

Canadian Broadcast Standards Council

Annual Report 2007/2008



For the fiscal year running from September 1, 2007 to August 31, 2008

"Private Broadcasting, Public Trust"

Table of Contents

	Page
1. Message from the National Chair	1
2. Decisions Released in 2006/2007	5
3. Summary of Complaints	19
4. Adjudicators	26

1. MESSAGE FROM THE NATIONAL CHAIR

As in the last Annual Report, much of the emphasis in the current Report relates to the Codes administered by the CBSC, since these are the Council's "statutory" *raison d'être*. They are the root of our definition of standards. And they have grown. There has also been a significant change in the CBSC's ethnocultural outreach program.

The CAB Equitable Portrayal Code

The oldest of the four Codes administered by the CBSC without any revision was the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code*, which had been in effect since 1990. Flowing from the Canadian Association of Broadcasters studies in the areas of multiculturalism and persons with disabilities mentioned in the CBSC's last Annual Report, a new code, called the *CAB Equitable Portrayal Code*, was drafted and submitted to the CRTC. Its approval by the CRTC was anticipated in last year's Annual Report but the Code did not finally come into effect until March 17, 2008. The new Code is a Condition of Licence for all broadcasters, and it replaces the 1990 *Sex-Role Portrayal Code*. It is innovative and original. In its final form, it defines types of negative portrayal such as stereotyping, victimization and stigmatization, derision of myths and traditions, degrading comments, and exploitation. It also codifies contextual justifications for broadcasting otherwise potentially problematic content, these being legitimate artistic usage, satirical usage, and intellectual treatment. With the generous help of CTVglobemedia, the Code will be translated into the CBSC's 42 languages, and will be made available in alternative formats in the coming fiscal year.

The Journalistic Independence Code

The *Journalistic Independence Code*, which responds to concerns regarding the cross-media ownership issue raised by the CRTC in 2001 at the licence renewals of CTV, Global and TVA, was a part of the CRTC hearings on

the Diversity of Voices held in September 2007. Together with John MacNab, the CBSC's Executive Director, and Teisha Gaylard, the CBSC's Director of Policy, I appeared before the CRTC to explain the reasons for the success of the CBSC and the strength of its team of Adjudicators. In the result, the text of the Code was approved by the CRTC in January 2008. At the same time, the Commission requested supplementary information regarding the Adjudicator appointment process. In response, the CBSC proposed a new Adjudicator nomination process in March 2008, which it had every reason to expect would be approved by the Commission early in the autumn.

Violence on Television

One of our most vexing issues this past year was the need to reply once again to the television violence bill proposed by Bernard Bigras, the Bloc Québécois MP for Rosemont-La Petite Patrie. M. Bigras had reintroduced his Private Member's Bill (C-327) (first introduced by him in 2000), which proposed the amendment of the *Broadcasting Act* to deal with the regulation of television violence.

It was the CBSC's view that this was an utterly unnecessary legislative proposal and I testified to that effect before the House of Commons Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage on March 6, 2008. At that time, it was clear that the greatest misunderstanding of Bigras and some other MPs was that the *CAB Voluntary Code regarding Violence in Television Programming* was, as its title unfortunately suggested, *voluntary*. The Code had, in fact, been a *mandatory* Condition of Licence for all television broadcasters, from the moment of its release in October 1993. The CRTC Chairman, Konrad von Finckenstein, and I both affirmed that fact before the Standing Committee. Our explanations were of value, for the Committee understood that was the case and, on April 9, voted not to proceed any further with the Bill. On May 13, the House of Commons adopted

that Report. The legislative life of that Bill ended on that date. Despite the death of the Bill, the issue of the *voluntary* nature of the Code remained troubling. Consequently, the CBSC sought approval from the CRTC that the title of the Code be shortened simply to *CAB Violence Code*. This approval was also anticipated early in the next fiscal year.

The RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics

One of the goals of the CBSC for a number of years has been the preparation of an annotated set of the Codes administered by the Council. The work that goes into such annotations is immense. It involves the review, selection, and organized presentation of all of the CBSC's jurisprudence developed over the past 17 years, some 425 decisions. These must be summarized and digested in a coherent and useful format, one that will permit users to easily reference the opinions of the CBSC on the clauses or articles of each code. The first code chosen by the Council was the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* since journalistic issues are of such interest to Canadians. Those annotations have been completed, translated and posted on the CBSC website. The process is a gradual one but I hope that we will be able to produce at least one additional annotated code every 12 to 18 months until they have all been completed.

Ethnocultural Outreach

Thanks to the generosity of OMNI Television, the CBSC has been actively engaged in the production of brochures and website information in 42 languages (in addition to Canada's two official languages) over the course of the past six years. As of the conclusion of that funding, more than 45,000 copies of the CBSC's informative brochure in the languages of comfort of Canada's multicultural communities have been published and distributed. And the same information in that multiplicity of languages has been posted on our website. Those brochures, either in print or electronic format, have enabled tens of thousands of Canadians to access the codified standards that Canada's private broadcasters apply to their programming, as well as the system that will

respond to those rules when a member of the public believes they have not been respected.

Following upon that great project, CTVglobemedia has taken the initiative of funding the translation of the new *Equitable Portrayal Code* as well as its introduction to Canadians. In the coming year, the CBSC will take the Code "on the road" to ensure that all communities directly affected by it will learn about it "in person". And, for the first time, the CTVglobemedia funding will enable the CBSC to ensure that all of the Council-administered Codes will be available in alternative formats to persons who are visually-impaired.

Complaints and Decisions

This past fiscal year has been busy in the complaints, decisions and summary decisions department. A total of 83 decisions were released: 23 of these were formal Panel Decisions and 60 were Summary Decisions. (It should be remembered that Summary Decisions are the informal, non-public variety of decisions that do not incur the time and expense associated with the formal meetings of an Adjudicating Panel required for a Panel Decision.) Some of the 2007-2008 decisions were particularly significant precedents, and these are dealt with in Section 2 of this Annual Report.

The number of complaint files opened in fiscal 2007/2008 rose to 1,747, of which the CBSC actually handled 1,498 or 85.7%; the balance were referred to Advertising Standards Canada (ASC) or to the CRTC, principally because they related to non-member broadcasters or dealt with issues that did not fall within the parameters of the Codes administered by the CBSC. Statistics relating to these can be found in Section 3 of this Report.

In addition, as in previous years, the CBSC received "general correspondence" from people seeking, for example, general information about the Council and its Codes, contact information for a broadcaster or requests for information about V-chip encoding in television broadcasts. This year, had such correspondence been classified in

the same manner as standard complaints, it would have added a further 163 “files” to the total.

Other Forms of Outreach

As noted above, the CBSC appeared at the CRTC hearings on the Diversity of Voices, as well as the House of Commons Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. We met, as the CBSC does annually, with the Jeanne Sauvé interns through the program established by Canadian Women in Communications. I reported to the Annual Meetings of the British Columbia Association of Broadcasters in Harrison Hot Springs and the Western Association of Broadcasters in Kananaskis and attended the Annual Convention of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters in Ottawa. Our close relations with the RTNDA – The Association of Electronic Journalists also led to a session that I ran on current journalistic issues at their annual convention in Ottawa. The CBSC also enhanced its international links by meeting with representatives from the Korean Broadcasting Commission. And I had the great opportunity to meet with content regulatory colleagues from Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Great Britain, the United States, and Brazil at a conference held in Port of Spain, Trinidad to discuss the host country’s proposed regulatory initiatives and related subjects.

Broadcaster Members

The number of private broadcaster members continues to increase at a rapid pace, reflecting the belief of broadcasters in the Codes they have created and the self-regulatory system they have supported to ensure pan-industry compliance. At the end of the fiscal year, CBSC membership stood at 698.

The Website

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

all-important complaints form, two sets of FAQs (frequently asked questions), one targeted at members of the public and another aimed solely at broadcasters, all formal CBSC decisions, biographies of Panel Adjudicators, Annual Reports, Codes, lists of broadcaster members (with links to their websites), corresponding links for other bodies both Canadian and international, relevant documents galore, and so on. Moreover, we provide a thorough explanation of the CBSC’s role and our most important Code provisions in, 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. Traffic remained strong with more than 50 gigabytes of total data transferred by viewers during the course of the year. The average time spent on the site by users increased more than a minute and a half to almost 11 minutes per session. It is also fascinating to note that there were visitors from more than 120 identifiable countries this year.

AGVOT

Direct requests to the CBSC for AGVOT related information remained steady over the past year. Although such requests do not form a large part of the CBSC’s day-to-day activities, they often involve unique questions that require research by the CBSC. It is also noteworthy that the files in the AGVOT section of the CBSC website receive more than a thousand hits each month.

The CBSC’s Adjudicators

The CBSC is, as always, immensely appreciative of the contributions of its Adjudicators. Representing the public and the industry in roughly equal numbers on every Panel adjudication, they listen to or watch the challenged broadcasts, review the complaints, and weigh these against the CBSC codes and jurisprudence. They discuss or debate every file with diligence, objectivity and awareness of the consequences of their determinations. On the basis of their deliberations and decisions, they set the broadcast content standards for the future. Indeed, those standards are often considered and applied by the regulator to content

matters involving broadcasters that are not members of the CBSC. At the end of the day, there can be little doubt that much is owed by the public and the industry to the CBSC Adjudicators.

Acknowledgments

In addition to the 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 Correspondence Officer Solange Courteau, our outgoing 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 considerable collective gratitude.

RONALD I. COHEN
National Chair

2. DECISIONS RELEASED IN 2007/2008

DECISIONS RELEASED IN 2007/2008

In order for one of the many complaints the CBSC receives annually to result in a decision, the complainant must submit a Ruling Request or equivalent indication of dissatisfaction with the broadcaster's response to the complaint. Experience shows that 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 83 decisions (of both varieties) this year, compared to 80 released in 2006/2007. Twenty-three of the decisions were Panel Decisions and 60 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 adjudicators from the broadcasting industry and the general public. Adjudicators read all correspondence relating to the complaint from both the complainant(s) and the broadcaster, review the challenged broadcast, and meet to debate the merits in order to arrive at their determination. Since Panel Decisions play an important role in the shaping of broadcast content policy, it is essential that they be accessible to both broadcasters and the general public. The CBSC accomplishes this goal by advising anyone interested in content matters of its

formal decisions via an accompanying press release and the permanent posting of all decisions on the CBSC website.

This year, the Panel Decisions dealt with almost equal numbers of television and radio programming. 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

Twelve of the Panel Decisions released in 2007/2008 dealt with television broadcasts. The issues treated in those decisions were sexual content, coarse language, violence, discrimination, accuracy of news, and crediting news sources.

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.

As a further precaution for the public, Clause 11 of that Code obliges broadcasters to provide viewer advisories alerting audiences to the sexual content of a dramatic program, while Article 6.3 of the *CAB Violence Code* contains a similar proscription for news programming. In addition, Article 4 of the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code* states that broadcasters shall not air programming that exploits men, women and children. Two decisions touched on these issues this year. (It should be noted that the latter Code was replaced in March 2008 by the *Equitable Portrayal Code*, and that the new Code includes a similar proscription in Article 8.)

The first decision was *TQS re Le Grand Journal report ("Girl Assaulted Live")* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0284, August 23, 2007). The story reported that an undercover police officer,

while doing cyber-surveillance, had discovered a young girl being assaulted live via webcam. The assailant was subsequently arrested. While the report did not include any images of the actual assault, it did show general blurred images of young women in underwear and topless. A viewer complained that these types of images encourage pedophilia. The Quebec Regional Panel concluded that the images did not breach Article 4 of the *Sex-Role Portrayal Code* because “the broadcaster chose discreet, non-exploitative images which were entirely relevant [...]. It [did] not find that the images were either explicit or sensationalist, as the complainant [had] contended. Moreover, the Panel [did] not consider that the reporting of such matters, to begin with, in any way perpetuates the recurrence of the criminal activity.” The Panel did, however, conclude that the disturbing subject matter should have been preceded by a viewer advisory in accordance with Article 6.3 of the *CAB Violence Code*.

The second decision was *Teletoon re Team America: World Police* (CBSC Decision 07/08-1011, August 7, 2008). *Team America* was a feature film involving marionettes who were members of an elite police force created to fight global terrorism. The movie, which aired from 9:30-11:40 pm, contained scenes of bloody violence, coarse language, sexual dialogue and a lengthy scene of two marionettes having sex in various positions. A viewer was particularly concerned about the sex scene and the fact that the viewer advisory only mentioned coarse language and mature subject matter. The National Specialty Services Panel concluded that the movie was clearly intended for adult audiences and thus appropriately scheduled within the Watershed period, but that Teletoon should have mentioned the violence and sexuality in its advisories: “While the Panel has no problem with the *additional* designation ‘mature subject matter’, it concludes that this is insufficiently precise.”

Coarse Language

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. 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. Only one television decision this year related to coarse language.

In *TSN re 2007 World Junior Hockey Championship (Interview)* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0515, May 1, 2007), the National Specialty Services Panel dealt with the use of the f-word in the context of sports programming. Immediately following Canada’s win at the 2007 junior hockey championship in Sweden, a TSN reporter conducted an interview with one of the team’s players who answered a question with “We did a fucking great job.” The interview aired live at 4:52 pm Atlantic Time, but TSN edited the coarse word in subsequent rebroadcasts. A viewer complained that this was inappropriate language in a broadcast that appealed largely to young people. The majority of the Panel agreed and, although the Panel acknowledged the difficulty in controlling such language in a live broadcast, it stated that “broadcasters must simply find a way to avoid the use of such coarse language during audiences’ safe haven.” Two Adjudicators dissented from the majority’s conclusion, noting that the f-word was uttered only once, in a live situation, and by a young player simply expressing his enthusiasm about his team’s victory.

Violence

Like sexual content and coarse language, violence intended for adult audiences may only be broadcast during the Watershed period pursuant to the requirement of Article 3.0 of the *CAB Violence Code*. That rule applies equally to advertising and promotional material. There is, however, an exception to the Watershed restriction when domestic broadcasters are entitled to simultaneously substitute the Canadian version for the foreign signal. In addition, all dramatic programs must carry an appropriate classification icon, which indicates the program’s intended audience age group. Gratuitous or glamorized violence (violence

that does not further a program's plot, theme or character development) is prohibited at any time of day. The task for the CBSC when assessing complaints about violence is to determine exactly what type of content constitutes "intended exclusively for adults" and/or "gratuitous" or "glamorized". The *CAB Violence Code* also contains a provision, Article 10.0, relating to violence in sports programming, which prohibits the promotion or exploitation of violent action outside the sanctioned limits of the sport. Four decisions this year touched on questions of violent programming.

Global re 24 (Season 6, Episode "1:00-2:00 pm") (CBSC Decision 06/07-0713, November 29, 2007) dealt with the action drama series *24*, in which each episode takes place within a single hour of a single day. The series follows the activities of the fictional Counter Terrorism Unit of the United States government as its agents attempt to prevent terrorist activities. The episode in question contained a number of scenes of violence, including one in which a man was being tortured with an electric drill and another in which a woman was shot in the head. The episode aired at 8:00 pm; Global availed itself of its simultaneous substitution rights as the program was also airing on the American network Fox. The broadcast included viewer advisories and a PG rating. A viewer was concerned about the nature and scheduling of the violence. The National Conventional Television Panel concluded that the violence was not gratuitous because it demonstrated the sadistic nature of one of the characters. The Panel pointed out that "it is essential not to confuse gratuitous with gruesome." The Panel agreed, however, that the violence was graphic and thus clearly intended exclusively for adult audiences. Under normal circumstances, this meant that the program should only have aired after 9:00 pm, but, because Global had availed itself of its simultaneous substitution rights, it did not violate the *CAB Violence Code* on account of the earlier broadcast. This exception to the rule ensures that Canadian requirements for viewer advisories and classification icons are respected since the program would in any event appear in Canada on a foreign service, without any of the informative rules designed

with Canadian audiences in mind. In this case, Global had provided adequate viewer advisories, but the Panel decided that the program's rating should have been 14+ rather than PG.

The other decision relating to violent programming was *Sportsnet East re Sportsnet Connected* (CBSC Decision 07/08-1222, August 7, 2008). *Sportsnet Connected* was a sports news program, aired on weekday mornings, that featured interviews, highlights and updates. The episode examined by the National Specialty Services Panel presented replays from recent NHL hockey games, including some in which fights had broken out between players. The video clips of the fights consisted of players punching each other about the head and pulling on each other's jerseys. The CBSC received a complaint from a viewer who felt that highlighting the fights exploited violent action outside the sanctioned activity of the sport and should not be broadcast during the day. The Panel explained that "*sanctioned* activities are best understood as anticipated activities". Since fighting is in the hockey rulebook, albeit subject to a penalty, mentioning fights in a matter-of-fact way in a sports news program does not amount to a violation of Article 10.0.

Advertising and promotional material were also the subject of complaints examined under the *CAB Violence Code*. *Global re an advertisement for the movie SkinWalkers* (CBSC Decision 06/07-1352, November 29, 2007) dealt with an advertisement for a horror movie about werewolves. The 15-second advertisement aired between 8:00 and 9:00 pm during an episode of the reality program *Big Brother 8*. It contained a rapid series of brief clips from the movie, including quick flashes of different werewolves, a woman with fangs, and scenes of men and women holding semi-automatic weapons leaping away from an exploding gas station. A viewer complained that the advertisement should not have been broadcast at a time when children were watching television. The National Conventional Television Panel determined that "while certain of the images were somewhat startling, [...] they did not depict any scenes of actual violence.

Moreover, given that the entire commercial lasted only 15 seconds, the images were too fleeting to become problematically violent. Had the commercial been longer and showed more graphic details of the werewolves' activities, the Panel might have concluded otherwise." The Panel also noted that the advertisement was broadcast during *Big Brother 8*, "a program which not infrequently deals with mature themes and is not in any way targeted to children."

A promotion for an ultimate fighting program was at issue in *Fox Sports World Canada re IFL promotional spot* (CBSC Decision 07/08-0012, August 7, 2008). The promo contained scenes from ultimate fighting matches of combatants with bloodied faces and voice-over narration, such as "I came to hurt somebody" and "There's no better feeling than crackin' the guy in the chin, watching his crippled carcass go face down on the mat." The promo aired at 7:12 pm during a sports news program that focussed on soccer and cricket. A viewer complained that the promo was too violent for that time slot. The National Specialty Services Panel agreed, noting that, although some International Fight League programming may be acceptable before 9:00 pm, these scenes and dialogue were "edited and constructed that the resulting promo constitutes adult material even if the program which it advertises does not. [...] In the 30-second spot, they have been aggregated to create a harsh physical and gory effect."

Discrimination

The CBSC addressed concerns about discriminatory remarks against an identifiable group in 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. In the case of religious programming, Clause 8 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* is also relevant because it states that religious broadcasts shall not be used to convey attacks upon another religion or identifiable group.

It was a religious program that was the subject of *VisionTV re Dil Dil Pakistan* (CBSC Decision 06/07-1426, November 29, 2007). The program featured a Muslim imam, Israr Ahmad, giving a sermon in a mix of English and Arabic. On the episode of July 14, 2007, Ahmad discussed Sura 2 of the Qur'an and touched on the issue of *jihad*. He explained that *jihad* can be achieved through either physical or financial means. The CBSC received a complaint that this mention of *jihad* would encourage violence against particular groups. VisionTV was also criticized for even allowing Ahmad to appear on television because he had apparently authored anti-Semitic books. The National Specialty Services Panel concluded that the broadcast did not violate any of clauses of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. The Panel pointed out that "although there is a reference [...] to the 'enemies of Allah', nowhere has the imam directly identified any group." With respect to the mention of *jihad*, the Panel noted that the term "has no exclusive or limited meaning as a holy war. It is at least as understandable as referring to struggle or strife, with no necessary implication of battle or hostility." The Panel also had no problem with Ahmad appearing on television since he uttered nothing abusive or unduly discriminatory on the challenged program, whatever he may have written or said elsewhere. There is no Code prohibition on allowing individuals with chequered pasts to appear in a broadcast: "Even a notorious figure [...] could be an acceptable invitee to discuss appropriate subject matter in controlled circumstances."

News

The CBSC dealt with a number of different news-related issues in decisions rendered this year. Accuracy and fairness in news reports is required by Clause 5 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* and Article 1 of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics*. Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* also requires the "full, fair and proper presentation" of news. If there are errors or omissions in a report, broadcasters are required to correct them under Article 7 of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics*. The RTNDA Code also contains a provision that prohibits broadcasters from infringing on

individuals' privacy unless it is in the public interest. All of the aforementioned issues were raised in CBSC decisions this year. In addition, the CBSC had its first opportunity to apply Article 11 of the RTNDA Code which relates to honouring intellectual property, such as audio and video material used in news reports.

Fairchild Television & Talentvision re news reports about a political campaign (CBSC Decision 05/06-1841 & -1842, November 29, 2007) involved news reports broadcast in Cantonese and Mandarin about the candidates for the federal Liberal Party nomination in a B.C. riding. The report informed viewers that an anonymous flyer had been circulated about one of the candidates, accusing him of mishandling an employee dispute when he had been chairman of the College of Traditional Chinese Medicine Practitioners & Acupuncturists (CTCMA). The report included an image of the flyer on which it was written (in Chinese) that the Administration of the CTCMA had been sued by a former employee and would have to pay \$750,000. The following day, the two stations broadcast reports covering the candidate's press conference at which he denied the allegations contained in the flyer. The CBSC received a complaint that the reports were inaccurate and unfair because the stations had not verified the allegations made in the flyer and had not contacted the candidate for comment. The stations argued that they had only reported information that was available in public documents and that the circulation of anonymous flyers was newsworthy. The National Specialty Services Panel agreed that the reporting of the existence of the flyer was newsworthy, but found that Fairchild's and Talentvision's reliance on the content of the flyer was inappropriate because it contained inaccurate information, most notably regarding the amount of damages awarded in the lawsuit. The Panel stated, "while the flyer was not the creation of the broadcaster, it was the latter which decided to make some of the content its own. [...] They chose to rely on information that was materially incorrect and that they ought to have known was materially incorrect." The broadcasters were thus found in breach of Article 1 of the

RTNDA Code and of Clauses 5 and 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*.

Accurate information regarding Canadian anti-terror laws was at issue in *CTV Newsnet re two reports entitled "Anti-Terror Measures Voted Down"* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0745, November 29, 2007). The federal government had voted not to extend certain provisions of the anti-terrorism legislation and CTV aired two reports in which the anchors interviewed experts who spoke to the implications of this decision. In the first report, the news anchor stated that the law allowed authorities to "arrest a guy on suspicion, hold him indefinitely." In the second report, the anchor commented that the provisions "were rarely used anyway." A viewer complained that the reports were inaccurate because the law did not allow indefinite detention; moreover, the law had *never* been used. The National Specialty Services Panel found no Code breach in either case. In the first, it found that the "anchor's approach was unfocused, exceedingly casual and without the rigour that an audience is entitled to expect," but that the interview was not "*materially* false or misleading." With respect to the second, the Panel concluded that the difference between "rarely" and "never" was "immaterial, a distinction without a difference."

A number of different issues were raised in *CFTO-TV (CTV Toronto) re a CTV News at Six report (Driveway)* (CBSC Decision 06/07-1301, April 14, 2008). The report told the story of a woman in Toronto who had been granted permission to extend her driveway, but five years later had her permit revoked and was told to restore the driveway to its original condition. The report stated that some of her neighbours had complained to City Hall. It named one of those neighbours, showed his house with address visible and informed viewers that he had not been home during the day when the reporter had tried to contact him. The report also mentioned that the neighbour had made a donation to the local city councillor's campaign. The complaint came from the neighbour who was concerned that the news report had not provided the full story, since the permit revocation resulted from a different cause, namely, the woman's provision of false

information to obtain the permit in the first place. He indicated that he had provided background information to the broadcaster and that promises to do a follow-up story had not been fulfilled. He also complained that the report had infringed his privacy by identifying him, mentioning that he was not at home during the day, and revealing information about his campaign donation. The Ontario Regional Panel agreed with the complainant on all counts. It found that the report was not accurate, comprehensive and fair under Clauses 5 and 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* and Article 1 of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* because the broadcaster had made no effort to investigate the reasons for which the City had revoked permission, despite the fact that it had easy access to that publicly available information, as well as to statements from the neighbours, which it did not collect. The Panel also found that the mention of the neighbour's small donation to the councillor's campaign was irrelevant and that the station violated the complainant's privacy by providing personal information about him contrary to Article 4 of the RTNDA Code. In addition, the Panel concluded that the broadcaster "had the opportunity to dig up and present corrected information on a timely basis, [...] but it chose not to do so," contrary to Article 7 of the RTNDA Code.

The CBSC had its first opportunity to apply Article 11 of the *RTNDA Code of Ethics in CablePulse 24 re a CityNews report ("Attempted Burglary")* (CBSC Decision 06/07-1408, November 29, 2007). The report told the story of an attempted burglary in Toronto which had been thwarted by the home owner. The would-be burglar had then fallen from a balcony and broken his leg. The report included photographs, taken by the homeowner, of the burglar lying on the ground as police and paramedics attended to him. The CBSC received a complaint from the homeowner who said that the station had not obtained his permission to use the photographs and should have credited him in the broadcast. The National Specialty Services Panel concluded that broadcasters should give credit when they know the source of the material. Referring in part to the fair dealing provisions of the *Copyright Act*, the Panel stated, "it seems [...] to be the opposite of

honouring the intellectual property of a creator to take his or her work without acknowledgment and to, in effect, pass that work off as the broadcaster's own." One adjudicator dissented, pointing out that news is timely and that the photographs were not used for "blatant profit motives, but to illustrate a breaking *television* news story."

RADIO

Eleven of the Panel Decisions released in 2007/2008 involved radio programming. The issues treated in those decisions were coarse language, violence, discrimination, privacy, conflicts of interest of hosts, misleading promotional material, sponsored programming, and the provision of logger tapes. In addition, one particular open-line program resulted in a decision that dealt with numerous issues, among which were sexual content, coarse language, and discrimination.

Doc Mailloux

That case was *CKAC-AM re Doc Mailloux (six episodes)* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0168 & -0266, August 23, 2007). The open-line program focussed on psychology and human relationships, so issues of sexuality frequently arose. The Quebec Regional Panel reviewed 18 hours of broadcast and concluded that the explicit questions asked by the host and descriptions provided by callers about their sex lives or sexual abuses they had suffered violated Clause 9(b) of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. The Panel also found that the host was abusive and unduly discriminatory towards different ethnic groups, including North Africans, Arabs, Central Americans, African Blacks, Russians and Japanese, contrary to the Human Rights Clause of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. Discriminatory and degrading comments about both women and men also contravened the Human Rights Clause as well as the *CAB Sex-Role Portrayal Code*. The host also frequently used coarse language in both English and French, much of which violated Clause 9(c) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* for having been broadcast during an afternoon program. The Panel acknowledged, however, that the station had taken considerable steps to rectify the recurring problem of this program, in particular by

removing it from the airwaves.

Coarse Language

Coarse language on radio is covered under Clause 9(c) of the *CAB Code of Ethics*, which prohibits unduly coarse or offensive language. The CBSC has interpreted “unduly” to relate to the time of day at which the content is aired; extremely coarse language should not be broadcast when children could reasonably be expected to be listening to the radio. In addition to the aforementioned *Doc Mailloux* decision, one other radio decision this year dealt with that issue.

CJDJ-FM re the song “Load Me Up” by Matthew Good Band (CBSC Decision 06/07-1118, May 12, 2008) involved a song that contained one instance of the f-word. It was broadcast at approximately 5:15 pm. Based on numerous precedents, the Prairie Regional Panel concluded that it violated the Code. The complainant had contacted the station directly prior to filing a complaint with the CBSC and the station had agreed that the broadcast of the word had been inappropriate. The station voluntarily aired an apology on six separate occasions. The complainant was still not satisfied because he wanted to dictate the wording and frequency of the apology. The Panel did not agree with the complainant on this point and commended the station for its “extraordinary measures in order to acknowledge the error and to put the matter right.”

Violence

Clause 9(a) of the *CAB Code of Ethics* deals with violence on radio. It requires broadcasters to ensure that programming does not contain gratuitous violence in any form, or otherwise sanction, promote or glamorize violence. Two radio decisions this year were examined under that Clause.

The first was *CFRB-AM re an episode of the Michael Coren Show* (CBSC Decision 06/07-1428, April 14, 2008). The topic of the day on the open-line program was the risks associated with pit-bulls. The host argued that pit-bulls are a dangerous breed that should all be euthanized. He also suggested

that pit-bull owners tended to be “white trash, semi-criminals” and joked that the owners should also be killed. Coren spoke with callers, some of whom agreed with him and some of whom did not. A listener complained that the program had disparaged pit-bull owners and advocated violence against them. The Ontario Regional Panel examined the complaint under Clauses 6 and 9(a) of the *CAB Code of Ethics*. The Panel found that, under Clause 6 regarding full, fair and proper presentation of comment, Coren was entitled to criticize pit-bull owners and to express his view that the dogs should be eliminated. The Panel also found that the broadcast did not violate Clause 9(a) because “nothing in what it has reviewed leads [the Panel Adjudicators] to believe in the slightest that [the host] had any intention of advocating violence of any kind toward the owners of pit-bulls.”

The second case was *CKAC-AM re a segment on Bonsoir les sportifs* (CBSC 06/07-0441, April 7, 2008). In an episode of the sports talk show, host Ron Fournier was discussing a hockey game during which the opposing team had interfered with the Montréal Canadiens’ goaltender. Fournier stated that, in the first two instances of interference, the team should approach the referee, but, if that does not work, in the third instance, [translation] “You cross-check him in the back of the head and he ends up with his face [...] in the ice.” A listener complained that this statement encouraged violence. The Quebec Panel agreed that Fournier’s remarks violated the Code because they “not only ‘endorsed’, ‘encouraged’, ‘approved’ and ‘supported’ such violent acts, they *recommended* such a course of action to protect a goaltender.”

Discrimination

As with television, 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

are simply commenting on political or social issues which may involve issues of race, ethnicity, religion, etc. Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* regarding full, fair and proper presentation of commentary may also be relevant in cases where the comments may be unfair or improper in other ways. In addition to the aforementioned *Doc Mailloux* decision, only one other decision raised such issues in 2007/2008.

That decision involved the highly-publicized case of a commentary read by Bruce Allen on CKNW-AM, Vancouver. The CBSC issued its decision on the matter in *CKNW-AM re episodes of Bruce Allen's Reality Check and the Christy Clark Show* (CBSC Decision 07/08-0127, November 27, 2007). In the editorial, Allen commented on making accommodations for immigrant groups. He mentioned a number of controversial issues, such as Sikh children being denied passports because they were wearing traditional headgear in their photos, Muslim women being allowed to vote while wearing a face-covering burka, and RCMP officers being allowed to wear turbans. He concluded his remarks with the view that, if you do not like the rules in Canada, "there's the door. If you don't like the rules, hit it. We don't need you here." A week later, Allen appeared on the *Christy Clark Show* to discuss the incident and the editorial was replayed. He also later aired an apology. The CBSC received many complaints about both the original broadcast and the replaying of the commentary on the *Christy Clark Show*. With respect to the original *Reality Check* broadcast, the B.C. Regional Panel concluded that the editorial did not violate Clause 2 because the comments were about immigrants in general, rather than any specific ethnic or religious group. The examples cited were "all issues of current, or recent, public discussion, and, even if controversial, absolutely fair to raise and discuss." The Panel was divided, however, on whether the editorial was in other ways improper under Clause 6. Three Adjudicators concluded that Allen "was only expressing a political perspective, which he was free to espouse and to broadcast." Three other Adjudicators were concerned with the "mocking or condescending" reference to Sikh religious headgear as "handkerchiefs" and the

misidentification of the Sikh surname as "Khan" rather than "Kaur". With respect to the *Christy Clark Show*, the Panel found nothing problematic because it was an extremely balanced discussion about the controversy that had arisen over the original editorial. The Panel also acknowledged the station's efforts to respond to the public's concerns, which included thoughtful written responses to all of the many complainants, reasoned debate about the issues on the air, and meetings with concerned ethnic groups.

Privacy

Privacy in news broadcasts is the subject of Article 4 of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics*. It states that journalists will not unreasonably infringe privacy except when necessary in the public interest. Although other types of programming are not bound by that Code, the CBSC applies Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* regarding unfair or improper comment within the spirit of Article 4 of the RTNDA Code.

The one radio decision that raised such issues this year was *CHMP-FM re a segment broadcast on Puisqu'il faut se lever* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0607, April 7, 2008). The host of the morning radio talk show, Paul Arcand, interviewed media personality Stéphane Gendron, who had just been fired from his role as host of a TQS public affairs program. Gendron explained that his dismissal had been due to a number of complaints TQS had received about him. Gendron mentioned that the complaints had come from "ethnic groups", the Quebec Bar Association and two individual politicians whom he named. One of those politicians complained to the CBSC that CHMP-FM should not have allowed Gendron to identify him on-air because he had not intended his complaint against TQS to be a public matter. Although broadcasters are not usually allowed to name complainants on air, the Quebec Regional Panel considered that the station had not violated the Code on this occasion because: Gendron did not make the statement in an aggressive or vindictive manner; the politician was acting in his public capacity because both complaints were on *Assemblée nationale* letterhead; and the complaint

against TQS was initially sent to the CRTC, which puts all complaints on broadcasters' public files.

Conflict of Interest

Article 6 of the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* states that "journalists will govern themselves on and off the job in such a way as to avoid conflict of interest, real or apparent." The CBSC dealt with two very similar cases regarding such matters in 2007/2008.

In *CHML-AM re the Bob Bratina Morning Show* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0908, April 14, 2008), the Ontario Regional Panel dealt with a complaint about the fact that a radio talk show host also served as city councillor in Hamilton, Ontario. A listener complained that this was a conflict of interest and provided one broadcast to serve as an example of how the host used his program to espouse his views on municipal political issues. First, the Ontario Panel explained that, although Article 6 of the RTNDA Code technically applied only to journalists, it could be extended to apply to this type of political talk show. Second, the Panel concluded that, outside of election campaign periods, there is nothing "inherently incompatible between the holding or seeking of office by an individual, on the one hand, and being on air, on the other." The Panel also clarified that "[t]his does not mean that [...] absolutely anything could be said at any time by a candidate or office-holder." With respect to the specific broadcast noted by the complainant, the Panel found that the host had not said anything that put him in a conflict of interest; he merely stated that a newspaper article had misrepresented his view on a local political controversy. It also found that he had not insulted the newspaper and its reporter, as alleged by the complainant.

The second decision on that subject, *CIGL-FM re a segment on the morning show (Jack Miller)* (CBSC Decision 07/08-0473, April 14, 2008), was also taken by the Ontario Regional Panel. The station's sports announcer was serving as a city councillor in Belleville, Ontario. The complainant felt that that was a conflict of interest and that, on air, the

sportscaster should only be allowed to comment on sports. The Panel reiterated the general comments it had made in the *CHML-AM* decision about on-air personalities as politicians. With respect to the precise comments made by Miller, the Panel also found no problem, primarily because he was commenting on a matter which had already come before City Council, so there was no question of advocacy of any particular position. The Panel also noted that there is no rule limiting a sportscaster from discussing other topics of interest to listeners.

Misleading Promotions

Clause 12 of the *CAB Code of Ethics* requires that promotions shall not be misleading. That was at issue in one decision this year.

CILQ-FM re "Two Minutes Away" promos (CBSC Decision 06/07-1122, April 14, 2008) involved station promos that advertised "You're never more than two minutes away from great classic rock." A listener did the calculation and discovered that there were frequently more than two minutes between songs. The station argued that the two-minute promise did not apply during the morning show, and that it did not broadcast the promos during that block of time. The Ontario Regional Panel pointed out that "one could still, quite legitimately, be *four* minutes away and still be within two minutes from the song that just ended and, upon the expiry of that two minutes, be within two minutes of the song about to begin." The Panel nevertheless found a violation of Clause 12 because, during the morning show, there were frequently large blocks of time between songs so "by saying [...] *never*, without excluding the *very* large block of time between 5:00am-9:00am, [...] [the station] was purposefully luring listeners by the promise of frequent music."

Sponsored Programming

For complaints about sponsored programming, the CBSC applies a combination of Clause 14 regarding Advertising and Clause 6 of the *CAB Code of*

Ethics. Clause 14 requires advertising material to be distinguishable from information programming, while Clause 6 requires full, fair and proper presentation of comment and opinion. The CBSC issued one decision about sponsored programming in 2007/2008.

In *CHWO-AM re Sunday Showcase with Murray Segal* (CBSC Decision 06/07-0999, April 14, 2008), the station failed to divulge the fact that the owner of a home renovation company had paid for the opportunity to appear on a talk program discussing home improvements. The host asked questions of the company owner about different types of renovation projects and occasionally suggested during the broadcast that listeners could “give the good folks at [the company] a call” because “they do excellent work”. A listener complained that the host’s endorsement of the company was inappropriate and that the station should inform its audience that it received payment from the company. The station admitted that the segment was paid for, but argued that announcing that fact would be “stating the obvious”. The Ontario Regional Panel disagreed with the broadcaster, stating “audience members could be expected to recognize 15- or 30-second commercial spots, but they would not know, without advice, that the challenged *Sunday Showcase* was nothing more or less than paid flattery. The failure to inform them is misleading and unfair,” contrary to Clauses 6 and 14 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*.

Provision of Logger Tapes

In addition to Code provisions, the CBSC sometimes examines broadcast complaints under its own Manual, which lays down broadcasters’ membership obligations. One such obligation is the requirement to retain logger tapes of challenged programming when requested to do so by the CBSC. As a general rule, the CBSC requires complaints to be filed within 28 days of the broadcast since, after that period, broadcasters are entitled to recycle their tapes. A complication regarding this obligation arose in one decision this year.

In *CFDA-FM and CFGO-FM re on-air comments (logger tapes)* (CBSC Decision 06/07-1235 and -1236, August 23, 2007), upon receipt of the complaint, the CBSC sent its customary e-mail request to the stations to hold tapes of the challenged programming (the two stations were owned by the same company). The CBSC did not receive any e-mail bounceback, nor did it receive confirmation that the tapes were being held, as it usually does from broadcasters. Unfortunately, due to an administrative oversight, the CBSC did not discover this lack of confirmation until after the 28-day logger tape retention period had elapsed. At that point, the CBSC contacted the broadcaster by telephone and was informed that the stations had never received the initial e-mails, possibly due to the installation of a new e-mail spam filter, and that the tapes had been recycled. The CBSC was thus unable to adjudicate on the substance of the complaint (which related to allegedly insulting comments made about the complainant). The Quebec Regional Panel did, however, discuss whether the station had fulfilled its obligation to be responsive to the CBSC and hold tapes when requested. The Quebec Panel determined that if the e-mail had indeed been routed into a spam filtering program, “the full responsibility to retain the logger tapes would remain with the broadcaster.” Since the CBSC could not ascertain exactly what had actually occurred and because the CBSC Secretariat did not follow up in its customary assiduous manner, “the Panel [could] only conclude that, on *this* occasion, the broadcasters will not be found in breach of their membership obligation.”

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. It is a reasoned explanation, which cites previous CBSC Panel Decisions as authority for its determination. 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 60 Summary Decisions in 2007/2008, a hair less than the 61 informal decisions issued in 2006/2007.

As in previous years, 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 his or her 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	1	1	19
	Television	25	9	7	41
	Total	42	10	8	60

Hot Topics in Summary Decisions

Summary Decisions released this year dealt with a number of different issues. The one that arose most frequently was the broadcast of sexual content, which resulted in 15 Summary Decisions this year, the exact same number as last year. Sexually explicit content can only be broadcast on television during the Watershed period of 9:00 pm to 6:00 am with viewer advisories and appropriate classification icons. As long as broadcasters fulfill those requirements, there is no violation of Clause 10 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*, which relates to the television scheduling of sexual material, or Clause 11, which relates to the provision of viewer advisories. Brief images of nudity, such as a bare breast, are acceptable at any time of day as long as there is no sexual activity involved.

The second most common subject raised in complaints that resulted in Summary Decisions was biased or unfair information. Eleven Summary Decisions dealt with such matters. In most cases, the complainant was simply dissatisfied with the way a particular political topic was covered, feeling that more time had been given to one viewpoint than another or that the issue had generally not been covered or discussed in the way the complainant would have preferred. Under Clauses 6 and 7 of the *CAB Code of Ethics*, broadcasters are entitled to present different opinions on controversial issues and need not provide precisely equal time to all points of view.

A third category of complaint that arose in nine Summary Decisions this year was violence. Some of those complaints related to comments made on radio or television talk programs which the complainant felt advocated violence. The Codes do not,

however, prohibit discussion of political issues such as capital punishment or the use of torture to combat terrorism. With respect to televised images of violence, the Codes allow for some scenes of mild violence in order to further the plot development of a dramatic program. More graphic violent scenes or references are also acceptable, but only during the Watershed period and with appropriate viewer advisories and classification icons.

Nine Summary Decision complaints fell into the more general category of “improper comment or content”. The majority of those complaints related to criticisms of individuals or groups not identified in the Human Rights Clause, such as political parties, animal rights activists, community service clubs, and bloggers. Criticism of such groups based on their political viewpoints or actions is acceptable as long as the comments do not descend to the level of extremely harsh personal insults.

The scheduling of adult material was of concern to the complainant in eight 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 viewer advisories and classification icons. Programming that respects those rules is not in violation of any Code provisions.

The CBSC Secretariat also issued seven Summary Decisions that dealt with complaints about inaccurate news or information. A number of those decisions were about the pronunciation of certain words in Cantonese newscasts. The complainants argued that the

announcers were using a style of pronunciation that rendered the reports incomprehensible and inaccurate. Under the accuracy provisions of the *CAB Code of Ethics* and the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics*, however, the use of an uncommon pronunciation does not render a report inaccurate.

The CBSC also received a number of complaints about contests in 2007/2008, seven of which resulted in Summary Decisions. Of those, five related to the telephone voting system for a reality program. The complainants alleged that the winner announced in the final episode was not actually the participant who had received the most votes from the public. The CBSC explained to those complainants that it is unable to examine complaints about aspects of program production that occur off-air.

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	11
Classification/Rating	0
Coarse Language	4
Conflict of Interest	0
Unfair Contest	7
Discrimination Based on Age	0
Discrimination Based on Disability	1
Discrimination Based on Ethnicity	0
Discrimination Based on Gender	0
Discrimination Based on Nationality	2
Discrimination Based on Race	3
Discrimination Based on Religion	5
Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation	2
Exploitation of Children	0
General Improper Comments/Content	9
Inaccurate News or Information	7
Journalistic Conduct	0
Invasion of Privacy	1
Degrading Representation of Women	1
Scheduling	8
Sexual Content	15
Subliminal Advertising	0
Treatment of Callers to Open-Line Programs	1
Violence	9

*Some complaints raised more than one issue, so the total exceeds 60.

3. SUMMARY OF COMPLAINTS

OVERVIEW OF CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

In 2007/2008, the total number of complaint files opened by the CBSC was 1,747. This year, there were, however, a few individual broadcasts that generated a meaningful number of complaints. The one that generated the most, 302 complaints in all, was a British Columbia radio editorial on the subject of accommodations made for immigrants, which many people felt was abusive or unduly discriminatory on the basis of ethnicity and religion. The CBSC issued a Panel Decision on the matter. The CBSC also received 80 complaints about the viewer voting system of a French-language reality series entitled *Loft Story 4*; 57 complaints about comments disparaging women from Northern Ontario made on a sports morning radio show; and 46 complaints about a public service announcement produced by the Workplace Safety & Insurance Board that depicted a female chef being scalded with hot liquid.

- Of the 1,747 complaint files opened in fiscal 2007/2008, the CBSC actually handled 1,498 or 85.7%; 116 files were referred to Advertising Standards Canada (ASC) and 133 to the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) (of these 133 files, 79 related to non-member broadcasters and 54 dealt with issues which did not fall within the parameters of the Codes administered by the CBSC).
- The CBSC nonetheless responded to all the complaints, including those sent elsewhere for resolution.
- This year, the CRTC forwarded 979 complaints to the CBSC (56.0% of the total number of CBSC complaint files opened in 2007/2008). Only four complaints were forwarded from another agency this year (0.2% of complaint files). The CBSC

received 764 complaints directly (43.7% 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 the V-chip classification system for television broadcasts. Expressions of support or approval for certain programs are also categorized as “general correspondence”. All together, these types of general correspondence added a further 163 files to the total number of files opened by the CBSC this year. Of that number, 114 were approval letters regarding the immigrant accommodation editorial.

RADIO AND TELEVISION COMPLAINTS

Of the 1,498 complaint files handled by the CBSC,

- 605 dealt with radio programming (40.3%);
- 0 dealt with satellite radio programming (0%);
- 854 dealt with television programming (57%);

- 39 dealt with general concerns about broadcasting or could not otherwise be categorized (2.6%).

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	11	3	24
Quebec	49	0	183	4	236
Ontario	161	0	127	12	300
Prairie	42	0	49	4	95
B.C.	343	0	53	4	400
National Conventional Television	0	0	164	5	169
National Specialty Services	0	0	253	0	253
Non-determined	0	0	14	7	21
TOTAL	605	0	854	39	1498

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 1,498 complaint files handled by the CBSC,

- 1225 complaints dealt with English-language programming (81.8%);
- 222 dealt with French-language programming (14.8%).

SOURCE OF PROGRAM

Of the 1,498 complaint files handled by the CBSC,

- 1139 complaints dealt with Canadian programming (76%);
- 269 dealt with foreign programming (18%).

Language of Program

Language	Radio		Television		N/A		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
English	549	90.7	661	77.4	15	38.5	1225	81.8
French	45	7.4	176	20.6	1	2.6	222	14.8
Third Language	8	1.3	13	1.5	1	2.6	22	1.5
Non-determined	3	0.5	4	0.5	22	56.4	29	1.9
TOTAL	605		854		39		1,498	

Source of Program

Source	Radio		Television		N/A		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Canadian	588	97.2	538	63	13	33.3	1139	76
Foreign	12	2	256	30	1	2.6	269	18
Non-determined	5	0.8	60	7	25	64.1	90	6
TOTAL	605		854		39		1,498	

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 2007/2008.

<u>Type of Program - Radio</u>			
Type of Program	# of Radio Complaints	% of Radio Complaints	% of All Complaints
Advertising	6	1	0.4
Comedy	2	0.3	0.1
Contests	15	2.5	1
Information	6	1	0.4
Infomercial	0	0	0
Informal Discourse	410	67.8	27.4
Songs	17	1.2	1.1
News and Public Affairs	17	1.2	1.1
Open Line/Talk Show	120	19.8	8
Promos	10	1.7	0.7
Public Service Announcement	3	0.5	0.2
Religion	1	0.2	0.1
Sports	63	10.7	4.2
Undetermined	5	0.8	0.3
Non-applicable	2	0.3	0.1

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 (605). Accordingly, the sum of the percentages would, if totalled, of course, be greater than 100%.
- 2) This percentage is based on the total number of complaint files handled by the CBSC (1,498). Accordingly, the sum of the percentages would, if totalled, be greater than 100%.

TYPE OF PROGRAM – TELEVISION

As explained in the immediately preceding section, the CBSC classifies the type of

programming of its complaints in a non-exclusive manner. The reader should refer to that explanation to understand the percentages provided in the chart below.

<u>Type of Program - Television</u>			
<u>Type of Program</u>	<u># of Television Complaints</u>	<u>% of Television Complaints</u>	<u>% of All Complaints</u>
Advertising	84	9.8	5.6
Animation	53	6.2	3.5
Children's Programming	4	0.5	0.3
Comedy	65	7.6	4.3
Contests	1	0.1	0.1
Drama	78	9.1	5.2
Documentaries	37	4.3	2.5
Fantasy / Science Fiction	0	0	0
Game Show	15	1.6	1
Infomercial	0	0	0
Informal Discourse	2	0.2	0.1
Information	25	2.9	1.7
Movies	34	3.9	2.3
Music Video / Song	6	0.7	0.4
News and Public Affairs	199	23.3	13.3
Talk Show / Open-Line Programming	10	1.2	0.7
Promos	41	4.8	2.7
Public Service Announcement	38	4.4	2.5
Reality Programming	160	18.7	10.7
Religion	15	1.6	1
Sports	47	5.5	3.1
Station ID Logo	0	0	0
Variety	8	0.9	0.5
Undetermined	15	1.6	1
Non-applicable	5	0.6	0.3

Notes:

- 1) The percentage of complaints in each category is calculated on the basis of the actual number of complaint files concerning television programming (854). See note 1 on the previous page.
- 2) See note 2 on the previous page.

KEYWORDS

The CBSC classifies complaints 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 complaint 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 2007/2008.

<u>Keywords</u>			
<u>Clause</u>	Radio #	Television #	Total #
Advisories	0	35	35
Age Discrimination	1	3	4
Bad Taste	1	15	16
Bias/Unfair/Imbalanced Information	21	96	117
Classification/Rating	0	23	23
Coarse Language	31	94	125
Conflict of Interest	5	4	9
Contests -- Dangerous	0	0	0
Contests -- Unfair	9	87	96
Disability Discrimination	13	7	20
CRTC Matter	2	43	45
Ethnic Discrimination	311	22	333
Exploitation of Children	2	11	13
Gender Discrimination	10	13	23
Improper Comments	54	91	145
Inaccurate News/Info	29	66	95
Journalistic Conduct	3	9	12
National Discrimination	12	13	25
Other	10	63	73
Privacy	5	12	17
Program Selection/Quality	12	37	49
Racial Discrimination	23	14	37
Religious Discrimination	24	31	55
Representation of Men	0	13	13
Representation of Women	71	41	112
Scheduling	26	259	285
Sexual Content	38	264	302
Sexual Orientation -- Discrimination	7	10	17
Subliminal Content	1	5	6
Treatment of Callers	8	1	9
Violence	16	202	218

**STATUS OF COMPLAINTS
AT YEAR END**

Of the 1,498 files handled by the CBSC, 875 (58.4%) 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 623 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 875 “code relevant and specific” complaints, 702 (80.2%) will not require follow-up by the CBSC as they were resolved at the level of broadcaster and complainant communication. Forty-five complaints (5.1%) were either resolved through the release of decisions of the various Panels and the CBSC Secretariat. Eighty-nine complaints (10.2%) have yet to complete the dialogue process with the broadcaster and 39 (4.4%) complaints are at various stages in the complaints review process, i.e. the complainant has requested a ruling by the CBSC.

4. ADJUDICATORS

Below is a list of CBSC Adjudicators who have served for some or all of fiscal 2007/2008. 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 twenty-two vacancies to fill as of the end of the fiscal year.

There is also a category of At Large Adjudicators, to which individuals may be appointed when they are ineligible to sit on any of the Panels on a permanent basis. These Adjudicators may sit on any of the Panels on an *ad hoc* basis, representing either the public or industry, depending on their most recent affiliation. There are up to sixteen positions that may be held by At Large Adjudicators. There remained six 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
 Tom Plasteras, Industry 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
Madelyn Hamilton, Industry 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 Spennath, Industry Adjudicator

QUEBEC REGIONAL PANEL

Suzanne Gouin, Chair, Industry Adjudicator
Louise Baillargeon, Public Adjudicator
Yves Bombardier, Industry Adjudicator
Bernard Guérin, 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
Marie-Anne Raulet, Public 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
 Fo Niemi
 Peter O'Neill

Specialty Services Adjudicators

Sarah Crawford, Vice-Chair
 Elizabeth Duffy-MacLean
 Vera Houle

Conventional Television Adjudicators

Bob Culbert
 Peggy Hebden
 Jim Macdonald
 Tina-Marie Tatto

AT LARGE ADJUDICATORS

Daryl Braun, Industry Adjudicator
 Rita Deverell, Industry Adjudicator
 Elizabeth Duffy-MacLean, Industry Adjudicator
 Prem Gill, Industry Adjudicator
 Shari Graydon, Public Adjudicator
 Michael Harris, Industry Adjudicator
 Mike Omelus, Industry Adjudicator
 Joan Pennefather, Public Adjudicator
 Gerry Phelan, Industry Adjudicator
 Pip Wedge, Industry Adjudicator

LIST OF CBCS MEMBERS BY REGION

Newfoundland

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

P.E.I.

CHTN

Nova Scotia

CFDR · CFRQ-FM · CIGO-FM · CIHF-TV · CIOO-FM · CJC-B-TV · CJCH-FM · CJCH-TV · CJFX-FM · CJLS-FM · CJNI-FM · CKBW-FM · CKTO-FM · CKTY-FM · CKUL-FM

New Brunswick

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

Quebec

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

Ontario

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

Manitoba

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

Saskatchewan

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

Alberta

CFAC · CFBR-FM · CFCN-TV · CFCW · CFDV-FM · CFEX-FM · CFFR · CFGP-FM · CFGQ-FM · CFIT-FM-1 · CFIT-FM · CFMG-FM · CFMY-FM · CFOK · CFRI-FM · CFRN · CFRN-TV · CFRV-FM · CFUL-FM · CFXE · CFXH-FM · CFXL-FM · CFXO-FM · CFXW-FM · CHAT-FM · CHAT-TV · CHBN-FM · CHBW-FM · CHCA-TV · CHDI-FM · CHED · CHF-M-FM · CHF-M-FM-1/RB** · CHF-FM · CHLB-FM · CHLW · CHMC-FM · CHMN-FM · CHQR · CHQT · CHR-B · CHR-K-FM-3/RB** · CHSL-FM · CHUB-FM · CIBK-FM · CIBQ · CIBW-

FM · CICT-TV · CIGY-FM · CILB-FM · CIRK-FM · CISA-TV · CISN-FM · CITL-TV**TS · CITV-TV · CIXF-FM · CIXM-FM · CIZZ-FM · CJAY-FM · CJBZ-FM · CJEG-FM · CJMN-FM-1/RB** · CJOK-FM · CJPR-FM · CJRX-FM · CJUV-FM · CJXK-FM · CJXX-FM · CKAL-TV · CKBA · CKCE-FM · CKCS-TV · CKDQ · CKEM-TV · CKER-FM · CKES-TV · CKGY-FM · CKHL/RB** · CKIS-FM · CKJR · CKKX-FM · CKKY · CKLA-FM/RB** · CKLJ-FM · CKMX · CKNG-FM · CKRA-FM · CKRY-FM · CKSA-FM · CKSA-TV · CKSQ · CKUV-FM · CKVH · CKVN-FM · CKWA · CKWY-FM · CKYL · CKYX-FM

British Columbia

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

National Broadcasters

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