
APPENDIX

CBSC Decision 09/10-0726 CFWF-FM re comments made on the *Big Breakfast Show*

The Complaint

The following complaint dated January 14, 2010 was sent to the CRTC and forwarded to the CBSC in due course:

Broadcast was approximately 7:25 am Thursday, January 14, 2010 on 104.9 FM in Regina, Saskatchewan (The Wolf).

As trivia or entertainment, the announcer read graphical details of sexual assault by one man to another. This broadcast was, I submit, "obscene and profane" and/or "sexually explicit" which is prohibited by your regulations.

I ask that you review this broadcast and reprimand the station, if my submission is correct.

Broadcaster Response

The station responded to the complainant on January 19:

First I would like to thank you for listening to The Wolf. Complaints that are submitted to the CBSC are something we take very seriously at Harvard Broadcasting.

I have reviewed the tapes from January 14, 2010 and while the story is disturbing, it was a news story. The story was in bad taste; however, there was no profane language used outside of everyday terms. If the Wolf offended you, for that we are sorry and we hope that you will continue to use the Wolf as your station of choice.

Additional Correspondence

The complainant submitted his Ruling Request on January 24:

The broadcaster's response is unsatisfactory and I request a ruling from the CBSC Panel.

The response from the broadcaster is unsatisfactory for the following reasons:

1. The broadcast was obscene and/or profane and this is not admitted by the broadcaster.
2. The broadcast was "sexually explicit" and this is not admitted by the broadcaster.

3. The broadcast was a violation of CRTC radio regulations including those which prohibit "sexually explicit" material and "obscene or profane" language and this is not admitted by the broadcaster.
4. The broadcaster claims that the words used were "everyday terms" and this is not accurate.
5. The broadcaster claims that the words used were not profane and this is not accurate.
6. The broadcaster admits that the story was in "bad taste" but this admission is insufficient.
7. The broadcaster appears to indicate that similar stories and language will be repeated in the future, whereas the broadcaster purports nothing was wrong. They appear to claim that the regulation violations alleged, will continue.