

Canadian Broadcast Standards Council

Annual Report 2009/2010



For the fiscal year running from September 1, 2009 to August 31, 2010

"Private Broadcasting, Public Trust"

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. Decisions Released in 2009/2010	6
3. Summary of Complaints	24
4. Adjudicators	35

1. MESSAGE FROM THE NATIONAL CHAIR

The Canadian Broadcast Standards Council is an odd duck. It is often criticized, curiously contradictorily as, on the one hand, a censor and, on the other, powerless. It is neither. What it is is an effective arbiter of societal values and concerns on the airwaves.

As to the issue of **censorship**, I consider the charge misguided. It is of the essence of the process of censorship that the inspection of offending material takes place *before* publication or broadcast. The purpose of censorship is to ensure that the publication of inappropriate material is denied prior to public access to it.

The CBSC exercises no such function. Its role, as prescribed by the Canadian Radio–television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) in 1991 is “to administer codes of industry standards and to provide a means of recourse for members of the public regarding the application of these standards.” It has no *anticipatory* role; it only *responds* to the written concerns of the public *after* the broadcast of a program. In other words, *whatever* the nature of broadcast content, in the event that no person complains to the CBSC, no steps are taken to evaluate or even comment on a hypothetically problematic program.

When, however, there is a complaint from a member of the public, the CBSC process is engaged. Ultimately, after all necessary procedural steps are taken, a CBSC Panel

made up of equal numbers of public and industry Adjudicators determines whether or not the complaint is well–founded. If it is found to be, the issue of consequences then comes to the fore.

As to the issue of **powerlessness**, the CBSC has long made the point that it needs no penalties stronger than its requirement that broadcasters announce the results of any negative decisions on the airwaves. Why?

The answer is, and has been, clear for nearly twenty years. The private broadcasters that created the self–regulatory system remain strong supporters of it. When CBSC decisions are rendered, they respect them. They adhere to them. They incorporate the decision principles into their programming practices, even when the consequences are uncomfortable or costly, and even when they consider that the removal of a program may be the best way of conforming to CBSC–defined standards.

Just as imitation is said to be the sincerest form of flattery, respect for, and adherence to, the CBSC’s decision results is the sincerest reflection of the Council’s actual power and authority.

Relationships with stakeholders – The CAB

After 83 years, the Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB) significantly compacted the size of its operations and staff and, consequently, its central involvement in the

very wide range of matters relating to the business of broadcasting in Canada. That said, the Association's continuing core activities reflect its more sharply focussed input into today's rapidly evolving communications environment, and the CBSC is grateful for the private broadcasters' continuing financial and moral support of the Council. We are particularly appreciative of the CAB's increased funding that will permit the issuance of every Panel decision in both official languages for the first time in about fifteen years, beginning on September 1, 2010. The number of private broadcaster members of the CBSC stood at about 735 at the end of the fiscal year.

Relationships with stakeholders – The RTNDA

There is no other standards-driven association in Canada whose activities overlap those of the CBSC as significantly as the Radio Television News Directors Association of Canada (RTNDA – The Association of Electronic Journalists). The CBSC became the administrator of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* as of October 28, 1993, and has since then rendered *many* decisions relating to those journalistic standards.

While not every News Director could reasonably be expected to agree with every CBSC decision, the RTNDA honoured the CBSC with its life-time recognition Bill Hutton Award of Excellence in June of this year. In announcing that award, RTNDA's then-President Cal Johnstone said

Our members may not always agree with the rulings handed down by the CBSC. But everyone recognizes the important role the organization plays. RTNDA is proud to work hand in hand with the CBSC to ensure fairness and accuracy in Canadian broadcast journalism.

In accepting that Award on behalf of the CBSC, I noted that, since the amendment of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* in 2000,

there have been 2,637 complaints relating to journalistic issues on radio and television. We work at resolving these together. We are proud of our association with the RTNDA. Your commitment to professionalism is palpable. And we strive *with you* to ensure fairness and accuracy in Canadian broadcast journalism.

The CBSC is grateful to the RTNDA for that recognition. We look forward to the continuation of that close relationship.

Relationships with Stakeholders – Outreach Activities

The CBSC makes it its business to connect with its individual broadcaster members, the regulator, and colleges around the

country. We also respond to media enquiries on a range of broadcast issues on a regular basis. In order to meet broadcasters in the regions, I consistently attend the annual conventions of the British Columbia Association of Broadcasters, the Western Association of Broadcasters, and the Ontario Association of Broadcasters, and I give reports of CBSC activities at the BCAB and WAB AGMs. In addition to those visits, I gave a full address at this year's WAB as well as a keynote address at the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan Association of Broadcasters in Saskatoon this year. I also make sure that I visit various individual broadcasters' stations around the country, and this year I managed to do that in southern Saskatchewan (Estevan, Weyburn, Moose Jaw, Swift Current and Rosetown), Halifax, St. John's and Vancouver.

I also continued to attend the annual RTNDA Board meeting in Toronto and to give my annual lecture to the first year class at BCIT in Burnaby, which ensures that its graduates are familiar with the broadcast codes and the self-regulatory process. Together with our Executive Director and Director of Policy, the CBSC appeared before the CRTC in closed-door executive session in order to bring the Commissioners and senior staff up to date on developments at the CBSC. We also appeared at the CRTC's public hearings on its review of the community television policy framework.

Complaints

The number of complaint files opened in fiscal 2009/2010 was 2,035, a reflection of the continuing awareness on the part of the public that a process exists to respond to their concerns about broadcast content issues. Of this number, the CBSC handled 1,504, or almost 74%; the balance were referred to Advertising Standards Canada (ASC) or to the CRTC, principally because they related to non-member broadcasters or dealt with issues that did not fall within the parameters of the Codes administered by the CBSC. Statistics relating to these can be found in Section 3 of this Report.

In addition, as in previous years, the CBSC received "general correspondence" from people seeking, for example, general information about the Council and its Codes, contact information for a broadcaster, other requests for information, and reactions to, or comments on, decisions rendered by the CBSC. This year, had such correspondence been classified in the same manner as standard complaints, it would have added a further 59 "files" to the total.

Decisions

The seven Codes that the CBSC administers are the skeleton or framework of principles that guide broadcasters' content planning. They are, however, continually fleshed out by the decisions of the various CBSC Adjudicating Panels. Those decisions serve the purpose of informing broadcasters and the public of the CBSC's perspective both on narrow issues and broad societal trends.

Knowing that they fulfil that role in Canada (and, to some modest extent, abroad), those decisions are sent, on their day of release, to any person who wishes to receive them. And then they are permanently posted on the CBSC website, where they serve as a valuable jurisprudential reference. At the end of this year, there were 474 CBSC decisions on the website.

This year, 101 decisions were released: 21 of these were formal Panel Decisions and 80 were Summary Decisions. (It should be remembered that Summary Decisions are the informal, non-public variety of decisions that do not incur the time and expense associated with the formal meetings of an Adjudicating Panel required for a Panel Decision.) These are individually summarized in Section 2 of this Annual Report.

I am also extremely pleased that, beginning September 1, 2010, *every* Panel decision (no longer just those related to Quebec broadcasts) will be released in both French and English. Moreover, the CBSC is seeking funding to support the gradual translation of the Council's existing jurisprudence. I hope to have more news in that regard by the next Annual Report.

The Website

The CBSC's website is the world's window on the Canadian self-regulatory system. That accessibility makes it constantly available to complainants, broadcasters, regulators, researchers, and other interested parties around the world. The

website includes the all-important complaints form, two sets of FAQs (frequently asked questions), one targeted at members of the public and another aimed solely at broadcasters, all formal CBSC decisions, biographies of Panel Adjudicators, Annual Reports, Codes, lists of broadcaster members (with links to their websites), corresponding links for other bodies both Canadian and international, relevant documents galore, and so on. Moreover, we provide a thorough explanation of the CBSC's role and our most important Code provisions in 42 languages (in addition to Canada's two official languages).

A useful indicator of the CBSC's familiarity to the public is the extent of the world's recourse to its website. Traffic remained strong with more than 58 gigabytes of total data transferred by viewers during the course of the year. The average time spent on the site by users was just over 14 minutes per session and there were visitors from almost 80 identifiable countries this year.

AGVOT

AGVOT-related information is generally sought either by direct request or website page views. Although such requests do not form a large part of the CBSC's day-to-day activities, they often involve unique questions that require research by the CBSC. Although we do not receive many e-mailed or telephoned requests regarding AGVOT issues, it is noteworthy that the files in the AGVOT section of the CBSC website

receive more than three thousand page views each month.

The CBSC's Adjudicators

The CBSC decision-making process is entirely dependent on the thoughtfulness of the Adjudicators who listen to or watch the challenged broadcasts, review the complaints, and weigh these against the CBSC codes and jurisprudence. Their CBSC work is entirely voluntary. Their commitment is nonetheless substantial. Representing the public and the industry in essentially equal numbers on every Panel adjudication, they bring their judgment, common sense and sensitivity to their adjudicative functions. They discuss and debate every broadcast brought before them with diligence, objectivity and consciousness of the consequences of their determinations. On the basis of their deliberations, they define the broadcast content standards for the future and advise broadcasters and the public alike of the parameters of the acceptable. On behalf of all Canadians, I express to the Adjudicators our considerable appreciation for their contribution to the evolution of the codified broadcast standards that define our news and programming.

Acknowledgments

One of the principal reasons for the CBSC's success is the efficiency, dedication and skills of the CBSC staff. It is an extraordinarily small team, particularly when measured against the backdrop of the matter they must respond to and process.

The reception, assessment and processing of the thousands of complaints and related queries, the generation of information to the public and broadcasters alike, responding to students and researchers, preparation of files for adjudication, and so on depend upon our Communications Co-ordinator Solange Courteau, our Director of Policy Teisha Gaylard, and our Executive Director John MacNab. With their energy and contribution, the stream bubbles and flows; without that commitment, the creek dries up. What they do benefits everyone who enjoys radio and television from coast to coast to coast. On behalf of all those beneficiaries, whose interests they serve, and on my own behalf, I express our considerable gratitude.

RONALD I. COHEN
National Chair

2. DECISIONS RELEASED IN 2009/2010

DECISIONS RELEASED IN 2009/2010

In order for one of the many complaints the CBSC receives annually to result in a decision, the complainant must submit a Ruling Request or equivalent indication of dissatisfaction with the broadcaster's response to the complaint. Experience shows that satisfaction with broadcasters' responses is generally high, but, on those occasions when a Ruling Request is received, the CBSC Secretariat must determine whether a formal Panel adjudication or a Secretariat Summary Decision is the appropriate resolution in the circumstances. (For a definition and explanation of what constitutes a Summary Decision, see the heading "Summary Decisions" at p. 20.)

The CBSC released a total of 101 decisions (of both varieties) this year (compared to 75 in 2008/2009 and 83 in 2007/2008). Twenty-one of these were Panel Decisions and 80 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; the issue has been found in the past to result in a Code breach; or the outcome of an adjudication is uncertain.

Panel Decisions involve a formal adjudication by one of the CBSC's Regional

or National adjudicating Panels, which are composed of equal numbers of adjudicators from the general public and the broadcasting industry. Those Adjudicators read all correspondence relating to the complaint from both the complainant(s) and the broadcaster, review the challenged broadcast, and meet to discuss the merits of the content issue(s) in order to arrive at their determination. Since Panel decisions play an important role in the shaping of Canadian broadcast content policy, it is essential that both broadcasters and the general public be aware of these as they are issued. The CBSC accomplishes this goal by electronically advising all interested parties of its formal decisions on the day of their release and by posting all Panel decisions on the CBSC website.

This year, 14 Panel decisions dealt with television programming and seven with radio programming. Seventeen decisions related to English-language broadcasts and four to French-language programming. Brief descriptions of each of those decisions are provided below, broadly separated as to television and radio and then subdivided under specific issue-related sub-headings.

TELEVISION

As noted just above, 14 of this year's Panel Decisions involved television broadcasts. Those 14 decisions touched on a number of different issues: violence, sex, coarse language, discrimination, fairness of contests, and news-related matters such as accuracy, bias, and revelation of sources.

Violence

Four television decisions raised violence as the primary issue in 2009/2010. Article 1.0 of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters' (CAB) *Violence Code* states that Canadian broadcasters shall not air gratuitous violence or programming that promotes, sanctions or glamorizes violence. Even if violent content does not violate Article 1.0, there are still restrictions regarding its scheduling under Article 3.0 of the Code. Violent content that is considered to be "intended exclusively for adult audiences" shall not be broadcast outside of the "Watershed" period of 9:00 pm to 6:00 am. The CBSC Panels must determine exactly what constitutes "violence intended for adult audiences" in each case, but issues such as the level of blood and gore, as well as whether the violent acts are actually shown on-screen are among the factors considered. The nature of the violence also has implications for the viewer advisories requirements set out in Article 5.0. Programs with violent content intended exclusively for adult audiences must carry viewer advisories at the beginning of the program and coming out of commercial breaks. Programs broadcast outside the Watershed period which do not include adult violence but still might be disturbing to children under 12 must also carry viewer advisories at the beginning and coming out of *all* commercial breaks. Those advisories must be in both video and audio formats and must refer to the specific nature of content that viewers might find offensive. All dramatic/fictional programs must also be rated appropriately under Article 4.0 of the *CAB Violence Code*.

One of the decisions that dealt with violence this year was *CTV re an episode of Criminal Minds ("Omnivore")* (CBSC Decision 08/09-1405, June 25, 2009). Its subject was an episode of an American crime drama that followed a special unit of the FBI specializing in psychological profiles of serial killers. The challenged episode included scenes of graphic and bloody violence, such as the killer striking a man with a crowbar, slicing a woman's throat, going on a shooting rampage on a city bus, and slicing his own wrists on a metal bedframe and then drinking the blood. CTV aired the episode at 7:00 pm with viewer advisories and rated it 14+. The National Conventional Television Panel concluded that the violence was clearly intended exclusively for adults and should only have been broadcast after 9:00 pm, and that the "frequent, explicit, graphic and gory" violence required the highest rating of 18+.

Another American crime drama was at issue in *TQS re two episodes of Les experts: Manhattan (CSI: New York)* (CBSC Decision 08/09-0880, August 11, 2009). The Quebec Regional Panel examined two episodes of the French-dubbed version of this program about New York forensics officers. The episodes contained scenes of murders at which the investigators pieced together the clues. The murder clips included a woman being stabbed in the stomach with a large hook, a man being struck in the mouth with a rifle muzzle, and a woman being pushed onto the hose of a liquid nitrogen tank causing it to penetrate her chest. There were also close-ups of dead bodies and wounds. TQS aired both episodes at 8:00 pm with a rating of 8+ and without any viewer advisories. The Panel

concluded that the violence was graphic enough to constitute scenes intended for adults with the consequence that it should only have aired after 9:00 pm with appropriate viewer advisories. The Panel also stated that the episodes should have carried the higher (Quebec) rating of 16+.

A reality program with a violent component troubling a viewer was adjudicated in *MTV Canada re Bully Beatdown* (CBSC Decision 08/09-1667, April 1, 2010). Hosted by a Mixed Martial Arts (MMA) champion, the program allowed bully victims to “get even” with their bullies by putting them in the ring against a real MMA fighter. An anti-bullying activist who was concerned that the program sent the wrong message, namely, that violence should be solved with more violence, complained. The National Specialty Services Panel concluded that the program did not promote or glamorize violence; rather it criticized bullying. The Panel observed that “Whereas bullying itself is a form of violence or fighting *without* rules, this program was a form of violence or fighting *with* rules (that is, the bully consented to participate, had a training session, followed the MMA rules, and was wearing protective gear).” The program was also rated 14+ and contained sufficient viewer advisories during its 10:30 pm broadcast.

An adult animated program was the subject of *G4 Tech TV re Superjail!* (CBSC Decision 09/10-0078, August 18, 2010). The program frequently contained scenes of outrageous and very gory violence, as well as strong references to sex. In the two episodes reviewed by the National Specialty Services Panel, one man’s limbs were torn

from his body, resulting in blood spurting everywhere; another man had all of his skin and tissues torn off until he was a walking skeleton; and one man stabbed another in the eye with a fork. There were also scenes involving S&M gear, a woman shoving her dirty underpants into a man’s mouth, and references to “pleasure holes”. The challenged episodes began at 9:00 pm and were rated PG. The station did not air a viewer advisory at the beginning of the first episode, only the second. And then the advisory was in video format only, alerting viewers to nothing more specific than “mature subject matter”. The Panel decided that both episodes were clearly intended exclusively for adults, which meant that the 9:00 pm scheduling was correct, but the episodes should have been rated higher: 18+ for the first and 14+ for the less gruesome second. The Panel also found a Code violation for the station’s failure to provide a viewer advisory at the beginning of the first episode and for its failure to provide one in both audio and video format in all instances. The advisories also failed to mention violence and sexual content.

Sexual Content

Like scenes of violence, scenes of sexual content intended exclusively for adults may only be broadcast between 9:00 pm and 6:00 am, as set out in Clause 10 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. The CBSC’s definition of “sexual content intended for adults” depends on the frequency and strength of sexual references, the presence of nudity in a sexual context, and how detailed the images of actual sexual activity are. Only one television decision this year raised this as a primary issue.

That decision was *CHCH-TV re E!'s Wildest Spring Break Moments* (CBSC Decision 08/09-1097 & -1743, May 26, 2010). The program was a light information show that featured young people participating in various alcohol- and sex-related activities at Spring Break events around the world. It included numerous scenes of young men and women in various states of undress, participating in contests and stunts, such as wet t-shirt contests, pudding wrestling, sexual position contests and "stripper olympics". There were frequent close-ups of breasts and buttocks, but any actual nudity was pixillated. The scenes were interspersed with comedians making sexually suggestive comments about the Spring Break activities. The station aired the program at 1:00 pm with a PG rating, but without viewer advisories. The Ontario Regional Panel determined that the program should only have aired after 9:00 pm because "almost every segment of the hour-long program was aggressively suggestive of sexual activity and [...] the pixillation of genitalia [...] did not diminish the explicitness of the sexual content." The Panel also decided that the program should have carried viewer advisories and been rated 14+.

Coarse Language

Clause 10 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* also states that coarse language intended exclusively for adults shall not be broadcast outside of the Watershed period. The CBSC has consistently said that, in most contexts, the English f-word (and variations thereof) constitutes "language intended exclusively for adults". That issue arose in one decision this year. In French, the English f-

word is also potentially problematic when aired before 9:00 pm, as are some other coarse French words. Such matters arose in one decision.

The English-language program decision was *BBC Canada re The F-Word* (CBSC Decision 08/09-1516, April 1, 2010). *The F-Word* is a program featuring celebrity chef Gordon Ramsay who is well-known for his demanding style and frequent use of the f-word. This program contained numerous unedited instances of that word and its variants during an 8:00 pm broadcast. BBC Canada rated the program 18+ and included viewer advisories alerting audiences to the coarse language. Despite those measures, the National Specialty Services Panel found that the program should not have been broadcast so early without editing out the f-word. The Panel therefore found a violation of Clause 10.

The Quebec Regional Panel decided likewise with respect to a French-language program in *TQS re an episode of Scrap Metal* (CBSC Decision 08/09-1711, August 11, 2009). *Scrap Metal* was a reality program that followed a group of guys who restore old vehicles. The group spoke French, but occasionally interjected English expressions, particularly the English f-word. They also used coarse French words such as "ostie", "chrisse", "tabarnac" and "calice". The episode aired at 8:30 pm without classification and with a single viewer advisory at the very beginning of the broadcast. The Panel determined that the English and French coarse language rendered the program "intended exclusively for adults" so it should only have been broadcast after 9:00 pm with viewer

advisories coming out of every commercial break. The Panel also determined that the program was the style of reality show that does require classification and should have been rated 16+. In addition, the program contained scenes of the men ogling young women at a motocross event and the host commenting “The sweet smell of pussy.” The viewer who complained also raised the treatment of women as an issue. The Panel “conclude[d] that the skimpy clothing, ogling and crass reactions of the motorcycle crowd were crude and tasteless, but not to such an extent that they approximated the levels needed to breach the degradation or exploitation provisions of Articles 7 and 8 of the *CAB Equitable Portrayal Code*.”

Discriminatory Comments

Clause 2 (Human Rights) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* states that broadcasters shall not air programming that contains abusive or unduly discriminatory material based on matters of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability. The substance of that Clause is mirrored in Clause 2 of the *CAB Equitable Portrayal Code*. In addition, Clause 8 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* deals specifically with religious programming; it provides that such programs shall not be used to convey attacks on other races or religions.

Those clauses were applied in *CKND-TV (Global Manitoba) re Jack Van Impe Presents* (CBSC Decision 08/09-0691 & -1774, November 13, 2009), which dealt with a religious program hosted by American evangelist Jack Van Impe and his wife

Rexella. The program consisted of Rexella reading the week’s news headlines, focusing on reports about world conflicts and military actions in the Middle East, Russia and China, followed by Jack quoting Bible passages which, he suggested, predicted those world events. For example, in one episode, Jack responded to a quote from US President Obama that “we will never be at war with Islam” by stating “we are already at war with Islam.” A viewer complained about Van Impe’s consistent messages of hate, fear and doom. Observing that the program is broadcast on Sunday mornings, the complainant argued that, because Van Impe’s predictions about violence could disturb children, the program should carry a viewer advisory. The Prairie Regional Panel observed that, while there were discussions of global conflicts, there was no actual violence in the program, with the result that there was no requirement that the program be aired after 9:00 pm or contain viewer advisories. With respect to the complainant’s allegations of hateful commentary about other groups, the Panel found no Code violation and pointed out that “many religious adherents view their way as the best way, if not the only way. [...] Jack Van Impe’s observation [...] that ‘we are already at war with Islam’ [...] may or may not be a correct or accurate characterization of the recent and/or current world order, but that does not make it *discriminatory*, much less unduly discriminatory.” The Panel also observed that there is no codified standard that prevents Van Impe from selling his books and DVDs during the program, an activity about which the viewer also complained.

Unfair Contests

Clause 12 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* requires that contests shall be conceived and conducted fairly and legitimately and particular care shall be taken to ensure that they are not misleading. The CBSC applied that Code provision in two separate decisions this year, both relating to a similar type of phone-in contest television program.

One of those decisions was a follow-up to *TQS re Call TV* (CBSC Decision 08/09-1834 & -1856, August 11, 2009), which had been released in the 2008/2009 fiscal year. TQS aired the program during the summer of 2009. The Quebec Regional Panel adjudicated two of the complaints about the program in that previous decision, but complaints about the program continued to arrive during the first part of 2009/2010, requiring the Quebec Panel to adjudicate nine more complaints, covering a total of 31 episodes, in *TQS re Call TV (version 1, round 2)* (CBSC Decision 08/09-1827+ & 09/10-0025+, August 24, 2010). The program consisted of various questions, puzzles and contests that were presented on-screen by a female host. Viewers were then encouraged to call a 1-900 number or send a text message to get the opportunity to provide their answer on-air and win cash prizes. Both the on-air hosts and words on the screen clearly indicated that each call or text would cost \$1. The complaints received by the CBSC touched on a variety of issues: for example, the inexplicable absence of calls for relatively long periods, the inaccessibility of program personnel, charges to participants' telephone bills for calls that had resulted in a busy signal, and

the unfairness of some of the contests. The CBSC was unable to deal with complaints about off-air issues, such as the amount of, or possible errors in, telephone bill charges. With respect to the on-air content that the CBSC was able to address, the Quebec Panel found problems with some of the contests, as it had in the first decision. The Panel pointed out that the contest solutions could be difficult and obscure, such as lists of car makes or male names with almost limitless possibilities, as long as viewers were not *misled*. For example, two contests involved lists of "animal" names, but the answers sought were not only animals such as cat and cow, but more specific *breeds* of animals, such as Shire and Pumi. The Panel found a breach for those contests, as well as some others that were similarly misleading. The Panel decided similarly in the case of a mathematically-based question for which the solution's methodology was not transparent.

The English-language program examined by the Ontario Regional Panel in *CIII-TV (Global Ontario) re Play TV Canada* (CBSC Decision 09/10-0201+, April 1, 2010) was similar in style and structure to *Call TV*. It featured a male host who encouraged viewers to call the program, at a cost of \$1.99 per call, for a chance to solve the puzzles and contests that appeared on screen. The CBSC received 42 complaints about the program, but only three people requested a CBSC ruling. Their complaints related to the illogical solutions to the mathematical problems. The Panel had no problem with a question that involved moving matchsticks around to form the highest number because, although the solution was difficult and unexpected (in

that it used exponents), “the viewers were treated to the physical displacing of matchsticks. They could *understand*. The exercise was transparent.” The Panel found a lack of transparency, however, with respect to two other mathematical questions, one involving an equation with addition, subtraction, multiplication and division that did not seem to match any possible result and another involving a word problem about girls and cats on a bus with the requirement to calculate “how many legs [were] on the bus”. The answer was 1359 and the complainant questioned how the answer could be an odd, rather than an even, number since humans and cats usually have legs in multiples of two. The Panel found Code violations for those two puzzles and commented that “the point is only that the answer[s were] far from evident. [...] And the second complainant’s scepticism about the solution of 1359 legs on the bus, in the Panel’s view, well-founded. [...] [E]ven if disclosure of methodology *did* have the effect of facilitating contest-solving, the Panel is of the view that the producer (and, inferentially, the broadcaster) *needed* to take that step to legitimize the contests as a function of Clause 12.”

Accuracy of News

A total of four television decisions in 2009/2010 dealt with news programming. Clause 5 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* and Article 1 of the Radio Television News Directors Association of Canada (RTNDA – The Association of Electronic Journalists) *Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* both require that news be presented accurately and fairly. In addition, Clause 7 of the *CAB*

Code of Ethics regarding the balanced presentation of controversial issues applies to all types of programming, including news. One news-related decision this year also raised issues about crediting sources of material under Article 11 (Intellectual Property) of the RTNDA Code.

One of the journalism adjudications this year was a joint decision of the Atlantic and Ontario Regional Panels that involved a number of different stations owned by CTVglobemedia. During much of 2009, factions of the Canadian broadcasting industry were debating an issue popularly known as fee-for-carriage. The conventional television broadcasters argued that cable and satellite television distributors (collectively called broadcasting distribution undertakings, BDUs) should pay the broadcasters to carry their signals. The BDUs argued that they should not have to pay because conventional broadcast signals are available over the air for free. In anticipation of CRTC hearings on the subject, both sides of the debate launched public relations campaigns in Spring 2009. The television stations’ campaign, called “Save Local TV”, posited that the failure to impose fee-for-carriage would lead to the demise of locally-produced content, particularly news, which is important for community-building. The BDUs’ campaign was called “Stop the TV Tax”. A consortium of BDUs, as well as one individual viewer, complained that the television stations were using their programming to promote their view and that coverage of the issue was biased and unbalanced. In their decision *CJCH-TV, CKCW-TV & ASN re “Save Local TV” campaign and CJOH-TV, CKCO-TV, CFTO-TV & CKVR-TV re “Save Local TV”*

campaign (CBSC Decisions 08/09-1707+ & -1748+, January 12, 2010 & April 1, 2010), the Panels observed that most of the news items identified by the complainants did not mention the fee-for-carriage controversy at all; rather they simply focussed on the role of local television in local communities. The Panels acknowledged that these news segments were “of course intended to build grassroots support for local television”, but “that the ‘save local television’ issue was not itself a ‘controversial public issue’” so there was “no need to treat a non-controversial issue in a fair or balanced way.” In the few instances where the fee-for-carriage issue was mentioned, the reports mainly presented the factual issues involved in the debate; “there was no actual *argument* over the rights and wrongs.” Any interviews on that subject with conventional television representatives were balanced by interviews with BDU representatives. The Panels also noted that any promotional spots, broadcast either during commercial breaks or at the end of newscasts, did not count as news broadcasts and were specifically designed to promote an idea so “[i]t cannot be expected that such pitches will be objective, unbiased, detached, or laid back.” The Panels found no violations of Clauses 5 or 7 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* or of Article 1 of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* with respect to the challenged programming or newscasts.

Biased news was also the complainant’s concern in *CHAN-TV (Global BC) re reports on News Hour* (CBSC Decision 08/09-1422, November 10, 2009). The three lead stories on the challenged newscast related to activities of police officers. The first related to the inquiry into the Taser death of a

Polish man at the Vancouver Airport. The reporter informed viewers about the testimony of the RCMP corporal who had given the order to use the Taser and claimed that all of the testifying officers had ignored the Polish man’s mother when she had attempted to talk to them at the inquiry hearings. The report did, however, contain a statement from an RCMP spokesman who countered that claim. The second report was about the same RCMP corporal and his off-duty involvement in a fatal vehicle crash in which impaired driving was suspected. The third report was about the fatal shooting of a homeless man by Vancouver police. The focus of the third report was allegations made by a witness that the police had erased his cell-phone video recording of the incident. The complainant felt that the combined effect of these three reports reflected an anti-police bias. He argued that the station had presented negative information about the RCMP corporal’s off-duty actions in order to call into question his character and credibility at the Taser inquiry. The complainant concluded that the station was motivated not to do the same background research on the Vancouver shooting witness since that would have revealed that that man was a pro-marijuana advocate who had had previous run-ins with the police. The BC Regional Panel began by pointing out that occupation is not a protected category under the Human Rights Clause, which meant that it could not consider that there was unduly discriminatory material broadcast about police officers. It examined the complaint instead under Clauses 5 and 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* and Article 1 of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* and found no breaches

because “it finds not a modicum of anything that could be characterized as ‘uncontained hostility [or] obvious bias’ [as alleged by the complainant] [... and the station] had no responsibility to *seek the impeachment* of [the bystander’s] assertions at the time of the report” about the Vancouver police shooting.

Accuracy was at issue in *CIVT-TV (CTV British Columbia) re reports on CTV News at 11:30 (“Seal Fur Uniforms” & “Oil Spill”)* (CBSC Decision 08/09-1660, September 24, 2009). The “Seal Fur Uniforms” report informed viewers that a motion had passed in the House of Commons to have seal fur included in Olympic uniforms. A viewer complained that the motion had actually referred to Olympic *clothing* not athletes’ *uniforms* and it was only about studying the possibility of doing so. He also complained that a report about an oil spill had inaccurately stated that the oil company was at fault when there were actually other companies and factors involved. He also thought that the inclusion of a comment from a nearby resident expressing her dissatisfaction with the location of the oil tank was biased because the tank had occupied that location prior to the construction of the residential homes. The BC Regional Panel found no Code breaches in either report. It considered that “the complainant has engaged in hair-splitting” because the MP who forwarded the seal fur motion had mentioned athletes’ uniforms in some of his comments even if that word was not used in the text of the motion. The Panel was “of the view that, in choosing the word ‘uniforms’ rather than ‘clothing’, the broadcaster was making a reasonable effort to convey the intention of the mover and

the unanimous Parliament.” With respect to the “Oil Spill” report, the Panel noted that the anchorperson had not used the word “caused”, but rather identified the spill as “involving” the oil company, which was accurate. The Panel also had no problem with the inclusion of the resident’s viewpoint because it was simply “a cursory interview reflecting local residents’ concerns” regardless of the fact that the oil tank had existed before the housing development.

APTN re a report on APTN National News (boundary marker YouTube clip) (CBSC Decision 09/10-0509, April 1, 2010) raised a different issue, namely, crediting sources of material used in news reports. The report in question was about the unauthorized removal of an international boundary marker in Akwesasne. The report included a YouTube video clip that showed people removing the large stone marker and placing it on a truck. The complaint came from the person who had filmed the clip. She stated that the reporter had contacted her regarding use of the clip and that she had told him that he was not allowed to use it in a broadcast. APTN responded that it had not included credit for the clip because it had clearly indicated that the clip was from the video-sharing website YouTube, which, it argued, is “a public domain and available to anyone.” The complainant also wrote that the reporter had been rude to her. While the CBSC could not deal with her allegations regarding the reporter’s behaviour because their communication occurred off-air, it did deal with her concerns about the use of the clip. Although the station did not pass the video off as its own, the National Specialty

Services Panel nevertheless found that APTN should have credited the video to its creator, either by using her real name or her online handle or pseudonym. The broadcaster was thus in breach of Article 11 of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* for its failure to honour the intellectual property of others.

RADIO

Seven of the Panel Decisions released in 2009/2010 involved radio programming. Those decisions dealt with sexual comments, discrimination, coarse language, and accuracy of news. Some of the radio cases touched on more than one of those issues, but each is discussed under the heading that appeared to be of greatest concern to the complainant.

Sexual Content

Clause 9(b) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* prohibits the broadcast of “unduly sexually explicit material” on radio. The CBSC has interpreted the word “unduly” to relate to the time of day of the broadcast. The CBSC has determined that detailed descriptions of sexual activity are not appropriate at times of the day when children could be listening to the radio, namely, daytime and early evening. Mild references to sex, sexuality and certain body parts, however, are acceptable at any time of day.

For example, discussion about a gynecological exam was found to be unproblematic in *CFNY-FM re a “Wha’ Happened?” segment on the Dean Blundell Show* (CBSC Decision 08/09-1238,

September 23, 2009). The “Wha’ Happened?” segment on the rock radio station morning show involved listeners calling in to recount stories of unusual or outrageous things that had happened to them. One such broadcast included a story from one woman about how her boyfriend had accidentally cut off her nipple with a weed-whacker and another story from another woman telling the tale of a losing a condom inside her vagina and her resulting trip to the gynaecologist while in Mexico. A listener felt that this segment was too vulgar for morning radio as well as demeaning to the women. The Panel concluded that the segment was perhaps “distasteful”, but that no actual description of a sexual act was broadcast. It also did not find that the broadcast was degrading to women. The hosts of the program also made fun of Mexicans by affecting a Mexican accent and suggesting that a Mexican gynaecologist would work out of a taco stand with primitive tools. The Panel stated that it was “somewhat troubled” by the mocking attitude towards Mexicans, but found no Code violation for abusive comment or unduly negative stereotyping based on ethnicity or nationality.

A different segment of the same morning radio show was the subject of *CFNY-FM re a “Gay Jeff” segment on the Dean Blundell Show* (CBSC Decision 08/09-0700, June 25, 2009). In that case, a listener complained about a segment in which a gay friend of the hosts appeared on air to talk about his life and relationships. During the discussion, they made reference to a long-distance relationship that Jeff had had and suggested that Jeff had paid for the man’s airplane ticket so that he could visit Jeff for

sex. There were also double entendres and sexually suggestive comments made, such as a comment by Jeff that he “already got all nine that [he] needed from him” and questions posed to the female producer about whether she would sleep with a reality television star. The listener felt that this conversation was too explicit for morning radio. The Ontario Regional Panel concluded that “the examples were simply insufficiently explicit to amount to ‘unduly sexually explicit’ content. [...] And material that is on the cusp is protected by the application of the principle of freedom of expression, which takes precedence over material that is not clearly in breach of a codified standard.”

The third decision this year involving sexual comments made on radio was *CIHT-FM re a “Josie & the City” segment on The Morning Hot Tub* (CBSC Decision 08/09-1628, June 25, 2009). During an entertainment news segment on the morning show, a host stated that the *Oprah Winfrey Show* had achieved high ratings when a sex therapist had appeared as a guest on the program. *The Morning Hot Tub* host noted that the sex therapist had talked about masturbation for teen-aged girls and that perhaps the “O” in *Oprah* now stood for “orgasm”. The hosts also made jokes about men not being able to shake as fast as a vibrator because they are not battery-powered. A listener complained that this dialogue was too explicit for morning radio when he had been driving in a car with his young children. Again, the Ontario Regional Panel concluded that this conversation was not so explicit as to prevent it from being aired during daytime hours and that, consequently, there was no

Code breach.

Discrimination

Clause 2 (Human Rights) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* prohibits the broadcast of abusive or unduly discriminatory comments based on matters of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability. That clause is mirrored in the *CAB Equitable Portrayal Code*, which also contains more specific provisions relating to unduly negative stereotyping (Clause 4), stigmatization and victimization (Clause 5), and degrading material (Clause 7) in relation to race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability. The *Equitable Portrayal Code* also contains a provision relating to contextual considerations (Clause 10) that sets out the circumstances under which otherwise discriminatory comments may be acceptable for broadcast, when, for example, such comments are the topic of an intellectual discussion and the program as a whole is not intended to be abusive or unduly discriminatory. Two radio decisions in 2009/2010 addressed these issues.

The first was *CFNY-FM re a “Spencer the Cripple” segment on the Dean Blundell Show* (CBSC Decision 08/09-0650, September 22, 2009). Spencer Miller, a man with cerebral palsy, who is confined to a wheelchair, is a motivational speaker and disability activist who calls himself “Spencer the Cripple”. He appeared periodically on the *Dean Blundell Show* to talk frankly about his life with a physical disability. In the

challenged segment, Blundell and his co-hosts questioned Miller about his hygiene habits and sex life. They stated that they did not believe that he could wipe his own bottom after using the bathroom and that a good gift for Spencer would be a new assistant with supple hands who could help him with that task. They also suggested that Miller was not an active participant during sexual activity and would need an assistant to lie him down first and wipe him off after. One host mimicked the voice of a mentally-challenged person to mock what Miller might sound like while performing oral sex. A listener complained that the segment was degrading to people with disabilities. The Ontario Regional Panel agreed and found breaches of Clause 2 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* and multiple clauses of the *Equitable Portrayal Code* because the hosts “unrelentingly made Miller the target of jokes and mockery. [...] All in all, the Panel finds that the hosts’ comments in the areas of personal hygiene and sexual performance inappropriately portrayed Spencer Miller, as a result of his disability, as helpless and incapable. It also finds that their comments in these areas were reproachful, insulting and condemnatory.” The Panel also found a breach of Clause 9(b) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* because some of the comments made about Miller’s sex life were too explicit for the time of day at which they were broadcast.

The other decision was *CFBT-FM re a segment on the Kid Carson Show* (CBSC Decision 08/09-1275, September 4, 2009). A guest on that morning radio show was Dick Masterson, the American author of a book and website entitled *Men Are Better than Women*. Masterson made statements

about women, such as that they should not be allowed in the paid workforce, that they are only good at having babies but not raising them, that they use men for gifts and money and so on. The hosts and callers to the program challenged Masterson on every one of his points and questioned why he had such negative views about women. Carson also suggested that Masterson could not be serious and was only trying to be provocative in order to sell books. A listener complained that the program had provided Masterson with a platform for his misogynistic views. The majority of the BC Regional Panel concluded that the interview with Masterson did not violate any Code provisions because the hosts and callers consistently and immediately refuted all of his anti-female views so “the unsavoury Masterson comments were effectively blunted, indeed destroyed. [...] The unduly discriminatory, unduly negative stereotypical and abusive comments were debated on a level playing field, and the unacceptable comments were left tattered on that field of debate. [...] However problematic the opening and periodic Masterson assertions, there is in the result the contextual survival of the program itself.” One Adjudicator, however, disagreed, stating that the station should not have given Masterson a platform for his negative opinions at all.

Coarse Language

Clause 9(c) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* states that radio broadcasters shall not air unduly coarse or offensive language. As in the case of sexual content, the CBSC has interpreted “unduly” to mean at times of the day when children could be listening, which

it has determined constitutes daytime and early evening hours. In addition, the words must be extremely coarse rather than just mild swear words. Only one radio decision this year dealt with coarse language.

CKRB-FM re Prends ça cool ... and Deux gars le midi (CBSC Decision 08/09-0689 & -1228, August 11, 2009) involved multiple episodes of two talk shows in which the hosts used the French words “tabarnac”, “calice”, “chrisse” and “cristez-moi”. Since the Quebec Regional Panel had previously determined that those words fall into the category of “unduly coarse language” when aired during daytime hours, the Panel ruled similarly in this case. A breach of Clause 9(c) was found in all instances except one where one host had interrupted the other, which effectively prevented a coarse word from actually being broadcast. The Panel did not accept the broadcaster’s explanation that other stations air the same words and that these verbal slip-ups happen all the time. The complainant also expressed concern that the hosts had made negative comments about a community organization involved with low-income housing. The Panel observed that broadcasters are fully entitled to air criticisms of social and political organizations.

Accuracy of News

As mentioned above in the Television Decisions section, Clause 5 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* and Article 1 of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* both require that news be presented accurately. Article 7 of the RTNDA Code requires that errors be “quickly acknowledged and publicly

corrected”. Those three Code provisions were applied in one 2009/2010 radio decision.

That decision was *CFMJ-AM re an AM640 News report about an elevator accident* (CBSC Decision 08/09-2014, April 1, 2010). The station covered a breaking news story about an accident at a Toronto office tower in which an elevator technician had died. Reports stated that the technician “may have been” and “could have been” a “scab” worker because the union representing the building’s maintenance staff were locked out in a labour dispute. A listener complained about the reports because the technician was not a scab; he was employed by an independent elevator repair company. The complainant felt that it was “callous” and “unacceptable” for the station to call the man a “scab” and that this was insensitive to the man’s family. The broadcaster explained that its usual sources had informed it that maintenance workers were locked out and that, for this reason, the reports used the words “may have been”. The majority of the Ontario Regional Panel concluded that these were not sufficient justifications for the erroneous use of the term, particularly since the dictionary defines “scab” as a pejorative term when used in a labour context: “its very negative connotations mean that any broadcaster must be particularly careful before casting *such* aspersions. [...] [T]he majority is not at all convinced that the insertion of the apparent hedging word ‘may’ brought the broadcaster far enough away from the edge of a crumbling terminological cliff to be safe. The sentence seems far more an identification of the deceased as a scab than not as a

scab. [...] It was not germane to the story being told and it was inaccurate.” There was thus a breach of Clause 5 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* and Article 1 of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics*. Two Adjudicators, however, disagreed with that finding. They considered that “the speculative use of the term ‘scab’ was not unreasonable based on the information available to the broadcaster *at the time* of the two challenged news reports” because the information came from its regular source. They also considered the term to be the present-day equivalent of the more benign terms “strike-breaker” or “replacement worker”. The full Panel unanimously concluded that there was no breach of Article 7 of the *RTNDA Code* because confirmation about the worker’s employment situation was not necessarily available soon after the original reports.

SUMMARY DECISIONS

Summary Decisions are issued to the complainant only 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 will *not* amount to a Code violation. Since Summary Decisions do not involve a formal Panel adjudication or discussion of any new point of CBSC principles, they are dealt with as a matter of private correspondence between the Secretariat and the complainant, and, unlike Panel Decisions, they are not posted on the CBSC's website. (For a definition and explanation of what constitutes a Panel Decision, see the heading "Panel Decisions" at p. 6). Procedurally, in the case of a Summary Decision, 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. It is a reasoned explanation, which cites previous CBSC Panel Decisions as authority for its determination. As just noted, 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 80 Summary Decisions this year, compared to 52 in 2008/2009, and 60 Summary Decisions in 2007/2008.

As in previous years, the greatest number of those Summary Decisions involved English-language television broadcasts. A breakdown of the language of the broadcasts that resulted in Summary Decisions follows.

Language and Medium of Broadcasts that Resulted in Summary Decisions

Language		English	French	Other	Total
Medium	Radio	19	11	2	32
	Television	42	6	0	48
	Total	61	17	2	80

Hot Topics in Summary Decisions

The CBSC frequently receives complaints about broadcasts that contain criticisms of politicians, public figures, social and political organizations, or groups of people who hold particular political views. Those complaints are generally dealt with under Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*, which requires the full, fair and proper presentation of opinion and comment. It was that category of complaint that generated the largest number (18) of Summary Decisions in 2009/2010. The CBSC has long held that program participants are fully entitled to express their opinions on political and social issues, people and organizations, even when those opinions are harsh, controversial or provocative. Six of the 18 Summary Decisions in this category were about the same segment of a radio talk show in which the host had criticized a female politician in Quebec. A high school social studies manual contained positive information about the politician and she was the only politician featured in the book. The host complained that this was unobjective and indicative of the “leftist” educators in the province. He also encouraged students to tear out the relevant page as an act of protest against the political propaganda in the education system. A number of

listeners felt that these comments were inappropriate. The CBSC concluded that the broadcast was fair political commentary under Clause 6.

Another issue that led to 17 Summary Decisions this year was violence on both radio and television. In the case of the radio broadcasts and some of the television broadcasts, the complaint was that a program participant’s comments encouraged violence. In those cases, there was no violation of any Code because the comments had simply been critical of a person or group on the basis of their political views. It was only the complainants’ interpretation that such negative comments *could* indirectly incite violence; there was in fact no direct incitement to commit violent acts. With respect to the remaining television broadcasts, Article 3 of the *CAB Violence Code* states that scenes of violence intended exclusively for adults shall only be broadcast during the Watershed period of 9:00 pm to 6:00 am. The CBSC has considered that scenes of mild violence or scenes that are merely frightening rather than actually violent do not constitute scenes “intended exclusively for adults” and so can be broadcast at any time of day. It was those circumstances that resulted in Summary Decisions for complaints that raised such issues.

A total of 16 Summary Decisions dealt with complaints about scheduling of broadcast content on television and radio. In addition to the complaints about violent or frightening material on television described immediately above, this category included complaints about the scheduling of coarse language, sexual content and other mature subject matter. As with violence, television broadcasters cannot air coarse language or sexually explicit material intended for adults outside the Watershed period, as set out in Clause 10 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. Clause 9 of that Code requires that radio broadcasters refrain from airing “unduly” sexually explicit or coarse language; the CBSC has interpreted “unduly” to relate to the time of day at which the content is aired. Mild swear words are acceptable at any time of day, as are vague references to sex and sexuality and non-graphic visual depictions of nudity. This was the case in many of the broadcasts which led to Summary Decisions. In others, the extremely coarse language or explicit sexual content was aired between 9:00 pm and 6:00 am with appropriate viewer advisories and classification icons, with the result that there was no Code breach.

Eleven Summary Decisions dealt with inaccurate news or information. Clause 5 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* and Article 1 of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* both require accuracy in news reports, while Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* requires the full, fair and proper presentation of opinion and comment in talk and other information-based programming. The CBSC has explained that simplifying information or not covering every facet of a particular situation does not constitute a

breach of those Code provisions. A news report or talk show is allowed to contain a comment from someone offering his or her opinion on a particular topic; even if others would disagree with that opinion, it does not render the broadcast inaccurate. It was primarily these principles that were explained to the complainants who received Summary Decisions for their complaints about inaccurate content.

A smaller number of Summary Decisions dealt with various other topics. The table below provides statistics on the number of Summary Decisions that treated the various possible categories of issues raised by the complaints.

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	8
Classification/Rating	3
Coarse Language	9
Conflict of Interest	0
Unfair Contest	0
Discrimination Based on Age	0
Discrimination Based on Disability	5
Discrimination Based on Ethnicity	1
Discrimination Based on Gender	5
Discrimination Based on Nationality	2
Discrimination Based on Race	2
Discrimination Based on Religion	7
Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation	0
Exploitation of Children	0
General Improper Comments/Content	18
Inaccurate News or Information	11
Journalistic Conduct	3
Invasion of Privacy	2
Degrading Representation of Women	2
Scheduling	16
Sexual Content	9
Subliminal Advertising	0
Treatment of Callers to Open-Line Programs	2
Violence	17
Other	2

*Since some complaints raised more than one issue, the total exceeds 80.

3. SUMMARY OF COMPLAINTS

OVERVIEW OF CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

Complaints

In the 2009/2010 fiscal year, the CBSC opened a total of 2,035 complaint files. Not all of those complaints, however, raised issues that came within the purview of the Codes administered by the CBSC. Some of them, therefore, were forwarded on to other organizations better suited to deal with them. As is its practice, the CBSC nonetheless responded to all the complaints, including those sent elsewhere for resolution. This extends the public's awareness of, and familiarity with, the CBSC.

- Of the 2,035 complaint files opened in fiscal 2009/2010, the CBSC handled 1,504 (or 73.9% of all complaints).
- This year, 168 complaints (8.2%) were about broadcasters that are not CBSC members, so those letters were sent to the CRTC for resolution.
- An additional 285 complaints (14.0%) raised issues about aspects of the broadcasting system that are regulated by the CRTC rather than the CBSC, so those too were forwarded to the CRTC.
- 77 complaints (3.8%) relating to advertising were sent to Advertising

Standards Canada (ASC), the self-regulatory agency responsible for dealing with complaints about advertising in any medium.

- One complaint (0.04%) raised a technical broadcasting issue that fell within the jurisdiction of Industry Canada.
- Of the 2,035 complaints received this year, 1,265 (62.2%) had been sent directly to the CBSC; 761 (37.4%) had been forwarded to the CBSC by the CRTC; five by the Canadian Association of Broadcasters; three by ASC; and one from another organization.

In most cases, a complaint is filed by a single person and relates to a single broadcast. Sometimes, however, a particular broadcast or program will generate a number of complaints from different people. The CBSC experienced a few such cases this year.

- During the summer of 2009 (last fiscal year), Québec television station TQS broadcast a contest program entitled *Call TV*. Viewers were encouraged to telephone or text message the program to answer questions or solve puzzles, and win cash prizes. The CBSC received 256 written complaints about the program during the 2008/2009 fiscal year (the CBSC also received numerous telephone inquiries about the program). The CBSC quickly issued a Panel

Decision to address the many concerns of the public in August 2009. That did not end the influx of complaints, which continued to arrive as the 2009/2010 fiscal year began. In fact, the CBSC received an additional 63 written complaints in the 2009/2010 fiscal year about the Summer 2009 broadcasts and it issued a second Panel Decision to address those complaints. The station (now renamed V) began broadcasting a new version of the program in Spring 2010 and the CBSC received 27 complaints about those programs. A Panel Decision about the 2010 version of the program will be issued next fiscal year (2010/2011). Viewers complained about various aspects of the show, including the fairness, transparency and misleading nature of some of the contests, as well as off-air situations, such as alleged errors on their telephone bills. The CBSC was, of course, only able to deal with the on-air aspects of the complaints. An English-language version of the program entitled *Play TV Canada* also aired on Global stations across Canada and the CBSC received 43 complaints about it. The CBSC issued a Panel Decision about *Play TV Canada* during the 2009/2010 year.

Coverage of the 2010 Winter Olympics also resulted in a number of complaints this year, which related to various different stations since CTV, TSN, RDS, V and Rogers Sportsnet formed a broadcast consortium to televise the Games in English and French.

- The CBSC received 145 complaints about footage showing the death of the luger from Georgia who struck a post during a practice run just before the Olympic Games began. The clip was aired on various stations. Viewers complained both that the broadcasts were insensitive to the man's family and friends, and that they were disturbing for any audience members to see, particularly children. A CBSC Panel Decision will be released regarding these complaints sometime in 2010/2011.
- The CBSC received 117 complaints about remarks made by two French-language commentators about a male figure skater. Viewers alleged that the tone and wording of their criticism of his costumes and demeanour were discriminatory on the basis of sexual orientation. The CBSC will issue a Panel Decision regarding this matter in the upcoming fiscal year.
- The CBSC received an additional 67 complaints about other various aspects of Olympics coverage. Some of those did not provide enough information (i.e. broadcast date and time) for the CBSC to proceed with its investigation, while other complaints were resolved by the dialogue between the broadcaster and the complainant. Any complaints that were not resolved remain at various stages in the CBSC process.

General Correspondence

Correspondence which the CBSC classifies as "General Correspondence" differs from, and is not included in, the category of "Complaints". General Correspondence consists of letters from people wishing to obtain information or make a comment, rather than file an actual complaint. The CBSC received 59 such letters in 2009/2010. Those 59 are in addition to the 2,035 pieces of correspondence that are considered "complaints"; when added in,

these bring the total number of files opened this year to 2,094. The majority of this year's General Correspondence consisted of requests for copies of the Codes administered by the CBSC or questions regarding the rules applicable to different types of programs. There were also inquiries about the CBSC process and the television ratings system, as well as positive comments about certain stations, programs or hosts, among other miscellaneous inquiries.

RADIO AND TELEVISION COMPLAINTS

As mentioned above, the CBSC opened 2,035 complaint files, but 531 of those were referred to other organizations better suited to deal with them. The CBSC, therefore, actually handled 1,504 complaints. Of those 1,504 complaint files handled by the CBSC,

- 391 dealt with conventional radio programming (26.0%);
- 6 dealt with satellite radio programming (0.4%);
- 1,033 dealt with conventional or specialty television programming

(68.7%);

- 8 dealt with pay, pay-per-view or video-on-demand television programming (0.5%);
- 8 dealt with general concerns about broadcasting (0.5%); and 58 were not about broadcasting content (3.9%).

ADJUDICATING PANELS

Complaints are classified by adjudicating panels according to the location of the broadcaster that is the subject of the complaint.

<u>Region of Complaint (Adjudicating Panels)</u>							
Adjudicating Panel	Conventional Radio	Satellite Radio	Television (Conventional & Specialty)	Pay, Pay- Per-View & Video- on- Demand Television	N/D	N/A	Total
Atlantic	9	0	7	0	1	3	20
Quebec	160	0	276	0	2	5	443
Ontario	116	6	177	0	1	12	312
Prairie	57	0	31	0	3	6	97
B.C.	47	0	59	0	0	17	123
National Conventional Television	0	0	245	0	0	0	245
National Specialty Services	0	0	212	8	0	3	223
Non-determined	2	0	26	0	1	12	41
TOTAL	391	6	1033	8	8	58	1504

Notes:

1. The vertical "Non-determined" (N/D) column includes complaints that described a content issue, but did not identify whether it was television or radio programming. The vertical "Not Applicable" (N/A) column includes complaints concerning matters other than radio or television programming, such as internet content, print media, or bills from telecommunications companies.

2. The region of complaint origin, as noted above, is determined by the location of the broadcaster, unless, however, the complaint relates to matters which must be dealt with by one of the National Panels (because of 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 originating region are provided in the complaint, it is categorized as non-determined.

LANGUAGE OF PROGRAM

Of the 1,504 complaint files handled by the CBSC,

- 997 complaints dealt with English-language programming (66.3%);
- 422 dealt with French-language programming (28.1%);
- 17 dealt with third-language programming (1.1%);
- 11 complaints did not provide enough information to identify the language of the programming (0.7%);
- 57 were about off-air issues or non-broadcasting matters, so language was irrelevant (3.8%)

SOURCE OF PROGRAM

Of the 1,504 complaint files handled by the CBSC,

- 1,097 complaints dealt with Canadian programming (73.0%);
- 261 dealt with foreign programming (17.3%);
- 80 did not provide enough information to determine the national origin of the programming (5.3%);

66 were about off-air issues or non-broadcasting matters, so source was irrelevant (4.4%).

Language of Program

Language	Conventional Radio	Satellite Radio	Conventional & Specialty TV	Pay, Pay-per- view & Video-on- demand TV	N/D	N/A	Total
English	234	1	741	8	5	8	997
French	147	0	272	0	2	1	422
Third Language	8	0	9	0	0	0	17
Non-determined	2	0	8	0	1	0	11
Not applicable	0	5	3	0	0	49	57
TOTAL	391	6	1033	8	8	58	1504

Source of Program

Source	Conventional Radio	Satellite Radio	Conventional & Specialty TV	Pay, Pay-per- view & Video-on- demand TV	N/D	N/A	Total
Canadian	362	1	721	0	6	7	1097
Foreign	20	0	233	6	0	2	261
Non-determined	8	0	68	2	2	0	80
Not applicable	1	5	11	0	0	49	66
TOTAL	391	6	1033	8	8	58	1504

Notes:

- 1) As in the "Region of Complaint" table, the vertical "Non-determined" (N/D) columns of the two tables above include complaints that described a broadcast content issue, but did not identify whether it was television or radio programming. The vertical "Not Applicable" (N/A) columns include complaints concerning matters other than radio or television programming, such as internet content, print media, or bills from telecommunications companies. As some of those complaints were about non-broadcast, print format media content such as website content or newspaper articles, the language and national origin were identifiable for those complaints.
- 2) The horizontal "Non-determined" rows refer to complaints for which there was not enough information for the CBSC to determine the language of the broadcast (in the "Language of Program" table) or the national origin of the programming (in the "Source of Program" table). The horizontal "Not Applicable" rows refer to complaints that raised issues relating to off-air matters or non-broadcast content, so language and source of programming were not relevant, but some of those complaints nevertheless did identify a particular station or broadcast medium.

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 table below, if totalled, would naturally exceed the actual number of radio complaints received in 2009/2010. This table only provides a breakdown of the 397 radio complaints actually handled by the CBSC (not any that were referred elsewhere).

Type of Program	# of Conventional Radio Complaints	# of Satellite Radio Complaints
Advertising	12	0
Comedy	3	0
Contests	19	0
Drama	1	0
Fantasy	0	0
Information	6	0
Infomercial	0	0
Informal Discourse	95	0
News and Public Affairs	18	0
Open Line/Talk Show	175	0
Promos	27	1
Public Service Announcement	0	0
Religious Program	1	0
Songs	29	0
Sports	11	1
Undetermined	5	1
Non-applicable	9	4

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. The reader should refer to that explanation to understand the

numbers provided in the table below. This table only provides a breakdown of the 1,041 television complaints actually handled by the CBSC (not any that were referred elsewhere).

Type of Program	# of Conventional & Specialty Television Complaints	# of Pay, Pay-Per-View & Video-on-Demand Television Complaints
Advertising	90	0
Animation	16	0
Children's Programming	10	0
Comedy	38	0
Contests	89	0
Drama	36	2
Documentaries	12	0
Fantasy / Science Fiction	2	0
Game Show	4	0
Infomercial	5	0
Informal Discourse	2	0
Information	201	0
Movie	36	4
Music Video / Song	2	0
News and Public Affairs	278	0
Open-Line/Talk Show	22	0
Promos	37	0
Public Service Announcement	3	0
Reality Programming	30	0
Religious	35	0
Sports	88	1
Station ID Logo	1	0
Variety	19	0
Undetermined	19	1
Non-applicable	13	0

KEYWORDS

The CBSC classifies complaints using a set of non-exclusive keywords. As the program-type classification system described above, keyword classification is non-exclusive, *i.e.* allowing for a complaint to be classified under more than one category. As a result, the sum of the entries in the table below, if totalled, would naturally exceed the actual number of complaints received in 2009/2010. This table only provides a breakdown of the 1,504 complaints actually handled by the

CBSC (note that, prior to the 2006/2007 Annual Report, the Keywords table provided a breakdown of all files opened by the CBSC, including those classified as General Correspondence; hence any direct Keywords comparisons to earlier Annual Reports must be done with care). Unlike the above tables, both conventional and satellite radio complaints are combined under the heading "Radio", while conventional, specialty, pay, pay-per-view and video-on-demand television complaints are all combined under the heading "Television".

Keywords

	Radio #	Television #	Total #
Advisories	1	59	60
Age Discrimination	3	3	6
Bad Taste	5	9	14
Bias/Unfair/Imbalanced Information	25	55	80
Classification/Rating	0	20	20
Coarse Language	39	67	106
Conflict of Interest	4	11	15
Contests -- Dangerous	0	0	0
Contests -- Unfair	6	88	94
Disability Discrimination	9	5	14
Ethnic Discrimination	8	7	15
Exploitation of Children	5	25	30
Gender Discrimination	5	20	25
Improper Comments	93	52	145
Inaccurate News/Info	19	57	76
Journalistic Conduct	2	15	17
National Discrimination	23	12	35
Other	18	34	52
Privacy	48	156	204
Program Selection/Quality	10	62	72
Racial Discrimination	11	14	25
Religious Discrimination	10	21	31
Representation of Men	2	17	19
Representation of Women	37	50	112
Scheduling	32	234	266
Sexual Content	39	177	216
Sexual Orientation -- Discrimination	30	134	164
Subliminal Content	0	3	3
Treatment of Callers	11	1	12
Violence	20	274	294

It is worth noting by way of exception this year that 145 of the 274 complaints noting television violence were related to the news coverage of the death of the Georgian luger at the 2010 Winter Olympics

STATUS OF COMPLAINTS AT YEAR END

Of the 1,504 files handled by the CBSC, 798 (53.1%) 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 706 (46.9%) 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 CBSC, or were made too late; consequently, these files were closed by the CBSC immediately following its response to the complainant.

Of the 798 “code relevant and specific” complaints, 553 (69.3% of the code relevant and specific complaints) will not require follow-up by the CBSC as they were resolved at the level of broadcaster and complainant communication. Forty-seven complaints (5.9%) were resolved through the release of decisions of the various Panels or the CBSC Secretariat. 141 complaints (17.7%) have yet to complete the dialogue process with the broadcaster and 57 (7.1%) complaints for which the complainant has requested a ruling by the CBSC are at various stages in the complaints review process.

4. ADJUDICATORS

Below is a list of CBSC Adjudicators who have served for some or all of fiscal 2009/2010. A short biography remains on the CBSC's website at www.cbsc.ca during their term.

There may be up to six public Adjudicators and six industry Adjudicators on each Regional Panel. The two National Panels share twelve Public Adjudicators and each have six Industry Adjudicators; they are chaired by the National Chair. Since Adjudicators come and go during the year, it may appear that Panels have more than the maximum number of Adjudicators or more than one Chair or Vice-Chair, but the

positions are held successively, not on an overlapping basis. Overall, there remained fifteen vacancies to fill as of the end of the fiscal year.

There is also a category of At Large Adjudicators, to which individuals may be appointed when they are ineligible to sit on any of the Panels on a permanent basis. These Adjudicators may sit on any of the Panels on an *ad hoc* basis, representing either the public or industry, depending on their most recent affiliation. There are up to sixteen positions that may be held by At Large Adjudicators. There remained two vacancies to fill at the end of the fiscal year.

ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL

Hilary Montbourquette, Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Burnley A. (Rocky) Jones, Vice-Chair, Public Adjudicator
Jennifer Evans, Industry Adjudicator
Kathy Hicks, 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
Jasmin Doobay, Industry Adjudicator
Pippa Lawson, Public Adjudicator
Gordon Leighton, Industry Adjudicator
Mason Loh, Public Adjudicator
Olivia Mowatt, Industry Adjudicator
Tom Plasteras, Industry Adjudicator
Joan Rysavy, Public Adjudicator
Norman Spector, Public Adjudicator

ONTARIO REGIONAL PANEL

Madeline Ziniak, Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Hanny Hassan, Vice–Chair, Public Adjudicator
Bill Bodnarchuk, Industry Adjudicator
Jennifer David, Public Adjudicator
Madelyn Hamilton, Industry Adjudicator
Michael Harris, Industry Adjudicator
Karen King, Industry Adjudicator
Leesa Levinson, Public Adjudicator
Mark Maheu, Industry Adjudicator
Mark Oldfield, Industry Adjudicator
John Pungente, Public Adjudicator
Cynthia Reyes, Public Adjudicator

PRAIRIE REGIONAL PANEL

Daniel Ish, Chair, Public Adjudicator
Vic Dubois, Vice–Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Vince Cownden, Industry Adjudicator
Dorothy Dobbie, Public Adjudicator
Jennifer Fong, Public Adjudicator
Kelly Johnston, Industry Adjudicator
Kurt Leavins, Industry Adjudicator
Rey Pagtakhan, Public Adjudicator
Mike Shannon, Industry Adjudicator
Eleanor Shia, Public Adjudicator
Glenda Spenrath, Industry Adjudicator

QUEBEC REGIONAL PANEL

Dany Meloul, Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Gilles Moisan, Vice–Chair, Public Adjudicator
Yves Bombardier, Industry Adjudicator
André H. Caron, Public Adjudicator
Sylvie Charbonneau, Public Adjudicator
Véronique Dubois, Industry Adjudicator
Monika Ille, Industry Adjudicator
John Paul Murdoch, Public Adjudicator
Tony Porello, Industry Adjudicator
Marie–Anne Raulet, Public Adjudicator

NATIONAL Panels

Public Adjudicators

Ronald I. Cohen, Chair
Howard Pawley, Vice-
Chair
Andrew Cardozo, Vice-
Chair
Sharon Fernandez
Meg Hogarth
Allan Mirabelli
Fo Niemi
Peter O'Neill
Jim Page
Mark Tewksbeury
Doug Ward

***Specialty Services
Adjudicators***

Jon Medline, Vice-Chair
Du-Yi Leu
Connie Sephton
Lea Todd

***Conventional Television
Adjudicators***

Jim Macdonald, Vice-Chair
Peggy Hebden
Troy Reeb
Tina-Marie Tatto

AT LARGE ADJUDICATORS

Daryl Braun, Industry Adjudicator
André Chevalier, Industry Adjudicator
Cam Cowie, Industry Adjudicator
Sarah Crawford, Industry Adjudicator
Rita Deverell, Industry Adjudicator
Elizabeth Duffy-MacLean, Industry Adjudicator
Prem Gill, Industry Adjudicator
Paul Gratton, Industry Adjudicator
Michael Harris, Industry Adjudicator
Jason Mann, Industry Adjudicator
Mike Omelus, Industry Adjudicator
Joan Pennefather, Public Adjudicator
Gerry Phelan, Industry Adjudicator
Pip Wedge, Industry Adjudicator

JOURNALISTIC INDEPENDENCE PANEL

Genviève Bonin, Public Adjudicator

Mark Bulgutch, Industry Adjudicator

Stephen Callary, Public Adjudicator

Helen Del Val, Public Adjudicator

Suzanne Gouin, Industry Adjudicator

Bernard Guérin, Industry Adjudicator

Russell Mills, Public Adjudicator

Gerry Phelan, Industry Adjudicator

LIST OF CBSC MEMBERS BY REGION

Newfoundland

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

P.E.I.

CHTN

Nova Scotia

ASN · CFDR · CFRQ-FM · CHRK-FM · CIGO-FM · CIHF-TV · CIJK-FM · CIOO-FM · CJCX-TV · CJCH-FM · CJCH-TV · CJFX-FM · CJLS-FM · CJNI-FM · CKBW-FM · CKTO-FM · CKTY-FM · CKUL-FM

New Brunswick

CFRK-FM · CFXV-FM · CHNI-FM · CHSJ-FM · CHTD-FM · CHWV-FM · CIBX-FM · CIKX-FM/RB · CJCJ-FM · CJMO-FM · CJXL-FM · CKBC-FM · CKCW-TV · CKHJ · CKLT-TV · CKNI-FM

Quebec

CFAP-TV · CFCF-TV · CFCM-TV · CFDA-FM · CFEI-FM · CFEL-FM · CFEM-TV · CFER-TV · CFGL-FM · CFGS-TV · CFGT · CFIX-FM · CFJO-FM · CFJP-TV · CFKM-TV · CFKS-TV · CFLO-FM · CFLO-FM-1/RB** · CFMB · CFOM-FM · CFQR-FM · CFRS-TV · CFTM-TV · CFTX-FM · CFVD-FM · CFVM-FM · CFVS-TV · CFZZ-FM · CHAU-TV · CHEM-TV · CHEY-FM · CHGO-FM · CHGO-FM-1/RB** · CHIK-FM · CHJM-FM · CHLN-FM · CHLT-FM · CHLT-TV · CHLX-FM · CHMP-FM · CHOA-FM · CHOE-FM · CHOI-FM · CHOM-FM · CHOT-TV · CHOX-FM · CHRC · CHRD-FM · CHRL-FM · CHRM-FM · CHVD-FM · CHXX-FM · CIGB-FM · CIKI-FM · CIME-FM · CIMF-FM · CIMO-FM · CINF · CINW · CITE-FM · CITE-FM-1 · CITF-FM · CJAB-FM · CJAD · CJDM-FM · CJEC-FM · CJFM-FM · CJGO-FM · CJLA-FM · CJLP/RB** · CJMF-FM · CJMM-FM · CJMQ-FM · CJMV-FM · CJNT-TV · CJOI-FM · CJPM-TV · CJRC · CKAC · CKDG-FM · CKGM · CKLD-FM · CKLX-FM · CKMF-FM · CKMI-TV · CKOI-FM · CKOY-FM · CKRB-FM · CKRN-TV · CKRS-FM · CKRT-TV · CKSH-TV · CKSM/RB** · CKTF-FM · CKTM-TV · CKTV-TV · CKVM-FM · CKXO-FM · CKYK-FM

Ontario

CFBG-FM · CFCA-FM · CFGO · CFGX-FM · CFHK-FM · CFJR-FM · CFLG-FM · CFLY-FM · CFLZ-FM · CFMJ · CFMK-FM · CFNY-FM · CFOB-FM · CFPL · CFPL-FM · CFPL-TV · CFRA · CFRB · CFTR · CFXJ-FM · CFZM-AM · CHAM · CHAS-FM · CHAY-FM · CHBX-TV · CHCD-FM · CHCH-TV · CHEX-TV · CHEZ-FM · CHFD-TV · CHFI-FM · CHGK-FM · CHKT · CHKT-DR-2 · CHML · CHMS-FM · CHMS-FM/RB** · CHNO-FM · CHOK · CHOK-FM · CHPR-FM · CHRE-FM · CHRO-TV · CHST-FM · CHTZ-FM · CHUC · CHUM · CHUM-FM · CHUR-FM · CHVR-FM · CHWI-TV · CHYC-FM · CHYK/RB** · CHYK-FM · CHYM-FM · CHYR-FM · CIBU-FM · CICI-TV · CICX-FM · CICZ-FM · CIDC-FM · CIDR-FM · CIGL-FM · CIGM-FM · CIHT-FM · CIII-TV · CILQ-FM · CILV-FM · CIMJ-FM · CIMX-FM · CING-FM · CIQB-FM · CIQM-FM · CIRS · CIRV-FM · CISS-FM · CITO-TV · CITS-TV · CITY-TV · CIWW · CJBK · CJBK-TV · CJBQ · CJBX-FM · CJCL · CJCS AM · CJDV-FM · CJET-FM · CHBM-FM · CJMJ-FM · CJMR · CJMX-FM · CJOY · CJPT-FM · CJQM-FM · CJQQ-FM · CJRL-FM · CJRQ-FM · CJSB-FM · CJSJ-FM · CJSP · CJSS-FM · CJTN-FM · CJUK-FM · CJXY-FM · CKAP-FM · CKAT · CKBT-FM · CKBY-FM · CKCB-FM · CKCO-TV · CKDK-FM · CKDR-FM · CKEY-FM · CKFM-FM · CKFX-FM · CKGB-FM · CKGL · CKIS-FM · CKKL-FM · CKKW · CKLC FM · CKLH-FM · CKLW · CKLY-FM · CKNR-FM · CKNX · CKNX-FM · CKNX-TV · CKNY-TV · CKOC · CKPR · CKPR-TV · CKPT · CKQB-FM · CKQM-FM · CKRU · CKSL · CKTB · CKTG-FM · CKVR-TV · CKWF-FM · CKWS-FM · CKWS-TV · CKWW · CKXT-TV · CTV Ottawa · CTV TORONTO · OMNI.1 · OMNI.2

Manitoba

CFAM · CFAR · CFEQ-FM · CFQX-FM · CFRW · CFRY · CFRY-FM · CFWM-FM · CHIQ-FM · CHMI-TV · CHNK-FM · CHSM · CHTM · CHVN-FM · CIIT-TV · CILT-FM · CITI-FM · CJAR · CJAW-FM · CJBP-FM · CJEL-FM · CJGV-FM · CJKR-FM · CJOB · CJPG-FM · CJRB · CJSB-FM · CKDM · CKFI-FM · CKJS · CKLF-FM · CKLQ · CKMM-FM · CKMW · CKND-TV · CKVX-FM · CKXA-FM · CKX-FM · CKY-FM · CKY-TV · NCI-FM

Saskatchewan

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

Alberta

CFAC · CFBR-FM · CFCN-TV · CFCW · CFDV-FM · CFEX-FM · CFFR · CFGP-FM · CFGQ-FM · CFIT-FM-1 · CFIT-FM · CFMG-FM · CFMY-FM · CFOK · CFRI-FM · CFRN · CFRN-TV · CFRV-FM · CFUL-FM · CFVR-FM · CFXE · CFXG · CFXH-FM · CFXL-FM · CFXO-FM · CFXP-FM · CFXW-FM · CHAT-FM · CHAT-TV · CHBN-FM · CHBW-FM · CHDI-FM · CHED · CHF-FM · CHF-FM-1/RB** · CHKF-FM · CHLB-FM · CHLW · CHMC-FM · CHMN-FM · CHQR · CHQT · CHR-B · CHR-K-FM-3/RB** · CHSL-FM · CHUB-FM · CIBK-FM · CIBQ · CIBW-FM · CICT-TV · CIGY-FM · CILB-FM · CIRK-FM · CISA-TV · CISN-FM · CITL-TV**TS · CITV-TV · CIXF-FM · CIXM-FM · CIZZ-FM · CJAQ-FM · CJAY-FM · CJBZ-FM · CJCO-TV · CJEG-FM · CJMN-FM-1/RB** · CJOK-FM · CJPR-FM · CJRX-FM · CJUV-FM · CJXK-FM · CJXX-FM · CKAL-TV · CKBA · CKCE-FM · CKCS-TV · CKDQ · CKEA-FM · CKEM-TV · CKER-FM · CKES-TV · CKGY-FM · CKHL/RB** · CKIS-FM · CKJR · CKKX-FM · CKKY · CKLA-FM/RB** · CKLJ-FM · CKMH-FM · CKMX · CKNG-FM · CKNO-FM · CKRA-FM · CKRI-FM · CKRY-FM · CKSA-FM · CKSA-TV · CKSQ · CKUV-FM · CKVH · CKVN-FM · CKWA · CKWY-FM · CKYL · CKYX-FM

British Columbia

CFAX · CFBT-FM · CFBV · CFCP-FM · CFEK/RB** · CFFM-2-FM · CFFM-FM · CFJC-TV · CFKC/RB** · CFLD · CFMI-FM · CFNI · CFOX-FM · CFPW-FM · CFSR-FM · CFTK · CFTK-TV · CFUN · CHAN-TV · CHBC-TV · CHBE-FM · CHBZ-FM · CHDR-FM · CHEK-TV · CHHR-FM · CHKG-FM · CHMJ · CHNM-TV · CHNU-TV · CHNV-FM · CHOR · CHPQ-FM · CHQM-FM · CHRX-FM · CHSU-FM · CHTK · CHTT-FM · CHWF-FM · CIBH-FM · CICF-FM · CIEG-FM/RB** · CIFM-FM · CIGV-FM · CIOC-FM · CIOR · CIPN-FM/RB** · CIQC-FM · CIRX-FM · CISC-FM/RB** · CISE-FM · CISL · CISP-FM/RB** · CISQ-FM · CISW-FM/RB** · CIVH · CIVI-TV · CIVT-TV · CJAT-FM · CJAV-FM · CJCD-FM · CJCI-FM · CJDC · CJDC-TV · CJEK/RB** · CJEO-TV · CJEV/RB** · CJFW-FM · CJJR-FM · CJMG-FM · CJOR · CJSU-FM · CJVB · CJZN-FM · CKBX · CKBZ-FM · CKCL-FM · CKCL-FM-/RB** · CKCL-FM-2/RB** · CKCQ-FM · CKCR · CKDV-FM · CKFR · CKGF-FM · CKGO-FM · CKGO-FM/RB** · CKGR · CKIZ-FM · CKKC · CKKN-FM · CKKQ-FM · CKLG-FM · CKLR-FM · CKLZ-FM · CKMK/RB** · CKNL-FM · CKNW · CKOR · CKQQ-FM · CKPG-TV · CKPK-FM · CKQC-FM · CKQR-FM · CKRX-FM · CKSR-FM · CKST · CKTK-FM · CKVU-TV · CKWL-FM · CKWV-FM · CKWX · CKXR · CKYE-FM · CKZZ-FM

National Broadcasters

Animal Planet · APTN · BBC Canada · BBC Kids · BNN · Book Television · BPM TV · Bravo! · Canal D · Canal Évasion · Canal Vie · Cinépop · CMT · Cosmopolitan TV · CP24 · CPAC · CTV · CTV News Channel · DéjàView · Discovery Channel · Discovery Civilization · Discovery HD · Discovery Health Channel · DIY · documentary · Sundance Channel · Encore Avenue · ESPN Classic Canada · Fairchild Television · Family Channel · Fashion Television · Food Network Canada · Fox Sports World · G4techTV Canada · Game TV · Global · Global Reality Channel · Gol TV (Canada) · HARD ON Pridevision TV · Historia · History Television · Home & Garden Television Canada · I Channel · Independent Film Channel · Investigation Discovery · Le canal nouvelles · Les idées de ma maison · MenTV · Météomédia · Movie Central · Movieola · MoviePix · MovieTime · MTV Canada · MTV2 · MusiMax · MusiquePlus · Mystery · National Geographic Channel · National Geographic HD · NHL Network · Nickelodeon Canada · OLN · Out TV · PunchMuch · Réseau des sports · RIS · Rogers Sportsnet · Rogers Sportsnet One · Scream · Setanta Sports · Séries+ · W Movies · Showcase Action · Showcase Diva · Showcase HD · Showcase Television · Silver Screen Classics · Sirius · Slice · Space · Star! · Super Channel · Super Écran · Talentvision · Teletatino · Teletoon · Télétoon · Teletoon Retro · The Accessible Channel · The Biography Channel · The Christian Channel · The Comedy Network · The Movie Network · The Pet Network · The Score · The Weather Network · Travel + Escape · Treehouse · TSN · TV Land Canada · TV5 · TVA · TVtropolis · VisionTV · VIVA · VRAK.TV · W Network · World Fishing Network · Xtreme Sports · XM · YTV · Z Télé