

Canadian Broadcast Standards Council

Annual Report 2006/2007



For the fiscal year running from September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007

"Private Broadcasting, Public Trust"

Table of Contents

	Page
1. Message from the National Chair	1
2. Ethnocultural Outreach Project	5
3. Decisions Released in 2006/2007	9
4. Summary of Complaints	21
5. Adjudicators	28

1. MESSAGE FROM THE NATIONAL CHAIR

In most CBSC Annual Reports, my message is focussed primarily on the CBSC's complaints and decisions. While those remain fundamentally important to the Council, the past year has seen a greater emphasis on the Codes, past and future, and policy matters (beyond decision content) than is usually the case.

The CAB Equitable Portrayal Code

Of the four Codes administered by the CBSC, three have had substantive revisions over the past five to nearly fifteen years; namely, the Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB) *Violence Code* (revised in 1994), the Radio–Television News Directors Association of Canada (RTNDA) *Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* (revised in 2000) and the *CAB Code of Ethics* (revised in 2002). Only the *CAB Sex–Role Portrayal Code (SRPC)* has not, and it has been in effect since 1990.

After the leading studies of the CAB in the areas of multiculturalism and persons with disabilities (namely, the report of the Task Force for Cultural Diversity on Television, called *Reflecting Canadians – Best Practices for Cultural Diversity in Private Television*, and the report entitled *The Presence, Portrayal and Participation of Persons with Disabilities in Television Programming*), the timing of a revision of the *SRPC* was apt. And so, the CBSC collaborated with the CAB and its Joint Societal Issues Committee in the creation of a new Code, which is currently before the CRTC and the subject of its call for comments in Public Notice CRTC 2007–89. This new Code, called the *Equitable Portrayal Code (EPC)*, will replace the *SRPC*.

While the precise text of the *EPC* will not be absolutely fixed until it has gone through the CRTC process (in the next fiscal year), some of its innovative and far-reaching components are exciting enough to report to you now. First and foremost, it is designed “to ensure the equitable portrayal of *all* persons in television and radio

programming.” In other words, it takes the best aspects of the gender-focussed Code and extends them to all identifiable groups. To these, it adds the Human Rights provision of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. It then establishes a concept of “negative portrayal”, acknowledging that it “can take many different forms, including (but not limited to) stereotyping, stigmatization and victimization, derision of myths, traditions or practices, degrading material, and exploitation.” Each form is in turn defined and proscribed. Finally, also for the first time, the Code anticipates contextual considerations that will help the CBSC Panels’ interpretation of challenged programming.

We await the adoption of this Code with enthusiasm.

The Journalistic Independence Code

It was in 2001 that the CRTC authorized CTV, CanWest Media and TVA to work with the CBSC on the elaboration of a Code that would ensure that the broadcasters would maintain separate and independent news management and presentation structures for television operations that would be distinct from those of any affiliated newspapers. That draft Code was submitted to the Commission in 2002. After receiving a request for minor editorial changes in December 2006, the CBSC submitted a revised version of the Code in January 2007. In April, the Commission issued a Public Notice calling for comments on the revised *Journalistic Independence Code*. Comments were solicited in the present fiscal year, although the CRTC hearings were slated to take place in the 2007–2008 fiscal year.

The results in terms of the final text of the Code and the establishment of the Journalistic Independence Panel will, therefore, be reported on in this Message in the next CBSC Annual Report.

The Bigras Bill

In 2000, I met with Bernard Bigras, the Member of Parliament for Rosemont–La Petite Patrie, to explain why the Private Member’s Bill (which would have amended the *Broadcasting Act* to deal with the issue of violence on television) he had proposed in that Parliamentary session was unnecessary. At that time, I explained that the private broadcasters’ *Violence Code* and their self-regulatory system had the matter well in hand. In the end, there was no debate on the Bill and it died on the Order Paper. He reintroduced it in the 1st Session of the 37th Parliament. It was read but it underwent no debate.

Out of nowhere, it reappeared during the 1st Session of the 39th Parliament in June of 2006 (as Bill C–327) and became a matter of public discussion early in the New Year. I participated in that debate with a series of letters to the editor and op-ed articles in newspapers across the country that appeared in January and February 2007 (they are all posted on the CBSC website). The thrust of the articles and letters was that, if the Bill was unnecessary in 2000 in order to deal with violence on television, it was even less useful in 2007. First and foremost, the private broadcasters had a world-class and effective *Violence Code* and self-regulatory system in place. Second, by 2007, there is every likelihood that there was more easily-accessible and unregulated violent content available from a myriad of other sources, such as DVDs, video games, song lyrics on CDs, and the Internet than was the case in 2000. Third, the proposed Bill would add absolutely nothing useful to the private broadcaster self-regulatory system that is already in place.

The bottom line: no problem back then; less of a problem today. No need for such a Bill at either time.

On April 19, 2007, the CBSC was called to appear before the House of Commons Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage in connection with their hearings on the CBC (in the Committee’s formal terms, their “Full Investigation of the Role of a Public

Broadcaster in the 21st Century”). While the CBSC had no position to take on the CBC, we did use the opportunity to explain how the CBSC functioned, what our responsibilities were, how we fulfilled them, the effectiveness of our Ethnocultural Outreach Project, and so on.

We also explained, since debate on the Second Reading of the Bigras Bill was scheduled for that very afternoon in the House, why the private broadcasters’ method of dealing with violent content on Canadian television had succeeded. We also advised the Committee that “as a percentage of complaints, those relating to violence on television ha[d] been steadily declining, by a huge margin, namely, 37%, between 2001 and 2006.” (Those remarks and the link to the transcript of the questions and answers can be found on the CBSC website.) Ultimately, following the debate in the House, the Bill received Second Reading and was referred to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

Complaints and Decisions

While still at very high levels, the number of complaints fell to 1,426. Of these, the Council’s Secretariat actually handled the 1,138 complaint files that fell within the CBSC’s jurisdiction; 60.5% of those were Code relevant and specific. As to the decisions, there were fewer than there have been for years, only 19 of the formal / public variety and 61 of the Secretariat / summary type. The ratio of summary to formal resolutions remains essentially the same; it is the overall level that has dropped. As to the issues dealt with, there were, as always, important conclusions. They are dealt with in Section 3 of the Annual Report.

A Reminder about CBSC Summary Decisions

It should be remembered that not all CBSC decisions are created equal. The formal variety take longer to process, and involve Panel Adjudicators. They generally deal with issues that have not previously been tackled by a CBSC Panel or that may be decided against a broadcaster. In other words, any decision rendered against a broadcaster will

be a public document. Nothing that could be viewed as adverse to a broadcaster gets swept *under* a carpet.

On the other hand, as we have explained in past Annual Reports, summary decisions are only rendered when the complaint is of a genre decided sufficiently frequently in the past by a CBSC *Panel or Panels* that its outcome in favour of the broadcaster is *undoubted*. This means that the time that would be consumed by a formal Panel adjudication is not taken. The effect of that is that such files, indeed all files, can be dealt with far more efficiently than would be the case if *every* matter were sent to a Panel. If the opposite were the case, every single complaint would be adjudicated by a full Panel and the resolution of all matters would necessarily be considerably slowed down. By using the summary process, the pace of resolution is much faster for each and every complainant. Nor are complainants in summary decision matters short-changed. They receive a full explanation of the reasons for the resolution in favour of the broadcaster, including detailed references to, and quotations from, earlier decisions. They know *why* the result is what it is. A résumé of the past year's Summary Decision content is provided in the second part of Section 3.

Ethnocultural Outreach

The CBSC continues to make diversity and ethnocultural outreach a significant component of our activities. Two new languages, Hebrew and Swahili, have been added to the 40 languages in which the CBSC reaches out to Canada's diverse communities. And the CBSC does this both in print and on our website. In the past fiscal year, as the OMNI Television funding draws to a close, the CBSC Ethnocultural Outreach Project has started its end-of-project evaluation process. By this stage in its operations, the Council has fine-tuned its outreach methods and database, and has produced new and revised brochures (in English and French, as well as the languages noted just above), and informed more Canadians about the CBSC and the self-regulatory system. These issues and others are fully reviewed in Section 2 of this Annual Report.

Other Forms of Outreach

Given the above-noted dialogue on Bill C-327, there was perhaps more contact with the media than usual this year; the reinforcement of that relationship remains an important component of the CBSC's outreach activities. So, too, is the opportunity to speak to the tomorrow's broadcast industry core at various communications and journalism colleges and universities around the country.

As noted above, the CBSC appeared before the House of Commons Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. We also 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 Meetings of the British Columbia Association of Broadcasters in Penticton and the Western Association of Broadcasters in Kananaskis and attended the Annual Convention of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters in Vancouver. Wearing my CBSC hat, I also serve on the Boards of Directors of the Academy of Canadian Cinema and Television and the Audio-Visual Preservation Trust.

I also maintained our international links by meeting with Kobus Van Rooyen, the Chair of the Broadcast Complaints Commission of South Africa (and a Councillor on the Independent Communications Authority of South Africa), several times during his visit to Ottawa, and by speaking about Canadian self-regulatory processes to the visiting delegation of the British House of Commons Select Committee on Culture Media and Sport.

Broadcaster Members

This year the number of private broadcaster members finally broke the 600 mark, a long hoped-for threshold. It is immensely encouraging to observe that, in my first Message (accompanying the 1994-1995 Annual Report), CBSC membership stood at 387. The continuing growth reflects both the increase in the number of licensees, to be sure, but also the constant commitment of Canada's private broadcasters to the self-regulatory process they created.

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. 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 just 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, as noted above, 44 languages.

A useful indicator of the CBSC's familiarity to the public is the extent of the world's recourse to its website. Last year's "hits" ranged just over 6 million while the website sessions grew from almost 58,000 per month on average last year to more than 67,000 this year. The total pageviews rose slightly from nearly 135,000 monthly to about 154,000, and the total bytes transferred from just over 4.8 gigabytes to more than 5.3 each month. It is also fascinating to note that there were visitors from nearly 80 identifiable countries this year.

AGVOT

When the *CAB Violence Code* was introduced almost 14 years ago, it included a section that anticipated the introduction of a classification or ratings system. After the 1995 CRTC hearings on the subject of violence, the notion of the V-Chip was introduced. These issues were all managed by the Action Group on Violence on Television (AGVOT), which had been formed in February 1993, following the Hincks conference on television violence. AGVOT, as it quickly came to be known, brought representatives of the television and cable industries together with, originally, members of the production and advertising sectors. From soon after those beginnings,

AGVOT, supported solely by the CAB and the Canadian Cable Television Association (CCTA), continued to be active in the broad area of issues related to violence on television and the solutions created to respond to such parental concerns. When the CCTA dissolved in 2006, the AGVOT website, by then known as *vchipcanada.ca*, folded quite naturally and comfortably into that of the CBSC, which is proud to carry on its work. The CBSC also acknowledges, with gratitude, the leadership role of Al MacKay, who was long the leader and sole voice of that important body.

The CBSC's Adjudicators

The CBSC always acknowledges, with good reason, the contributions of its Adjudicators. Representing the public and the industry in roughly equal numbers, the Adjudicators are the thinkers, the mediators, those who weigh the challenged broadcasts against the CBSC codes and jurisprudence. They bring reason, balance, thoughtfulness, objectivity and concern to their debates and adjudications. On the basis of their deliberations and decisions, they set the broadcast content standards for the future. To them, much is owed by the public and the industry, perhaps even the regulator.

Acknowledgments

In addition to commitment of the Adjudicators, the CBSC is entirely dependent on the skills and dedication of the staff. The efficiency of the Council and its ability to process the thousands of complaints and related queries depend upon our complaints personnel, our Ethnocultural Outreach Project Manager Burhaan Warsame, our Director of Policy Teisha Gaylard, and our Executive Director John MacNab. Without them, the intellectual and policy machinery is still. With them, it hums. On behalf of all Canadians, whose interests they serve, and on my own behalf, I express our collective gratitude.

RONALD I. COHEN

National Chair

2. ETHNOCULTURAL OUTREACH AND POSITIVE PORTRAYAL INITIATIVE

In the 2006/2007 fiscal year, the CBSC Ethnocultural Outreach Project has started its end-of-project evaluation process, fine-tuned its outreach methods and database, produced new multilingual brochures, print-PSAs and web pages in two additional languages, and informed more Canadians about the CBSC and the self-regulatory system. But before delving into the details of this year's project achievements, it is important to start with a brief discussion on the related issue of diversity and the role of the CBSC.

Diversity (of voices, choices and reflection) has become a key issue for the CBSC and its stakeholders: the CRTC, private broadcasters and the public at large. The CBSC deals with diversity issues in ways that are connected to its organizational mandate and are thus central to its operations.

The issue of diversity is addressed in a number of the codified standards that the CBSC is mandated to administer. Arguably all the broadcast codes that the Council administers touch on some aspect of diversity. Of particular relevance, however, are the code provisions that deal with the treatment of issues relating to socio-demographic diversity. These include the Human Rights Clause in the *CAB Code of Ethics* and the Demographic Spectrum provision in the soon to be phased out *CAB Sex-role Portrayal Code*. Aspects of these two provisions are carried over to, and thus bolstered by, the forthcoming *CAB Equitable Portrayal Code*, a comprehensive new code that will establish industry standards for the portrayal of all identifiable groups and the coverage or reflection of diversity in general. Another new code, the *Journalistic Independence Code*, will seek to enhance the diversity of editorial voices available to Canadians.

Moreover, the CBSC reflects linguistic diversity through its public information and

outreach endeavours. It must be noted that, in addition to administering the broadcast codes, the CBSC is also mandated to inform the public about the codes, and broadcasters about societal trends in relation to the codes. Of these two Janus-like roles, the former is seen to be most essential. Informing the public about the broadcast standards is essential to CBSC operations because only an informed public is likely to participate in the self-regulatory system, and only through public participation will the system work. And as the Canadian public, which the CBSC seeks to inform, is increasingly multicultural and multilingual, the CBSC has adopted an appropriate linguistic approach to the furnishing of public information, at least insofar as its own responsibilities are concerned.

Thanks to the generous financial support of OMNI Television, Canada's premiere multilingual broadcaster, the CBSC Ethnocultural Outreach Project has been working to empower Canadians of diverse backgrounds by providing them with broadcast standards information in their languages of comfort; information they need to dialogue with broadcasters on issues that concern them, including the need for a more accurate and non-stereotypical reflection and portrayal of diversity. In this the fifth year of its scheduled six-year run, the project has started its end-of-project evaluation process while at the same time moving forward with the usual public information and outreach activities.

Project Management

The CBSC Ethnocultural Outreach Project, which is pegged to the initial six-year licensing term of OMNI.2, is scheduled to come to a formal end next year. So, in addition to the usual project activities, we have started an end-of-project review process to examine project successes, challenges and lessons-learned with the

intention of charting a more effective course for future CBSC public information and outreach endeavours.

The review process, which will continue into next year, has both internal and external components. The internal component assesses the performance of the project in terms of the conceptualization, planning and implementation of the project, while the external component evaluates the performance of the outsource companies that handled the translation, design, layout and printing of the various information tools that have evolved throughout the project. In the latter case, there have been face-to-face meetings with the representatives of these companies to review all aspects of the outsourced work, including work plans, methodologies and quality control processes meant to ensure that the outreach materials continue to be delivered on-time, on-budget and error-free.

It is hoped that the review process and the established management, production and outreach infrastructure that the project has created will enable the CBSC to be even more effective with future public information campaigns to create more awareness of the CBSC and the codes it administers, including new codes like the *CAB Equitable Portrayal Code*.

Production of Public Information Materials

This year we have increased the number of languages in which the CBSC information is available to 44 languages. The newest languages to join the list were Hebrew and Swahili. As usual, we issued all our information materials – including a full-colour glossy brochure, a public service announcement in three different sizes, and web pages – in the latest languages.

In addition, we have reprinted the English and French brochures after again running out of stock. It is interesting to note that we have been reprinting the brochures in the official languages every year since the start of the project to keep up with higher public demand for them. The yearly reprints of the two official languages have averaged around 2000

to 3000 copies per language, with a combined total, printed and distributed since the start of the project, of 23,000 copies.

In this year's reprints of the English and French brochures, we have incorporated a number of textual changes and updates. The updates included, among other things, a mentioning of the fact that CBSC members now include satellite radio services. Also, we featured the new CBSC tagline, "Private Broadcasting; Public Trust", to drive home the point that private broadcasters are at the centre of the CBSC process to address any concerns the public may have on the content that is being transmitted over the airwaves.

Public Outreach and Promotion Activities

During this fiscal year, we have continued with our efforts to convey the CBSC message to the public in linguistically accessible manner. The message, which is all about the self-regulatory system and the recourse available to the public, is communicated through the distribution of information materials and through connections with members of the public at various events.

We have been sending out the CBSC brochure and other information materials to new contacts, while fulfilling orders for additional brochures within a 24 hour time span. Moreover, we have undertaken a number of specific measures to connect with or inform the project's various target audiences.

Broadcasters

One of the main target audiences for the project has been radio and television broadcasters themselves, especially 'ethnic' or third-language broadcasters, and broadcasters with periodical programming in third-languages. Still, all broadcasters – ethnic or otherwise – are considered to be very important for the outreach project in that they are the most likely intermediaries in informing the public about the codes. So this year, we sent all CBSC-member broadcasters a reminder about the project in the form of a factsheet that highlights the most salient aspect of the project and why it is useful to broadcasters. A number of broadcasters have

responded by ordering the brochures in large quantities for distribution to their community contacts.

Campus and community radio broadcasters have this year begun receiving CBSC multicultural and multilingual information. This year we updated the section of our database containing contacts for that group, sent out copies of our brochures to them, and had several meetings with their representatives. One such meeting explored ways that campus and community radio stations could help with public outreach, including airing the upcoming CBSC broadcast-PSA, while another focused on the possibilities of their joining the CBSC as members. A significant number of the campus and community radio stations have programming in third-languages, which makes them highly valued intermediaries for this project's multilingual public information and outreach efforts.

Community organizations

A second set of target audiences that the project has been focusing on is community organizations, including ethno-specific organizations, multicultural, newcomer or settlement agencies, faith-based associations, advocacy groups and community resource centers. This year's outreach to these groups included regular mailings, follow-up phone and email contacts, and attendance at various community outreach events.

This year we sent out information packages to several types of community contacts, one of which was community resource centers, to which many Canadians go to get information on the various public and private services available to their communities. It was particularly fitting to have the CBSC brochure available in those locations.

In addition to these mailings, we attended a number of outreach activities ranging from a reception for the Canadian Race Relations Foundation to a discussion with faith-based associations on ways we could better reach into different communities. We also attended a number of heritage events, including those

associated with the Black History Month and the Asian Heritage Month. These occasions provided ample opportunities to connect with members of the public and distribute the CBSC multilingual brochures. In the case of Asian Heritage Month, for example, we were able to send copies of the CBSC brochure in 16 Asiatic languages to the organizers for distribution, while also attending some of the month-long events to meet with key people and inform them about the CBSC and the self-regulatory system it administers.

Educational Associations

A third set of target audiences the project reached this year were educational associations, including media education associations, school boards, and parent / teacher associations. Much of our outreach to these groups centered on the annual National Media Education Week, week-long events that encourage media literacy in Canadian schools and communities.

The National Media Education Week, organized by the Media Awareness Network and the Canadian Teachers Federation (with the active participation of the print and broadcast media in Canada) provided us with an opportunity to connect with key educators and carry out mass mailings to educational groups across the country. We have, for example, sent our information packages to many of the parent/teacher associations in our database to once again position the CBSC brochure as a possible resource on media education; a tool for those who are interested to know more about their entitlements as TV viewers and/or radio listeners.

Aside from the outreach opportunities provided by the Media Education Week, we have fulfilled orders for the brochure from a number of educators, including teachers and professors from a number of Canadian schools and universities.

For the past five years, the Ethnocultural Outreach Project has been the CBSC's main vehicle for fulfilling its public information and outreach mandate. The project targets important intermediaries like broadcasters, other media practitioners, community

organizations and educational associations to convey the CBSC message to Canadians. It is hoped that, in the near future, this project and the lessons it provides will be the basis for an enhanced program to inform more

Canadians about the broadcast codes and the self-regulatory system created by Canada's private broadcasters.

3. DECISIONS RELEASED IN 2006/2007

DECISIONS RELEASED IN 2006/2007

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 initial complaint. Experience shows that the satisfaction with that broadcaster dialogue 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 solution in the circumstances.

The CBSC released a total of 80 decisions (of both varieties) this year, significantly fewer than the 117 released in 2006/2007. Nineteen of the decisions were Panel Decisions and 61 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, when that issue has been found in the past to result in a Code breach, or when 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 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 bilingual press release.

Almost equal number of the Panel Decisions

involved television and radio programming, ten and nine respectively. The brief descriptions of each of those Decisions are divided into those two broadcast categories and then subdivided under relevant issue-related sub-headings.

TELEVISION

Ten of the Panel Decisions released in 2006/2007 dealt with television broadcasts. The issues treated in those decisions were the broadcast of sexual material, the scheduling of coarse language and mature themes, violent content in public affairs programming, discrimination against identifiable groups and privacy in news programming.

Sexual Content

Clause 10(a) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* requires broadcasters to refrain from airing sexually explicit material that is intended for adult audiences outside of the Watershed period, which runs from 9:00 pm to 6:00 am. A provision with corresponding language relating specifically to advertising is set out in 10(f) of that Code. Clause 11 of that Code obliges broadcasters to provide viewer advisories alerting audiences to the sexual content of the program. In addition, Article 4 of the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code* states that broadcasters shall not air programming that exploits men, women and children. Four decisions touched on these issues this year.

The youth-oriented magazine-style program *MTV Live*, broadcast on MTV Canada, was the subject of two decisions this year. The program contained a mix of discussions with in-studio audience members, comedic sketches and interviews with experts. In *MTV Canada re an episode of MTV Live ("Virtual Sex")* (CBSC Decision 05/06-1459, January 8, 2007), the topic of the day was virtual sex. The episode included segments relating to cyber-sex, a virtual sex machine and an online role-playing sex game. While some of the segments featured only mild references to

sex, others provided more detailed descriptions of sexual activity. MTV Canada broadcast the episode from 8:00 to 9:00 am without any viewer advisories and rated it PG. The National Specialty Services Panel agreed with the complainant that the episode contained adult material since “even where there is neither nudity nor sexual activity, there may still be enough explicitness in the dialogue, discussion or descriptions to conclude that the programming is intended for adults.” The Panel also commented that “the theme of the episode, namely, internet sex, would not per se have been problematic; however, the illustration of the theme with references to the [Virtual Sex machine and the Naughty America on-line sexual game] segments [...] was unduly explicit. The broadcaster, therefore, violated Clause 10 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* for airing the episode before the Watershed period, and Clause 11 for its failure to broadcast viewer advisories. Since magazine-style programs are technically exempt from classification, the Panel found no breach for MTV Canada’s PG rating, but it observed that 14+ would have been more appropriate.

The National Specialty Services Panel reached the same conclusion in the other decision about a separate episode of *MTV Live*. The topic of that episode, namely, *MTV Canada re an episode of MTV Live (“Self Love”)* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0763, May 1, 2007), was masturbation. The episode included a sketch in which two comedians provided humorous “how to” tips, discussions with audience members about their experiences, scenes filmed inside a sex shop, and interviews with sex experts on the subject. This episode aired from 7:30 to 8:30 am and, again, contained no advisories and was rated PG. The Panel acknowledged that the subject matter “is hardly, by its nature, destined exclusively for adult audiences, [but] [t]he episode did not, after all, just deal briefly or peripherally with the subject; it was a full hour that focussed on a wide range of inclusive masturbatory sub-themes.” MTV Canada was again found in breach of Clauses 10 and 11 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* and the Panel noted that 14+ would have been a more apt rating.

A different type of programming was at issue in *Sun TV (CKXT-TV) re an infomercial for a telephone sex line* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0244, January 9, 2007). That decision involved a 3:30 pm Sun TV broadcast of an infomercial for a telephone sex line which featured young women in bikinis, lingerie and high heels posing provocatively. Occasionally, the women addressed the camera, urging male viewers to call because “there are sexy girls in your area who want to talk to you right now.” An advisory broadcast during the program indicated that it was a “paid advertisement” that was “intended for adults only”. A viewer complained that this content was inappropriate for a Sunday afternoon broadcast. The station explained that it had been broadcast in error. Although it did not contain any scenes of sexual activity, the Ontario Regional Panel concluded that the broadcast of this infomercial before the Watershed period constituted a violation of Clause 10(f) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* because the “infomercial was relentlessly sexually provocative for thirty minutes rather than thirty seconds” and its “theme and duration make it clear that it is material intended exclusively for adult audiences.”

The complainant’s concern related not to the scheduling of the program, but rather to its representation of women in *Teletatino re the film La Chiave Del Placere (The Key to Sex)* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0081, May 1, 2007). *Teletatino* broadcast an Italian-dubbed version of an erotic film at 2:00 am Eastern time (1:00 am Central, the complainant’s time zone) with viewer advisories. The film contained scenes of both male and female nudity, and various types of sexual activity between male-female and female-female couples. There were frequent close-ups of women’s bare breasts. The complainant characterized the film as “pornographic” and suggested that it was offensive and demeaning to women, contrary to the Exploitation clause (Article 4) of the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code*. The National Specialty Services Panel disagreed that the film constituted “pornography” and found no violation of the Exploitation clause. It cited previous decisions in which the CBSC had determined that sexual explicitness does not necessarily amount to exploitation as long as

there is no degradation of one gender vis-à-vis the other. The viewer also complained that the broadcast had been incorrectly rated. The Panel observed that Teletatino had rated it 18+, the highest designation in the AGVOT system, and that the complainant's issue seemed to relate to the fact that her digital cable provider was not employing the same rating system. The CBSC acknowledged the confusion (to viewers) resulting from the fact that different service providers use classification systems that differ from the AGVOT one employed by Canadian broadcasters, but that it concluded that it was unable to deal with this matter as long as Teletatino had put the correct AGVOT rating on-screen. The Panel did find a Code violation, however, for Teletatino's failure to display the rating icon for the requisite 15 seconds.

Coarse Language and Other Mature Themes

In addition to sexual content, Clause 10(a) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* states that broadcasters must not air coarse language that is intended for adult audiences outside of the Watershed period. Clause 11 also requires them to air viewer advisories when a program contains language intended for adult audiences or unsuitable for children. The CBSC makes its determinations about what words and phrases will constitute "intended for adult audiences" on a case-by-case basis bearing context and community standards in mind. In 2006/2007, the CBSC released two decisions relating to coarse language in English-language programming. In one of those decisions, the CBSC also extended Clause 10 to apply to other types of mature subject matter.

The first of the two decisions involved the broadcast of a feature film. In *Prime re the film Smokey and the Bandit* (CBSC Decision 05/06-1575, January 8, 2007), the National Specialty Services Panel addressed a complaint about the use of coarse words in the 1977 film starring Burt Reynolds and Sally Field. The movie contained numerous instances of the words "ass", "hell", "damn", "shit" and "son-of-a-bitch". The broadcast occurred from noon to 2:00 pm Eastern (11:00 am-1:00 pm Central, the

complainant's time zone). In response to the complaint, Prime acknowledged that it might have been more appropriate to air an edited version in that time slot, but pointed out that it had provided viewer advisories and a PG rating. The Panel concluded that the precise words employed in the context in which they were used in this film constituted only mild coarse language which "is insufficient to characterize the film as exclusively adult fare." Prime, therefore, did not violate Clause 10(a). The Panel also concluded that PG was an acceptable rating, since that classification allows for a certain amount of profanity.

The second decision involved a documentary/magazine-style program about action sports. The National Conventional Television Panel set out its findings in *Global re an episode of fatbluesky* (CBSC Decision 05/06-1611, January 8, 2007). The program was targeted at youth, and it covered activities such as skateboarding and extreme skiing and their related lifestyles and subcultures. Global aired the program at 10:00 am without any viewer advisories. The f-word was heard repeatedly in two separate segments: one in which a skateboarder failed to land a trick and the other in which a man who fishes for a living told viewers "why you should be fucking smart enough to scare up a couple thou' each month" and "if you're fucking working all the time, you're an idiot." The Panel noted previous decisions in which the CBSC determined that the f-word should only be broadcast during the Watershed period and found a breach of Clause 10(a) on this account. The Panel also extended that Code provision to other adult themes not expressly listed in Clause 10. The extension was relevant in this case because the fisherman was shown throughout the segment consuming alcohol while driving a boat, an inappropriate combination which had also been a concern of the complainant. The Panel also found a breach of Clause 10(a) on this account, because "there was no component of the program that served to point out that [the man]'s behaviour was illegal and dangerous" and "[w]hat would disarm the youthful viewers still more is the trivialization of [his] boating practices." As well, Global violated Clause 11 for failing to provide any viewer advisories.

Violence in Public Affairs Programming

Violence in public affairs programming is generally covered under Article 6 of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters' (CAB) *Violence Code*. The sub-paragraphs of that provision set out a number of guidelines for news and public affairs. For example, broadcasters must use appropriate editorial judgment in the presentation of violence, aggression or destruction and caution in the selection and repetition of violent video footage; they are also obliged to advise viewers in advance of showing violent reports and are prohibited from exaggerating or exploiting situations of aggression, conflict or confrontation, while not sanitizing reality. In some cases, other provisions of the *CAB Violence Code* may be relevant in decisions regarding public affairs programming, in particular Article 1, which prohibits the promotion, sanctioning or glamorization of violence, as well as other articles which set out that same prohibition with respect to specific groups, such as women and minorities.

In *Global Television re a segment on an episode of Entertainment Tonight* (CBC Decision 05/06-1525, January 8, 2007), the National Conventional Television Panel dealt with a segment on the entertainment information program which was broadcast at 7:30 pm. Throughout the *Entertainment Tonight* episode, there were teasers for an upcoming segment about an investigative journalism piece on dysfunctional step-families that was to be aired that evening on the American public affairs program *Primetime*. The segment itself appeared towards the end of the episode. Both the teasers and the actual segment contained footage of a step-mother yelling, unprovoked, at her step-daughter, and of a father repeatedly punching his teenaged daughter. Although the *Entertainment Tonight* host noted that the footage was "jaw-dropping", "explosive" and "horrifying", there was no real warning about the nature of the images. A viewer complained that this disturbing footage was inappropriate for broadcast during family viewing hours. The Panel concluded that Global did not violate Article 6 of the *CAB Violence Code* for merely

airing the segment, but that the repetition of the violent clips and the failure to warn viewers in advance resulted in a Code breach. The Panel observed that "[a]fter three of five combative clips were shown [...] the host alerted the audience about what was coming [...]. For the Panel, the brief spoken advisory [wa]s a case of too little, too late." As to the video clips, the Panel considered that they were "repeated too frequently [and] their re-use added nothing useful to the story. [...] [T]he combination of the images and the choice of sensational language breach [Article 6]."

An open-line public affairs program was the subject of *TQS re an episode of L'Avocat et le diable (décision de la Cour d'appel)* (CBC Decision 05/06-1636, December 11, 2006). On the program, hosts and callers discussed current events. On the challenged episode, the topic of the day was a decision by the Quebec Court of Appeal to reduce the sentence of a man convicted of sexual assault against a young girl as well as other crimes related to child pornography. One of the hosts strongly disagreed with the appellate court's decision and targeted his criticisms at the female judge who had written the majority opinion. The host and callers, who were encouraged by the host, referred to her as "crazy", "dishonourable", and "a disgrace", and went so far as to suggest that she ought to endure a similar sexual assault. A viewer complained that these comments were unacceptable. The Quebec Regional Panel acknowledged that broadcasters may criticize judicial decisions, but that the personal attacks on the female judge "exceeded by a considerable margin the full, fair and proper presentation of opinion, editorial and comment" set out in Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. The Panel also found a breach of Article 1 of the *CAB Violence Code* because "the advocacy of violence [...] made against the judge herself [...] constitutes a sanctioning of violent actions against a member of the Court of Appeal." It did not, however, find a violation of the Code provision regarding violence against women (Article 7 of the *CAB Violence Code*) because "[w]hile the nature of the incitement is focussed on a particular individual, who, like every other person, has gender, the Panel

does not consider that it is a gender-driven suggestion.”

Discrimination

The CBSC addressed concerns about discriminatory remarks against an identifiable group in only one television decision 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 programs are allowed to criticize policies and practices relating to identifiable groups, provided the comments do not make unsubstantiated negative generalizations about the group as a whole. In some instances, Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* is also relevant to the treatment of such issues, as it was in the one case examined this year.

That decision was *TQS re an episode of L'Avocat et le diable (accommodations)* (CBSC Decision 05/06-1605+, December 11, 2006). On an episode of the open-line public affairs program, the question of the day was “How far should we go to accommodate ethnic requirements?” The hosts and the majority of callers expressed the view that accommodations for minority groups should not be made. Some of the callers made specific references to Muslims and suggested that, if they did not want to conform to Canadian customs, they should go back to where they came from. One of the hosts also commented that Islam does not have any respect for women and that a provision in the Qur'an even gives a man the right to beat his wife. One female Muslim caller argued that this was not true. A number of people who identified themselves as Muslims complained that the comments were discriminatory. The Quebec Regional Panel disagreed. It stated that “the discussion of such matters is in and of itself entirely consistent with the entitlement, if not responsibility, [...] to discuss controversial issues. Nor is it a breach [...] to take the position that schools and other public

institutions ought not to cater to the demands of other religions or traditions. [...] [T]here was not [...] any abusive or unduly discriminatory comment with respect to the discussion of any of the foregoing issues. [...] There was [...] counterpoint to [any negative] comments.” With respect to the allegations made about the content of the Qur'an, the Panel also found no violation of Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* because “the sura referred to in the challenged broadcast was not misrepresented.”

Privacy in News

Article 4 of the Radio-Television News Directors Association of Canada (RTNDA) *Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* states that broadcast journalists must respect the dignity, privacy and well-being of everyone with whom they deal and must ensure that news does not unreasonably infringe privacy except when necessary in the public interest. A potentially related provision is Article 9, which requires broadcasters to ensure that their reporting does not interfere with the rights of an individual to a fair trial. Both of those Code provisions were applied in a decision taken in 2006/2007. It should also be noted that this was the first occasion on which the CBSC was called upon to apply the latter article.

CFTO-TV (CTV Toronto) re CTV News report (terrorist suspects) (CBSC Decision 05/06-1641, January 9, 2007) involved a news report that covered the arrests of 17 individuals on terrorism-related charges. Captioned with headlines such as “Terror strikes close to home” and “Terror in Toronto”, the report provided the full names of all of the 12 adult accuseds and the civic addresses of 10 of them both aurally and visually. A viewer complained that the display of the full home addresses of the accuseds was unreasonable because it infringed on their privacy, and that the language and presentation of the report assumed the accuseds' guilt before a trial occurred. CTV Toronto argued that the charges were extremely serious and that the public had a right to know the addresses. The Ontario Regional Panel found a violation of Article 4 for providing those details in full.

The Panel gave the following explanation for its decision: “there were other persons living at the disclosed addresses who had not a scintilla of connection with the (unproven) offences. Moreover, there was no indication of any issue of public safety or security associated with the revelation of such personal details, which might constitute a matter of public necessity. [...] [T]here was no indication that the public were any safer, more secure, or better protected by receiving those civic addresses than they would have been without them.” With respect to compromising the accuseds’ right to fair trials, the Panel was divided. The majority acknowledged that some of the language used in the report was provocative, but it did not consider that a trial would be prejudiced on that account. The minority, however, felt that the cumulative effect of the headlines and other language was “excessive” and “unnecessarily sensational”, leaving the impression that the accuseds had unquestionably committed the alleged crimes.

RADIO

Nine of the Panel Decisions released in 2006/2007 involved radio programming. One particular program generated a number of complaints and resulted in four decisions this year. Those decisions touched on a number of different issues, including discrimination against identifiable groups, gender stereotyping, explicit sexual discussions and coarse language, and political commentary. The other five radio-related decisions treated matters regarding discrimination, insults directed at individuals, live coverage of violent crimes, and sexualization of children.

Doc Mailloux

Doc Mailloux was an afternoon open-line program that aired on Quebec radio station CKAC. It was hosted by psychiatrist Doc Mailloux and co-hosted by Janine Ross. The hosts and callers discussed topics related to psychology, sociology, personal relationships and the like, occasionally inspired by a current news story or social phenomenon.

The episodes examined in the CBSC decisions raised issues related to numerous Code provisions. Clause 2 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* covers human rights; it prohibits broadcasters from airing abusive or unduly discriminatory content which is based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability. While programs may comment on political or social subjects related to identifiable groups, they are not entitled to make negative generalizations about a group as a whole. When the comments are based on sex or gender, the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code* is also applicable, in particular Article 2(c), which states that programming shall respect the intellectual and emotional equality of both sexes and the dignity of all individuals, as well as Article 4, which prohibits negative or degrading comments about the role and nature of women or men in society. Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* is a general provision relating to the proper presentation of comment, editorials and opinions. It is often applied in cases where a program contains insulting remarks against an individual or controversial opinions on a political topic. Sub-clauses 9(b) and (c) prohibit the broadcast of unduly sexually explicit material and coarse language at times of the day when children could be listening to radio.

In *CKAC-AM re an episode of Doc Mailloux (Adolescent Sexuality)* (CBSC Decision 05/06-1104, June 30, 2006), the topic of the day was how parents should approach discussing sexuality with their adolescent children. The subject was inspired by a story about Hollywood actor Bruce Willis who claimed that he had warned his teenage daughters about what teenage boys are “really thinking”, namely, sex. Mailloux objected to Willis’ position on the grounds that one cannot generalize about all teenage boys. Mailloux referred to Willis as “full of shit” and used other unsavoury terms. The Quebec Regional Panel indicated that Mailloux was entitled to disagree with and criticize Willis, but concluded that he had crossed the line by resorting to personal attacks using coarse language. The broadcast violated Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* on this account. Many

of the conversations with callers included descriptions of sexual activity, for example, one male caller's reference to "eating a woman's clitoris" and Mailloux's discussion of vaginal lubrication. For these, the Panel found a breach of Clause 9(b). The episode also included instances of coarse language in both French ("fourrer") and English ("fucking") for which the Panel found a violation of Clause 9(c).

CKAC-AM re an episode of Doc Mailloux (Money) (CBSC Decision 05/06-1379, December 11, 2006) dealt with an episode on which the topic of the day was money but, under that broad heading, the discussion touched on issues of happiness, honour and other related issues. Mailloux stated that Cubans, Iranians, and North Koreans were "deficients" and that Cubans and Russians had no sense of honour when it comes to repaying debt. Since those comments directly targeted the people rather than the political policies of their countries, the Quebec Regional Panel found them in violation of Clause 2 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. The episode also contained some mention of sexuality, such as Mailloux questioning a female caller about her husband's level of sexual arousal after he had lent money to her brother. The Panel considered that that conversation was "utterly unnecessary to the issue being discussed" and unduly explicit, contrary to Clause 9(b). In addition, the host again used French coarse language which was in violation of Clause 9(c).

Some of the same issues arose in *CKAC-AM re an episode of Doc Mailloux (Financial Difficulties)* (CBSC Decision 05/06-1405, December 11, 2006). The question of the day was "Have you ever had to use a food bank?" Like the other decisions, Mailloux made comments about identifiable groups that the Quebec Regional Panel concluded were in violation of Clause 2. Those included remarks about Haitians being dirty and women being idiots. In contrast, comments about the problems faced by the Black community were considered acceptable political commentary. Other acceptable political commentary (examined under Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*) included Mailloux's revelation that he had not paid

income tax for many years. There was also one instance of the English f-word, which the Panel found in violation of Clause 9(c).

CKAC-AM re an episode of Doc Mailloux (Childless by Choice) (CBSC Decision 05/06-1671, December 11, 2006) dealt with an episode on which the question of the day was "Have you decided not to have children?" Mailloux introduced the topic with information about Russia's declining birth rate. Within the context of that discussion, he characterized Russian as "deficients" and "morons", which the Quebec Regional Panel found in violation of Clause 2. The host also reiterated his Code-breaching view about people with Down Syndrome, stating that they did not have the "same value as a talented person." In addition, Mailloux stated that Quebec women are "not properly brought up or educated" and that they frequently resort to sexual or emotional blackmail to get their own way. Those remarks, combined with insulting terminology such as "broads", "wenches" and "shrews", demonstrated a "cumulative level of disrespect and intolerance that was in violation of Clause 2 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* and Clauses 2 and 4 of the *CAB Sex Role Portrayal Code*." With some callers, Mailloux again steered the conversation towards sexual matters. For example, he asked one male caller to provide details about the services offered by call girls and he questioned a female caller on her first sexual experiences. The Panel considered these discussions too sexually explicit for daytime radio and therefore in breach of Clause 9(b) of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. Mailloux's use of the English f-word was once again found in breach of the Code. His comments criticizing the CRTC, however, were found to be on the acceptable side of the line under Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*, though the Panel did express some concern about his use of vulgar language in expressing his views.

In the case of repetitive Code breaches, the CBSC's approach is to require the broadcaster to provide the Council with a written explanation of measures the station will take to ensure that the breaches do not recur. The CBSC made that demand on CKAC following the release of all of the foregoing decisions

against *Doc Mailloux*. CKAC, via its owner company Corus, furnished the required information within the requisite time frame, outlining its numerous efforts to educate its employees about Canadian broadcast standards and improve its programming in this regard.

Discrimination

As mentioned above, complaints about discriminatory comments made on radio are examined under Clause 2 (Human Rights) of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. Comments will be found in breach of that clause if they make negative generalizations about a group based on their race, ethnic or national origin, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability. Comments will not be found in breach if they simply criticize a group based on their political views or actions. Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* regarding full, fair and proper presentation of commentary may also be relevant in cases where the accuracy of comments is called into question and/or individuals (rather than groups) are the target of critical comments. Three decisions this year dealt with complaints about discrimination in radio programming.

The first was *CFRA-AM re an episode of the Lowell Green Show (the Qur'an)* (CBSC Decision 05/06-1380, May 18, 2006). The host of an open-line program, Lowell Green, discussed the case of a man in Afghanistan who had been condemned to death for apostasy, that is, converting from Islam to Christianity. Green then read a letter published in the *National Post* written by an academic who alleged that the Qur'an instructs Muslims to kill people who switch from Islam to other faiths. Green indicated that he wanted to hear from Muslims to find out if this was true; he also pointed out that Christianity does not have a similar prohibition against apostasy. A listener raised concerns about Green's comparison of the two religions, which he considered had the effect of misrepresenting Islam and inciting hatred towards Muslims. The Ontario Regional Panel concluded that the remarks were not abusive or unduly discriminatory

since "the host was critical of aspects of Islam but it is far from a blanket condemnation or denigration of the religion." The Panel did, however, find a violation of Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* for the misrepresentation of the Qur'an and for the host's treatment of callers. The Panel observed that Green was entitled to broadcast his opinion about Islam's approach to apostasy, but that "[t]he broadcaster had its own obligation to be certain, at material times, of the accuracy of the material on which it was *relying*." Green insisted that he was reading directly from the Qur'an when he cited the quotation "Kill him who changes his religion", but in fact that line is not found in the Qur'an at all. The Panel stated that CFRA "ought to have verified such an important point before using that provision as the *foundation* for almost the entire episode." The Panel also had difficulties with the way the host treated the callers who identified themselves as Muslim, particularly since Green had asked Muslim listeners to phone to explain their religion and had stated he would not interrupt them. The Panel noted that "he disregarded their explanations of the very nature of the Qur'an [and] [w]hen one of the Muslims even explained that the *Arabic*, that is, the original and definitive, version of the Qur'an, which he had before him, did *not* contain the words the host relied on, Green changed the subject. [...] The broadcaster's refusal to permit callers in good faith to provide the explanation of the misquoted text from the Qur'an when he had invited them to do so rendered the presentation of that text neither full, fair nor proper."

CHRB-AM (AM 1140) re an episode of Freedom Radio Network (CBSC Decision 05/06-1959, January 9, 2007) involved a talk radio program produced by an organization that identified itself as "socially conservative". On the challenged episode, the two hosts discussed a complaint that had been lodged against one of them at the Canadian Human Rights Commission for comments made on a website about homosexuals. The person who had filed that complaint then complained to the CBSC about the broadcast, alleging that it had been used unfairly to retaliate against him and had contained comments that violated Clause 2 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*.

Although the hosts used the term “homosexual activists”, the Prairie Regional Panel found no violation of Clause 2 because there was “*nothing* in the comments of [the hosts] that comes at all close to unjustified nastiness, vitriol and callous treatment of individuals on the basis of their sexual orientation.” On the other hand, with respect to fair and proper presentation and the treatment of controversial public issues, the Panel found several problems with the broadcast. Almost all of the program was consumed with a one-sided attack on the complainant, including identifying him by name, accusing him of frivolous concerns, and threatening to sue him. The Panel concluded that this behaviour “exceeded reasonable bounds” and constituted “electronic bullying” in violation of the Code. It also found that the co-hosts had seriously distorted the facts of the Canadian Human Rights Commission complaint by alleging that they had been accused of a “hate crime” and incorrectly asserting what they had “won” and where in litigious confrontations with the complainant. They also made a series of incorrect, distorted or exaggerated comments regarding the health implications of homosexuality and the political activism of the gay community, all of which violated Clause 6.

The third radio decision that touched on issues of discrimination was *CFMJ-AM re a segment on an episode of Coast to Coast AM* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0009, January 9, 2007). *Coast to Coast AM* is an American talk radio program syndicated on various Canadian stations. It generally focuses on conspiracy theories and the paranormal, but occasionally touches on current events. On the challenged episode, the host read from an essay written by a retired U.S. military officer which asserted that Americans did not really understand what was at stake in the war in the Middle East, namely, a real and immediate threat to Americans’ freedom. The essay included comments about Muslim radicals and terrorists, but also suggested that peaceful Muslims do not speak out for fear of reprisal. A listener complained that the broadcast incited hatred and racism against the Muslim community. The station responded that the comments had been about

Muslim “terrorists” only. The majority of the Panel concluded that the broadcast criticized the group on the basis of their criminal activities and that it had adequately differentiated between “terrorists” and Muslims in general: “the broadcaster was justified in identifying the ‘criminal sub-group’, to use the complainant’s term, by associating it with the characteristics of the group to which they belong, whether those characteristics are religious, national, ethnic, cultural, by gender or other pertinent designation. The Panel finds no inherent problem in such a choice.” There was a dissenting view, however, on the grounds that “there was too much assimilation of the Muslim terrorists with all Muslims” and “the host’s characterizations of Muslims were intended to give rise to fear and animosity on the part of audience members.”

Covering Crimes in Progress

A rarely applied article in the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* deals with covering violent situations in progress. Article 10 requires that reporting on criminal activities does not knowingly endanger lives or provide vital information to the perpetrator(s). Such a situation arose in one decision released in 2006/2007.

On September 13, 2006, there was a widely-reported shooting at a college in Montreal. Live radio coverage of the event was the subject of *CKNW-AM re Dawson College Shooting Coverage* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0061, March 26, 2007). The Vancouver radio station owned by Corus interrupted its regular programming on the day in question to provide news coverage via a live feed from its sister station in Montreal, CINW. At the time, facts and details of the event were unclear. Authorities were uncertain how many shooters there were, where they were located in the school, what their motives were, and how the attack had been organized. The coverage contained interviews with students and their family members. Two of the interviews broadcast on-air revealed the precise location of students still barricaded in the school. A listener expressed his concern that broadcasting this information could have

“tipped the gunman to whereabouts of the trapped people” and that “lives were put in jeopardy.” The British Columbia Regional Panel found a breach of the aforementioned Code provision. It noted that the broadcaster was entitled to air interviews with trapped students but that it “ought *never* [...] to have permitted that part of those calls (the students’ locations) to go to air” nor should it have “repeated, no less than *four* times, the locations of those students in the building” in the midst of the unresolved shooting crisis. The Panel also pointed out that “technology has created new risks for the public in the reporting of criminal activities” and “[t]he consequences might, as the complainant validly assumed, have been lethal. Broadcasters must always assume that the perpetrators have access to the information they report.”

Sexualization of Children

Article 4 of the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code* is entitled Exploitation and it requires that programming refrain from the exploitation of men, women and children. The last sentence of the provision specifically prohibits the sexualization of children through dress or behaviour. The CBSC applied that provision in one case this year.

The challenged comments were examined in *CFRQ-FM (Q104) re a conversation about a concert* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0763, May 1, 2007). Following a concert in Halifax by the Rolling Stones, two male announcers discussed the event. One suggested that the other was “excited like a little school-girl,” to which comment the other joked, “with my budding breasts and my rock-hard nipples.” A representative from a women’s organization complained that this comment sexualized children and objectified girls’ bodies. The station argued that the remarks were an attempt at humour with no intention of ridiculing or objectifying females. The Atlantic Regional Panel agreed with the complainant and found a violation of Article 4. It considered that the expression “excited like a little school-girl” would have been acceptable on its own, but “the dialogue [...] did not [...] end at such an innocuous place.

[...] In the view of the Panel, the reference [to rock-hard nipples] was clearly sexual and, when the reference to ‘budding’ breasts was added to ‘little school girl’, the intent to refer to children was unmistakable.”

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 will 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 61 Summary Decisions in 2006/2007.

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 Broadcasts that Resulted in Summary Decisions

Language		English	French	Other	Total
Medium	Radio	17	4	2	23
	Television	30	8	0	38
	Total	47	12	2	61

Hot Topics in Summary Decisions

Summary Decisions released this year dealt with a number of different issues. The most common one was sexual content, with a total of 15 dealing with that subject. The CBSC has consistently stated that television broadcasters are allowed to air sexually explicit content during the Watershed period of 9:00 pm to 6:00 am provided they broadcast adequate viewer advisories and appropriate classification icons. Radio broadcasters are not permitted to air sexually explicit discussions at times of the day when children are likely to be listening. That was the case in 11 Summary Decisions released in 2006/2007. The CBSC has also said that nudity (when not presented in the context of sexual activity), as well as mild or vague references to sex, are acceptable during the day on both television and radio. Four of the complaints that resulted in Summary Decisions related to that type of material.

Many of the complaints for which the CBSC Secretariat issued Summary Decisions fell into the broad category of "Improper Comments or Content". Twelve Summary Decisions were thus characterized and were examined under the Full, Fair and Proper Presentation Clause of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. They related to a variety of issues, but the majority related to insulting comments made about: groups not considered to be "identifiable" groups under the Human Rights Clause (for example, pit bull dog owners); public figures, such as politicians; and callers to open-line programs. The CBSC has explained in previous decisions that broadcasters are entitled to air comments that are critical of groups or individuals as long as the criticisms target their views or actions rather than resort to personal attacks. Also, since the purpose of open-line programs is to debate controversial

issues, it is reasonable to expect that conversations with callers may become heated. Again, as long as there are no personal insults broadcast, program hosts are permitted to be reasonably aggressive with their callers.

A third category of complaints that arose in nine instances was the degrading representation of women. The CBSC examines such complaints under the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code*. The CBSC's position is that the mere depiction of female nudity or sexuality is not necessarily exploitative provided that gender is not represented detrimentally vis-à-vis the other, and/or no negative comments are made about women in general. (This would, of course, be correspondingly true with respect to men, rather than women.)

The scheduling of adult material was of concern to the complainant in nine of the Summary Decisions issued by the CBSC Secretariat this year. "Adult material" includes sexual content, violence, coarse language and other mature subject matter. As explained above with respect to sexual content, broadcasters are allowed to air adult material during the Watershed period with adequate viewer advisories and appropriate classification icons. Programming that respects those rules is not in violation of any Code provisions.

The table below provides statistics on the number of Summary Decisions that treated the various possible categories of issues.

Issues Raised in Complaints that Resulted in Summary Decisions

Issue Raised in Complaints	Number of Complaints*
Viewer Advisories	1
Bad Taste	0
Biased/Unfair/Imbalanced Information	4
Classification/Rating	1
Coarse Language	6
Conflict of Interest	0
Unfair Contest	1
Discrimination Based on Age	1
Discrimination Based on Disability	0
Discrimination Based on Ethnicity	0
Discrimination Based on Gender	2
Discrimination Based on Nationality	1
Discrimination Based on Race	2
Discrimination Based on Religion	7
Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation	3
Exploitation of Children	0
General Improper Comments/Content	12
Inaccurate News or Information	7
Journalistic Conduct	0
Invasion of Privacy	5
Degrading Representation of Women	9
Scheduling	9
Sexual Content	15
Subliminal Advertising	0
Treatment of Callers to Open-Line Programs	2
Violence	6

*Some complaints raised more than one issue, so the total exceeds 61.

4. SUMMARY OF COMPLAINTS

OVERVIEW OF CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

In 2006/2007, the total number of complaint files opened by the CBSC was 1,426. Unlike in many previous years, there were no broadcasts that generated an unusually large number of complaints.

- Of the 1,426 complaint files opened in fiscal 2006/2007, the CBSC actually handled 1,138 or 79.8%; 149 files were referred to Advertising Standards Canada (ASC) and 139 to the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) (of these 139 files, 84 related to non-member broadcasters and 55 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 whose correspondence was sent elsewhere for resolution.
- This year, the CRTC forwarded 795 complaints to the CBSC (53.6% of the total number of complaint files opened in 2006/2007). Only three complaint were forwarded from another agency this year (0.2% of complaint files). The CBSC received 630 complaints directly (44.3% of the total complaint files).
- 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 or requests for information about Vchip encoding in television broadcasts. This year, had such correspondence been classified in the same manner as standard complaints, it would have added a further 34 “files” to the total.

RADIO AND TELEVISION COMPLAINTS

Of the 1,138 complaint files handled by the CBSC,

- 347 dealt with radio programming (30.5%);
- 4 dealt with satellite radio programming (0.4%);
- 771 dealt with television programming (67.8%);

- 16 dealt with general concerns about broadcasting or could not otherwise be categorized (1.4%).

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	Radio	Satellite Radio	Television	N/A	Total
Atlantic	10	0	5	0	15
Quebec	97	2	188	3	290
Ontario	114	1	95	2	212
Prairie	72	0	37	0	109
B.C.	52	1	36	3	92
National Conventional Television	0	0	141	1	142
National Specialty Services	0	0	257	1	258
Non-determined	2	0	12	6	20
TOTAL	347	4	771	16	1,138

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 1,138 complaint files handled by the CBSC,

- 834 complaints dealt with English-language programming (73.2%);
- 265 dealt with French-language programming (23.3%).

SOURCE OF PROGRAM

Of the 1,138 complaint files handled by the CBSC,

- 815 complaints dealt with Canadian programming (71.6%);
- 188 dealt with foreign programming (16.5%).

Language of Program

Language	Radio		Television		N/A		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
English	257	73.2	570	73.9	7	43.7	834	73.3
French	87	24.8	176	22.8	2	12.5	265	23.3
Third Language	4	1.1	19	2.5	0	0	23	2.0
Non-determined	3	0.9	6	0.8	7	43.7	16	1.4
TOTAL	351		771		16		1,138	

Source of Program

Source	Radio		Television		N/A		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Canadian	330	94.0	480	62.3	5	31.3	815	71.6
Foreign	10	2.8	178	23.1	0	0.0	188	16.5
Non-determined	11	3.2	113	14.6	11	68.7	135	11.9
TOTAL	351		771		16		1,138	

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 totalled, would naturally exceed the actual number of radio complaints received in 2006/2007.

<u>Type of Program - Radio</u>			
Type of Program	# of Radio Complaints	% of Radio Complaints	% of All Complaints
Advertising	13	3.7	1.1
Comedy	0	0.0	0.0
Contests	21	6.0	1.8
Information	2	0.6	0.2
Infomercial	0	0.0	0.0
Informal Discourse	155	44.2	13.6
Music	17	4.8	1.5
News and Public Affairs	19	5.4	1.7
Open Line	64	18.2	5.6
Promos	15	4.3	1.3
Public Service Announcement	1	0.3	0.1
Religion	1	0.3	0.1
Sports	13	3.7	1.1
Undetermined	14	4.0	1.2
Non-applicable	5	1.4	0.4

Notes:

- 1) While the CBSC's non-exclusive categorization of programming results in some duplication, the percentage of complaints in each category is calculated on the basis of the actual number of complaint files concerning radio programming (351). 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 (1,138). Accordingly, the sum of the percentages would, if totaled, be greater than 100%.

TYPE OF PROGRAM – TELEVISION

that explanation to understand the percentages provided in the chart below.

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

<u>Type of Program - Television</u>				
Type of Program	# of Television Complaints	% of Television Complaints	% of All Complaints	
Advertising	69	8.9	6.1	
Animation	36	4.7	3.2	
Children's Programming	7	0.9	0.6	
Comedy	61	7.9	5.4	
Contests	4	0.5	0.4	
Drama	53	6.9	4.6	
Documentaries	31	4.0	2.7	
Fantasy / Science Fiction	0	0.0	0.0	
Game Show	12	1.6	1.1	
Infomercial	3	0.4	0.3	
Informal Discourse	3	0.4	0.3	
Information	16	2.1	1.4	
Movies	31	4.0	2.7	
Music Video / Song	3	0.4	0.3	
News and Public Affairs	191	24.7	16.8	
Open-Line Programming	8	1.0	0.7	
Promos	39	5.0	3.4	
Public Service Announcement	4	0.5	0.4	
Reality Programming	47	6.1	4.1	
Religion	47	6.1	4.1	
Sports	34	4.4	3.0	
Station ID Logo	1	0.1	0.1	
Talk Show	75	9.7	6.6	
Variety	15	1.9	1.3	
Undetermined	35	4.5	3.1	
Non-applicable	4	0.5	0.4	

Notes:

- 1) The percentage of complaints in each category is calculated on the basis of the actual number of complaint files concerning television programming (771). 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 totalled, would naturally exceed the actual number of complaints received in 2006/2007. (Note that these numbers were calculated based only on complaints actually handled by the CBSC, while in other years they were calculated based on all correspondence received. The numbers are thus not directly comparable against other years.)

Keywords

Clause	Radio #	Television #	Total #
Advisories	2	22	24
Age Discrimination	4	2	6
Bad Taste	6	10	16
Bias/Unfair/Imbalanced Information	19	82	101
Children's Issues	23	166	189
Classification/Rating	0	16	16
Coarse Language	43	69	112
Conflict of Interest	1	2	3
Contests -- Dangerous	2	1	3
Contests -- Unfair	10	4	14
Disability Discrimination	19	9	28
CRTC Matter	0	3	3
Dissatisfaction re CBSC Decision	0	0	0
Ethnic Discrimination	31	11	42
Exploitation of Children	3	14	17
Gender Discrimination	7	7	14
Improper Comments	73	65	138
Inaccurate News/Info	25	74	99
Journalistic Conduct	3	15	18
National Discrimination	17	58	75
Other	12	41	53
Privacy	8	28	36
Program Selection/Quality	3	20	23
Racial Discrimination	23	34	57
Religion Discrimination	25	50	75
Representation of Men	2	24	26
Representation of Women	25	35	60
Scheduling	25	197	222
Sexual Content	43	179	222
Sexual Orientation --Discrimination	27	5	32
Subliminal Content	0	0	0
Treatment of Callers	12	2	14
Violence	24	167	191

**STATUS OF COMPLAINTS
AT YEAR END**

Of the 1,138 files handled by the CBSC, 689 (60.5%) 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 449 complaints were considered “general”, meaning, for example, 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; consequently, these files were closed by the CBSC immediately following its response to the complainant.

Of the 689 “code relevant and specific” complaints, 514 (74.6%) will not require follow-up by the CBSC as they were resolved at the level of broadcaster and complainant communication. Fifty-nine complaints (8.6%) were either resolved through the release of decisions of the various Panels and the CBSC Secretariat or through the issuance of other Secretariat correspondence. Fifty-two complaints (7.5%) have yet to complete the dialogue process with the broadcaster and 47 (4.3 %) 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 2006/2007. A short biography remains on the CBSC's website at www.cbsc.ca during their term.

Since Adjudicators come and go during the year, it may appear that there is more than one Chair or Vice-Chair, but the positions are held successively, not on an overlapping basis. There may be up to six public Adjudicators and six industry Adjudicators on each Regional Panel. The two National Panels, which share the twelve Public Adjudicators, plus six Industry Adjudicators on each, are chaired by the National Chair. Overall, there

remained sixteen vacancies to fill as of the end of the fiscal year.

There is also a new category, namely, 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 eleven vacancies to fill at 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
Jasmin Doobay, Industry Adjudicator
Gordon Leighton, Industry Adjudicator
Mason Loh, Public Adjudicator
Olivia Mowatt, 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
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
Eleanor Shia, Public Adjudicator
Glenda Spenrath, Industry Adjudicator

QUEBEC REGIONAL PANEL

Guyline Bachand, Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Suzanne Gouin, Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Marie-Anna Murat, Vice-Chair, Public Adjudicator
Louise Baillargeon, Public Adjudicator
Bernard Gu  rin, Industry Adjudicator
Monika Ille, Industry Adjudicator
Brian Kenemy, Industry Adjudicator
Dany Meloul, Industry Adjudicator
Gilles Moisan, Public Adjudicator
John Paul Murdoch, Public Adjudicator
Robert Parent, Industry Adjudicator

NATIONAL Panels

Public Adjudicators

Ronald I. Cohen, Chair
 Howard Pawley, Vice-Chair
 Tara Rajan, Vice-Chair
 Andrew Cardozo
 Sharon Fernandez
 Meg Hogarth
 Allan Mirabelli
 Catherine Murray
 Fo Niemi
 Peter O'Neill

Specialty Services Adjudicators

Sarah Crawford, Vice-Chair
 Elizabeth Duffy-Maclean
 Michael Harris
 Vera Houle

Conventional Television Adjudicators

Bob Culbert
 Peggy Hebden
 Jim Macdonald
 Tina-Marie Tatto

AT LARGE ADJUDICATORS

Rita Deverell, Industry Adjudicator
 Prem Gill, Industry Adjudicator
 Michael Harris, Industry Adjudicator
 Gerry Phelan, Industry Adjudicator
 Pip Wedge, Industry Adjudicator

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 · VOCM · VOCM-FM

P.E.I.

CHTN

Nova Scotia

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

New Brunswick

CFJX-FM · CFX-Y-FM · CHNI-FM · CHSJ-FM · CHTD-FM · CHWV-FM · CIBX-FM · CIKX-FM/RB · CJCJ-FM · CJMO-FM · CJNI-FM · CJXL-FM · CKBC · CKCW-TV · CKHJ-FM · CKLT-TV · CKNI-FM · CKTO-FM

Quebec

CFAP-TV · CFCF-TV · CFCM-TV · CFDA-FM · CFEI-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 · 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 · CHR-D-FM · CHRL · CHR-M-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 · CJMQ-FM · CJMS · CJMV-FM · CJNT-TV · CJOI-FM · CJPM-TV · CJRC · CKAC · CKDG-FM · CKGM · CKLD · CKLS-FM · CKMF-FM · CKMI-TV · CKNU-FM · 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-FM · 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 · CIBU-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 · CJB-N-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 · CJSD-FM · CJSS-FM · CJTN · CJXY-FM · CKAP-FM · CKAT · CKBT-FM · 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 · CKLY-FM · 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 · SunTV

Manitoba

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

Saskatchewan

CFIT-FM · 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 · CJUV-FM · 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 · CHBN-FM · CHBW-FM · CHED · CHF-M-FM · CHF-M-FM-1/RB · CHLB-FM · CHLW · CHQR · CHQT · CHR-B · CHR-K-FM · CHR-K-FM-3/RB · CHUB-FM · CIBK-FM · CIBQ · CIBW-FM · CICT-TV · CIOX-FM · CIRK-FM · CISA-TV · CISN-FM · CITL-TV · CITV-TV · CIXM-FM · 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 · CKWY-FM · 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 · CKYE-FM · 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 · CityPULSE24 · The Christian Channel · CMT · The Comedy Network · COOL-TV · Court TV Canada · CPAC · CTV · CTV Newsnet · CTV Travel · DéjàView · Discovery Channel · Discovery Civilization · Discovery HD · Discovery Health · Discovery Kids · The Documentary Channel · Drive-In Classics · ESPN Classic Canada · Fairchild Television · Family Channel · Fashion Television · Food Network Canada · Fox Sports World · G4techTV · Global · Hard On Pridevision · Historia · History Television · Home & Garden Television Canada · IFC · LCN · Life Network · LoneStar · MenTV · Movieola · MTV Canada · MusiMax · MusiquePlus · Mystery · National Geographic · NHL Network · OLN · Out TV · RDS · ROBTV · RIS · Rogers Sportsnet · The Score · Scream · Séries+ · SexTV · Showcase · Showcase Action · Showcase Diva · Silver Screen Classics · Space · Star! · Talentvision · Telelatino · Teletoon · TQS · TreeHouse · TSN · TV5 · TVA · TV Land Canada · TVTropolis · Vision TV · VRAK.TV · The Weather Network · W Network · Xtreme Sports · YTV · Z Télé