5.9	4.3
Sports	43	3.8	2.8
Undetermined	143	12.7	9.4
Non-applicable	14	1.2	0.9

Notes:

- 1) The percentage of complaints in each category is calculated on the basis of the actual number of complaint files concerning television programming (1,122). See note 1 on the previous page.
- 2) See note 2 on the previous page.

KEYWORDS

The CBSC classifies programming using a set of non-exclusive keywords. Similar to the program type classification system described above, keyword classification is non-

exclusive, *i.e.* allowing for a program to be classified under more than one category. As a result, the sum of the entries in the chart below, if given, would naturally exceed the actual number of complaints received in 2004/2005.

<u>Keywords</u>			
Keyword	Radio #	Television #	Total #
Advisories	1	15	16
Age Discrimination	2	3	5
Bad Taste	64	113	177
Bias	28	77	105
Children's Issues	37	217	254
Contests	24	1	25
Ethnic Discrimination	20	50	70
Foul Language	53	74	127
Gender Discrimination	57	38	95
Human Rights	71	143	214
Improper/Inappropriate Comments	125	101	226
Journalistic Practices	10	41	51
News and Public Information	17	228	245
Offensive Humour	31	24	55
Other	32	21	53
Physical Disability	5	47	52
Privacy	7	12	19
Program Classification	0	13	13
Program Selection/Quality	3	22	25
Racial Discrimination	32	47	79
Religion	22	40	62
Scheduling	15	296	311
Sexual Content	32	322	354
Sexual Orientation	14	58	72
Sports	0	15	15
Subliminal Content	1	4	5
Treatment of Callers	17	5	22
Violence	10	109	119

**STATUS OF COMPLAINTS
AT YEAR END**

Of the 1,526 files handled by the CBSC, 940 (61.6%) were “code relevant and specific complaints”, meaning that they (a) provided sufficient information concerning the broadcast in question to enable follow-up by the CBSC and (b) related to a code provision administered by the CBSC. The remaining 586 complaints were considered “general”, meaning that they may not have provided sufficient detail to enable follow-up, may not have raised an issue under the Codes administered by the Council or were made too late for logger tapes to be retained; consequently, these files were closed by the

CBSC immediately following its response to the complainant.

Of the 940 “code relevant and specific” complaints, 723 (76.9%) did not require follow-up by the CBSC as they were resolved at the level of broadcaster and complainant communication. Seventy-six complaints (8.1%) were either resolved through the release of decisions of the various Panels and the CBSC Secretariat or through the issuance of other Secretariat correspondence. Seventy-eight complaints (8.3%) have yet to complete the dialogue process with the broadcaster and 63 complaints are at various stages in the complaints review process, *i.e.* the complainant has requested a ruling by the CBSC.

5. ADJUDICATORS

Below is a list of CBSC Adjudicators who have served for some or all of fiscal 2004/2005. A short biography for each of these Adjudicators during their term may be found on the CBSC's website at www.cbsc.ca.

Since Adjudicators come and go during the year, it may appear that there is more than one Chair or Vice-Chair, but they are

successive, not overlapping. There are five public Adjudicators and five industry Adjudicators on each Regional Panel. The two National Panels include the National Chair and five Public Adjudicators, plus five Industry Adjudicators on each. Overall, there remain three vacancies to fill as of the end of the fiscal year.

ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL

Hilary Montbourquette, Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Gilbert Clements, Vice-Chair, Public Adjudicator
Leona Bossé, Public Adjudicator
Burnley A. (Rocky) Jones, Public Adjudicator
Bob MacEachern, Industry Adjudicator
Carol McDade, Industry Adjudicator
Randy McKeen, Industry Adjudicator
Roberta Morrison, Public Adjudicator
Toni-Marie Wiseman, Industry Adjudicator

BRITISH COLUMBIA REGIONAL PANEL

Sally Warren, Chair, Public Adjudicator
Hudson Mack, Vice-Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Hiroko Ainsworth, Public Adjudicator
Prem Gill, Industry Adjudicator
Gordon Leighton, Industry Adjudicator
Mason Loh, Public Adjudicator
Farnaz Riahi, Industry Adjudicator
Joan Rysavy, Public Adjudicator
Mohini Singh, Industry Adjudicator
Norman Spector, Public Adjudicator
Ross Winters, Industry Adjudicator

ONTARIO REGIONAL PANEL

Robert Stanbury, Chair, Public Adjudicator
Madeline Ziniak, Vice-Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Bill Bodnarchuk, Industry Adjudicator
Jennifer David, Public Adjudicator
Hanny Hassan, Public Adjudicator
Karen King, Industry Adjudicator
Mark Maheu, Industry Adjudicator
Mark Oldfield, Industry Adjudicator
John Pungente, Public Adjudicator
Cynthia Reyes, Public Adjudicator

PRAIRIE REGIONAL PANEL

Daryl Braun, Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Daniel Ish, Vice-Chair (then Chair), Public Adjudicator
Vic Dubois, Vice-Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Vince Cownden, Industry Adjudicator
Dorothy Dobbie, Public Adjudicator
Jennifer Fong, Public Adjudicator
Fil Fraser, Industry Adjudicator
Kelly Johnston, Industry Adjudicator
Kurt Leavins, Industry Adjudicator
Rey Pagtakhan, Public Adjudicator
Eleanor Shia, Public Adjudicator
Glenda Spenrath, Industry Adjudicator

QUEBEC REGIONAL PANEL

Guyline Bachand, Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Tara Rajan, Vice-Chair, Public Adjudicator
Michèle Audette, Public Adjudicator
Louise Baillargeon, Public Adjudicator
Brian Kenemy, Industry Adjudicator
Bernard Guérin, Industry Adjudicator
Gilles Moisan, Public Adjudicator
Marie-Anna Murat, Industry Adjudicator
Robert Parent, Industry Adjudicator

NATIONAL Panels

Public Adjudicators

Ronald I. Cohen, Chair
Howard Pawley, Vice-
Chair
Meg Hogarth
Catherine Murray
Fo Niemi
Peter O'Neill

*Specialty Services
Adjudicators*

Sarah Crawford, Vice-Chair
Heather Conway
Rita Cugini
Rita Deverell
Elizabeth Duffy-Maclean
Michael Harris
Valerie Morrisette

*Conventional Television
Adjudicators*

Suzanne Gouin, Vice-Chair
Bob Culbert
Peggy Hebden
Edward Holmes
Joanne Levy
Jim Macdonald

LIST OF CBCS MEMBERS BY REGION

Newfoundland

CFCB · CFCV-FM/RB · CFDL-FM/RD · CFGN/RB · CFLC-FM/RB · CFLN · CFLW/RB · CFNN-FM/RB · CFNW/RB · CFOZ-FM/RB · CFSX · CHCM/RB · CHOS-FM/RB · CHOZ-FM · CHVO · CIOS-FM/RB · CIOZ-FM/RB · CJON-TV · CJOZ-FM/RB · CJYQ · CKCM · CKGA · CKIM/RB · CKIX-FM · CKOZ-FM/RB · CKVO · CKXB/RB · CKXD-FM · CKXG-FM · CKXX-FM · VOXM · VOXM-FM

P.E.I.

CHTN

Nova Scotia

CFDR · CFRQ-FM · CIGO-FM · CIHF-TV · CIOO-FM · CJCB-TV · CJCH · CJCH-TV · CJLS · CKTY-FM · CKUL-FM

New Brunswick

CFJX-FM · CFXY-FM · CHSJ-FM · CHTD-FM · CHWV-FM · CIBX-FM · CIKX-FM/RB · CJCJ-FM · CJMO-FM · CJXL-FM · CKBC · CKCW-TV · CKHJ-FM · CKLT-TV · CKTO-FM

Quebec

CFAP-TV · CFCF-TV · CFCM-TV · CFDA-FM · CFEL-FM · CFEM-TV · CFER-TV · CFGL-FM · CFGS-TV · CFIX-FM · CFJO-FM · CFJP-TV · CFKM-TV · CFKS-TV · CFLO-FM · CFMB · CFOM-FM · CFQR-FM · CFRS-TV · CFTM-TV · CFVD-FM · CFVM · CFVS-TV · CFZZ-FM · CHAU-TV · CHEM-TV · CHEY-FM · CHEX-FM · CHGO-FM · CHGO-FM-1/RB · CHGO-FM-2/RB · CHIK-FM · CHLN · CHLT · CHLT-TV · CHMP-FM · CHOA-FM · CHOE-FM · CHOM-FM · CHOT-TV · CHPR-FM · CHRC · CHRL · CHRM-FM · CHVD · CHVD-FM/RB · CIGB-FM · CIKI-FM · CIME-FM · CIMF-FM · CIMO-FM · CINF · CINW · CITE-FM · CITE-FM-1 · CITF-FM · CJAB-FM · CJAD-AM · CJDM-FM · CJFM-FM · CJGO-FM · CJLA-FM · CJLP/RB · CJMF-FM · CJMM-FM · CJMS · CJMV-FM · CJNT-TV · CJOI-FM · CJPM-TV · CJRC · CKAC · CKDG-FM · CKGM · CKLD · CKLS-FM · CKMF-FM · CKMI-TV · CKOI-FM · CKRN-TV · CKRS · CKRT-TV · CKSH-TV · CKSM/RB · CKTF-FM · CKTM-TV · CKTV-TV · CKVM · CKYK-FM

Ontario

CFBG-FM · CFBK-FM · CFCA-FM · CFFX · CFGO · CFGX-FM · CFHK-FM · CFJR · CFLG-FM · CFLO-FM-1/RB · CFLY-FM · CFLZ · CFMJ · CFMK-FM · CFNY-FM · CFPL · CFPL-FM · CFPL-TV · CFRA · CFRB · CFTO-TV · CFTR · CHAM · CHAS-FM · CHAY-FM · CHBX-TV · CHCD-FM · CHCH-TV · CHEX-TV · CHEZ-FM · CHFD-TV · CHFI-FM · CHKS-FM · CHKT · CHML · CHMS-FM · CHMS-FM/RB · CHNO-FM · CHRE-FM · CHRO-TV · CHST-FM · CHTZ-FM · CHUC · CHUM · CHUM-FM · CHUR-FM · CHVR-FM · CHWI-TV/TS · CHWO · CHYC-FM · CHYK-FM · CHYK/RB · CHYM-FM · CHYR-FM · CICI-TV · CICX-FM · CICZ-FM · CIDC-FM · CIDR-FM · CIGL-FM · CIGM · CIHT-FM · CIII-TV · CILQ-FM · CIMJ-FM · CIMX-FM · CING-FM · CIOX-FM · CIQB-FM · CIQM-FM · CIRS · CIRV-FM · CISS-FM · CITO-TV/TS · CITS-TV · CITY-TV · CIWW · CJAQ-FM · CJBK · CJBK-TV · CJBQ · CJBX-FM · CJCL · CJDV-FM · CJET-FM · CJEZ-FM · CJLA-FM · CJLB-FM · CJMJ-FM · CJMR · CJMX-FM · CJOH-TV · CJOY · CJPT-FM · CJQM-FM · CJQQ-FM · CJRQ-FM · CJSJ-FM · CJSS-FM · CJTN · CJXY-FM · CKAP-FM · CKAT · CKBY-FM · CKCB · CKCB-FM · CKCO-TV · CKDK-FM · CKDO · CKEY-FM · CKFM-FM · CKFX-FM · CKGB · CKGE-FM · CKGL · CKKL-FM · CKKW · CKLC · CKLH-FM · CKLW · CKNR-FM · CKNX · CKNX-FM · CKNX-TV/TS · CKNY-TV · CKOC · CKPR · CKPR-TV · CKPT · CKQB-FM · CKQM-FM · CKRU · CKSL · CKTB · CKVR-TV · CKWF-FM · CKWS-TV · CKWW · OMNI.1 · OMNI.2 · Toronto1

Manitoba

CFAM · CFAR · CFRY · CFWM-FM · CHIQ-FM · CHMI-TV · CHSM · CHTM · CILT-FM · CITI-FM · CJAR · CJEL-FM · CJKR-FM · CJOB · CJRB · CKDM · CKJS · CKLQ · CKMM-FM · CKMW · CKND-TV · CKX-FM · CKX-TV · CKXA-FM · CKY-FM · CKY-TV · NCI-FM

Saskatchewan

CFMC-FM · CFMM-FM · CFQC-FM · CFQC-TV · CFRE-TV · CFSK-TV · CFSL · CFWF-FM · CFYM · CHAB · CHMX-FM · CHQX-FM · CICC-TV · CIMG-FM · CINT · CIPA-TV · CIZL-FM · CJCQ-FM · CJDJ-FM · CJGX · CJME · CJMK-FM · CJNB · CJNS · CJSL · CJSN · CJVR-FM · CJWW · CJYM · CKBI · CKCK-FM · CKCK-TV · CKJH · CKOM · CKRM · CKSW

Alberta

CFAC · CFBR-FM · CFCN-TV · CFCW · CFFR · CFGP-FM · CFMG-FM · CFMY-FM · CFOK · CFRN · CFRN-TV · CFRV-FM · CHBW-FM · CHED · CHFV-FM · CHFV-FM-1/RB · CHLB-FM · CHLW · CHQR · CHQT · CHRFB · CHRK-FM · CHRK-FM-3/RB · CHUB-FM · CIBK-FM · CIBQ · CIBW-FM · CICT-TV · CIQX-FM · CIRK-FM · CISA-TV · CISN-FM · CITL-TV · CITV-TV · CIYR/RB · CIZZ-FM · CJAY-FM · CJBZ-FM · CJMN-FM · CJMN-FM-1/RB · CJOK-FM · CJPR · CJRX-FM · CJXK-FM · CJXX-FM · CJYR · CKAL-TV · CKBA · CKDQ · CKEM-TV · CKER-FM · CKGY · CKHL/RB · CKJR · CKKX-FM · CKKY · CKLA-FM/RB · CKMX · CKNG-FM · CKRA-FM · CKRD-TV · CKRY-FM · CKSA · CKSA-TV · CKSQ · CKWA · CKYL · CKYX-FM

British Columbia

CFAX · CFBT-FM · CFEK/RB · CFGQ-FM · CFJC-TV · CFKC/RB · CFMI-FM · CFOX-FM · CFSR-FM · CFTK · CFTK-TV · CFUN · CHAN-TV · CHBC-TV · CHBE-FM · CHBZ-FM · CHDR-FM · CHEK-TV · CHKG-FM · CHMJ · CHNM-TV · CHNU-TV · CHOR · CHQM-FM · CHRX-FM · CHSU-FM · CHTK · CHTT-FM · CICF · CIEG-FM/RB · CIFM-FM · CIGV-FM · CILK-FM · CIOC-FM · CIOR · CIPN-FM/RB · CISC-FM/RB · CISE-FM · CISL · CISP-FM/RB · CISQ-FM · CISW-FM/RB · CIVI-TV · CIVT-TV · CJAT-FM · CJEK/RB · CJEV/RB · CJFW-FM · CJJR-FM · CJMG-FM · CJOR · CJVB · CJZN-FM · CKBD · CKBZ-FM · CKCL-FM · CKCL-FM-1/RB · CKCL-FM-2/RB · CKCR · CKDV-FM · CKFR · CKGF · CKGO-FM · CKGO-FM/RB · CKGR · CKIS-FM · CKIZ-FM · CKKC · CKKN-FM · CKKQ-FM · CKLG-FM · CKLZ-FM · CKMK/RB · CKNL · CKNW · CKOR · CKOV · CKQR-FM · CKSR-FM · CKST · CKTK · CKVU-TV · CKWX · CKXR · CKZZ-FM

National Broadcasters

Animal Planet · APTN · BBC Canada · BBC Kids · Biography Channel · Book Television · Bravo! · Canadian Learning Television · Canal D · Canal Évasion · Canal Vie · CMT · The Comedy Network · Court TV Canada · CPAC · CTV Network · CTV Newsnet · CTV Travel · Discovery Channel · Discovery Civilization · Discovery Health · Discovery Kids · The Documentary Channel · ESPN Classic Canada · Fairchild Television · Family Channel · Food Network Canada · G4techTV · Global Television Network · Historia · History Television · Home & Garden Television Canada · IFC · LCN · Life Network · MenTV · Movieola · MusiMax · MusiquePlus · National Geographic · NHL Network · Outdoor Life Network · Pridevision · Prime · Pulse24 · RDS · ROBTv · Réseau TQS · Réseau TVA · The Score · Scream · Séries+ · Showcase · Showcase Action · Showcase Diva · Silver Screen Classics · Space · Sportsnet · Star! · Talentvision · talktv · Teletatino · Teletoon · TreeHouse · TSN · TV5 · TV Land Canada · Vision TV · VRAK.TV · The Weather Network · W Network · YTV · Z Télé