



## CBC DETAILED ANALYSIS

20241018\_Highs and lows of B.C.'s tight election ahead of voting day / Power & Politics

Broadcast: MEDIA BIAS ANALYSIS REPORT | Analyzed: 2026-05-06 08:35

Version 2.0-cbc | Konverter 3.3 (2026-05-14) | Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 3(1)(l)

### OVERALL SCORE

**6.9/10**

*Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation*

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

## POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES 2024) is an academic survey of 609 political scientists in 31 countries. Each party is rated on a scale from 0 (far left) to 10 (far right).

Party	NDP	GPC	LPC	BQ	CPC	PPC
CHES	2.0	2.5	4.5	5.0	7.5	9.0
Spectrum	Left	Left	Center	Center	Right	Right

The overall tendency is presented on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly left-favoring, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly right-favoring). The calculation is based on the difference in average favoritism of left vs. right parties (grouping per CHES 2024).

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**8.0 / 10**

**Strongly right-favoring**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — [chesdata.eu](https://chesdata.eu) | [Jolly et al., Electoral Studies, 2022](#) | Thresholds: [Pew Research Center](#)

This section provides political context and does not contribute to the overall score.

## BROADCAST INFO AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast Identification

- Title: Power & Politics — "Highs and Lows of B.C.'s Tight Election Ahead of Voting Day"
- Network: CBC News Network / CBC/Radio-Canada
- Estimated Date: October 18, 2024 (day before the B.C. provincial election, October 19, 2024)
- Approximate Length: 18–22 minutes (estimated from transcript density)

**President:** Schläpfer, David - **Contact:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:kontakt@SVFAB.ch) - **Address:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zurich 1



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

- Presenter/Anchor: Unidentified by name in transcript; referred to in first person ("I've been distracted by a bunch of things happening in Ottawa"); contextually consistent with David Cochrane or Vassy Kapelos, regular Power & Politics anchors
- Format: Pre-election panel discussion with three regional reporters

### Guests / Interviewees

Name	Affiliation	Role
Justine Hunter	The Globe and Mail	B.C. Politics Reporter
Shannon Waters	The Narwhal	B.C. Politics & Environment Reporter
Rob Shaw	Chek News	Political Correspondent

Note: All three guests are journalists/reporters, not political scientists, pollsters, economists, or representatives of the parties being discussed. No party representatives, policy experts, or civil society voices appear in the panel itself.

### Main Topic

A pre-election panel discussion assessing the state of the British Columbia provincial election campaign the day before the October 19, 2024 vote, focusing on candidate controversies, party platforms, voter turnout, and electoral dynamics.

### Current Context (3–4 sentences)

The 2024 B.C. provincial election was one of the most competitive in the province's recent history, pitting incumbent NDP Premier David Eby against BC Conservative leader John Rustad, who had rebuilt the party from near-irrelevance after being expelled from the BC Liberal caucus in 2022. The campaign was marked by significant controversy over Conservative candidate vetting, including candidates with histories of anti-vaccine, anti-Muslim, and conspiracy-adjacent social media posts, most notably Brent Chapman. Simultaneously, the NDP government faced criticism over its drug decriminalization policy, record deficit spending, housing affordability failures, and public safety concerns — issues that had driven significant voter dissatisfaction after seven years in government. The BC Green Party, led by Sonia Furstenu, was positioned as a potential kingmaker in the event of a minority government, while the broader political realignment mirrored trends seen in Alberta and federally.



## CHAPTER 1 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: Who is chosen as an authoritative voice, and whether their selection introduces structural bias through funding, affiliation, or ideological alignment.

#### Finding 3.1

- Location: Panel composition (entire broadcast)
- Quote: Shannon Waters identified as "BC politics and environment reporter with the Narwhal"
- Technique: Ideologically skewed source selection — The Narwhal is an explicitly environmentally-focused publication with a stated editorial mission centered on environmental journalism. Its reporter's framing of the election consistently emphasizes environmental and progressive concerns. Including a Narwhal reporter as a neutral "B.C. politics expert" without disclosing the publication's editorial orientation misrepresents the source's neutrality.
- Why problematic: The Narwhal's funding model (donor-supported, foundation-funded) and editorial mission create a structural predisposition toward progressive policy perspectives. This is not disclosed to viewers, who may assume all three panelists represent equivalent journalistic neutrality.

#### Finding 3.2

- Location: Panel composition (entire broadcast)
- Quote: All three panelists — Hunter (Globe and Mail), Waters (Narwhal), Shaw (Chek News)
- Technique: Absence of ideological diversity in expert selection — all three panelists, while from different outlets, arrive at substantially similar conclusions about the Conservative campaign (problematic candidates, late platform, populism over policy). No panelist offers a perspective sympathetic to or analytically favorable toward the Conservative campaign.
- Why problematic: A balanced panel on a competitive two-party race should include voices capable of articulating the strongest case for each major party's electoral position. The absence of any voice that can explain the Conservative appeal without framing it as a failure of voter discernment is a structural omission.

#### Finding 3.3

- Location: Entire broadcast
- Quote: No pollsters, academics, or policy experts cited
- Technique: Journalist-only panel on policy-heavy topics — the broadcast discusses fiscal deficits, drug policy, electoral dynamics, and demographic voting patterns without a single economist, political scientist, or pollster.
- Why problematic: Journalists' assessments of fiscal policy ("the conservatives are going to run a higher deficit than the NDP") are presented with the same authority as expert analysis, without the methodological rigor or accountability that expert sourcing would provide.



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)*

Definition: Diversity and independence of cited sources, including funding, mandate, and potential conflicts of interest.

### Finding 12.1

- Location: Shannon Waters' affiliation
- Quote: Shannon Waters identified as reporter with "the Narwhal"
- Technique: Non-disclosed editorial orientation — The Narwhal is a non-profit environmental journalism outlet funded primarily by foundations and individual donors with strong environmental commitments. Its editorial mission is explicitly environmental. This orientation is not disclosed to viewers.
- Why problematic: Presenting a reporter from an explicitly environmentally-focused publication as a neutral "B.C. politics" expert without disclosing the publication's editorial orientation misrepresents the source's neutrality to viewers.

### Finding 12.2

- Location: Entire broadcast
- Quote: No independent sources — polls, academic studies, government documents, or expert reports — are cited by name throughout the broadcast.
- Technique: Assertion-based analysis — all analytical claims are made on the authority of the three journalists' personal assessments without citation of verifiable sources.
- Why problematic: Claims about deficit projections, polling numbers, voter turnout, and electoral dynamics are made without sourcing, making them impossible for viewers to verify or contextualize.

### Finding 12.3

- Location: Anchor's reference to Global News video
- Quote: "there was this remarkable video I saw where Global News went to his campaign headquarters"
- Technique: Competitor sourcing without attribution — the anchor references a Global News report without providing the specific report, date, or context, making it impossible to verify the characterization.
- Why problematic: Using a competitor's report as the basis for characterizing a candidate as "hiding" without providing the actual source material is journalistically imprecise.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION							7/10		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Definition: Whether speaking time is distributed equitably across different political positions and perspectives.

### Finding 6.1

- Location: Entire broadcast
- Quote: Conservative candidate controversies occupy approximately 40–45% of total panel discussion time; NDP campaign strategy occupies approximately 35–40%; Green Party receives approximately 5–8%; Conservative policy rationale receives approximately 5%.
- Technique: Asymmetric time allocation by topic — the broadcast allocates disproportionate time to Conservative controversies relative to NDP policy failures, despite both being electorally relevant.
- Why problematic: In a competitive two-party race, a balanced broadcast would allocate roughly equivalent time to scrutinizing both major parties' records, platforms, and controversies.

### Finding 6.2

- Location: Opening clip sequence
- Quote: The opening clips include: (1) an anti-NDP voter comment about drug policy; (2) an NDP attack on Rustad's "conspiracies"; (3) a Conservative attack on Eby; (4) an NDP defense; (5) a Conservative attack on Eby's record. The panel then spends the majority of its time on Conservative controversies.
- Technique: Opening balance abandoned in panel — while the opening clips gesture toward balance, the panel discussion that follows is heavily weighted toward Conservative criticism.
- Why problematic: The structural imbalance between the opening (which includes Conservative voices) and the panel (which does not) creates a misleading impression of balance while the substantive analysis is one-sided.

### Finding 6.3

- Location: Entire broadcast
- Quote: No Conservative spokesperson, supporter, or sympathetic analyst is given any speaking time in the panel.
- Technique: Complete exclusion of one major party's perspective from analytical discussion — approximately 45–47% of B.C. voters were considering the Conservative Party at the time of this broadcast, yet zero panel time is allocated to voices that can articulate the Conservative case.
- Why problematic: This is the most fundamental time distribution failure: one of two major parties in a competitive election has no analytical advocate in a 20-minute pre-election panel.



## 4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Relevant facts, perspectives, or context that are absent from the broadcast in ways that distort the overall picture.

### Finding 4.1

- Location: Throughout broadcast
- Quote: "I think the message that the NDP are putting out... they have emptied the stalls out with a huge pile of muck that's been generated by both Mr rustad and his candidates"
- Technique: Omission of NDP accountability — the broadcast extensively covers Conservative candidate controversies but makes no substantive examination of the NDP government's seven-year record on housing affordability, drug decriminalization outcomes, deficit spending, or public safety failures that drove voter dissatisfaction.
- Why problematic: The opening clip includes a voter saying "we've had enough quite frankly of David Eby and these drugs and handing out free crack pipes" — a significant voter concern — but this is never analyzed by the panel. The NDP's record is treated as a backdrop rather than a subject of scrutiny.

### Finding 4.2

- Location: Discussion of Conservative platform/deficit
- Quote: "the costing numbers showed that the conservatives are going to run a higher deficit than the NDP which is kind of bizarre"
- Technique: Omission of NDP deficit context — the broadcast notes the Conservative deficit projection without providing the NDP's actual deficit figures, the trajectory of B.C.'s fiscal position under seven years of NDP government, or any independent fiscal analysis. The NDP's "record deficit in the last budget" is mentioned by the anchor but not examined.
- Why problematic: Describing the Conservative deficit as "bizarre" without providing the NDP's comparable figures or independent fiscal analysis presents an incomplete and potentially misleading fiscal picture.

### Finding 4.3

- Location: Discussion of Brent Chapman controversy
- Quote: "Brent Chapman has become a starring figure in the final role of this campaign he's running for the conservatives he's all social media posts resurfaced where he refers to Palestinians as inbred questions mass shootings like Sandy Hook Quebec City mosque"
- Technique: Omission of NDP/Green candidate controversies — the broadcast focuses exclusively on Conservative candidate controversies. Shannon Waters briefly notes "there have been incidences where green candidates and NDP candidates have not shown up" to debates, but no NDP or Green candidate controversies are examined with equivalent depth.
- Why problematic: If candidate vetting and controversy are legitimate electoral issues — and they are — a balanced broadcast would apply equivalent scrutiny to all parties' candidate selection processes.

### Missing Voices

1. Pollsters/Electoral analysts — No polling expert was consulted to contextualize the "too close to call" framing with actual data
2. Conservative Party spokesperson or supporter — No voice representing the approximately 45–47% of voters considering the Conservatives
3. Fiscal/economic policy expert — No independent economist to assess the deficit claims made about both parties
4. Drug policy researcher or harm reduction expert — The decriminalization controversy raised in the opening clip was never substantively analyzed



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

5. Muslim/Palestinian community representative — Mentioned as victims of Chapman's comments but given no voice
6. Rural B.C. residents — The Conservative wave in rural areas was discussed analytically but no rural voter perspective was included
7. Elections BC official or electoral integrity expert — Advanced voting records were cited without official sourcing
8. BC Green Party representative — Discussed as a factor but never given a voice



## 5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Complete figures include: absolute value, proportion (%) and trend

Definition: Selective, misleading, or decontextualized use of numbers, polls, or data.

### Finding 9.1

- Location: Shannon Waters on advanced voting
- Quote: "over a million people in this province took advantage of advanced voting to cast their ballot for context in the 2020 election a total of about 1.9 million people voted all told so we've seen record-breaking Advance turnout in the 2024 election here in DC"
- Technique: Incomplete statistical contextualization — while the comparison to 2020 total votes is provided, no context is given about whether advanced voting increases necessarily translate to higher overall turnout, which party benefits from advanced voting patterns, or how 2024 advanced voting compares to 2020 advanced voting specifically.
- Why problematic: The statistic is presented as straightforwardly significant ("record-breaking") without the analytical context needed to assess what it actually means for the election outcome.

### Finding 9.2

- Location: Discussion of Conservative deficit
- Quote: "the costing numbers showed that the conservatives are going to run a higher deficit than the NDP which is kind of bizarre"
- Technique: Decontextualized deficit comparison — the Conservative deficit projection is described as "bizarre" without providing: (a) the actual figures for both parties, (b) the NDP's deficit trajectory over seven years, (c) independent fiscal analysis, or (d) the economic assumptions underlying each party's projections.
- Why problematic: Describing one party's fiscal plan as "bizarre" without providing the comparative data needed to assess this claim is editorializing rather than analysis. The anchor's subsequent reference to the NDP's "record deficit" is not followed up with equivalent scrutiny.

### Finding 9.3

- Location: Justine Hunter on Green Party polling
- Quote: "if you look at the public opinion polls they're at best uh maybe 10% of the the popular vote and not a lot of efficiency in terms of their vote so they might come out of there with holding their two seats"
- Technique: Unattributed polling reference — the "10%" figure is presented without citation of any specific poll, polling firm, methodology, or margin of error.
- Why problematic: In a pre-election broadcast, polling figures should be attributed to specific polls with dates and methodologies. Unattributed polling figures cannot be verified or contextualized by viewers.



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting a position or party by associating it with extreme, discredited, or unpopular figures or movements.

### Finding 8.1

- Location: Shannon Waters on Conservative party composition
- Quote: "the conservative party has been built out of the kind of people who were making the comments that their candidates have made... John rustad has spent a couple of years building support among people who supported the Convoy that occupied Ottawa who opposed Public Health mandates who have some um pretty out there concerns about things like public health or globalism"
- Technique: Definitional guilt by association — the entire Conservative Party is characterized as having been "built out of" Convoy supporters and people with "out there concerns." This associates the entire party and its voters with the most extreme elements of its coalition.
- Why problematic: This characterization applies the characteristics of a subset of Conservative supporters to the entire party and its electorate. It is analytically imprecise and politically loaded, effectively telling viewers that voting Conservative means associating with Convoy supporters.

### Finding 8.2

- Location: Anchor's Trump comparison
- Quote: "I'm not comparing them to Donald Trump but Donald Trump has changed the laws of political gravity everywhere"
- Technique: Disavowal-then-association — the anchor explicitly says "I'm not comparing them to Donald Trump" while making a comparison to Donald Trump. This rhetorical device allows the association to be made while providing deniability.
- Why problematic: The Trump association, even when nominally disclaimed, activates a set of negative connotations (authoritarianism, dishonesty, extremism) that are then implicitly applied to the BC Conservative Party. This is a textbook example of the "I'm not saying X, but..." rhetorical technique.

### Finding 8.3

- Location: Opening clip (NDP source)
- Quote: "we don't have a candidate that says the vaccines give you AIDS we don't support antiva Convoy members"
- Technique: Definitional contrast through extreme association — the NDP defines itself against the most extreme possible characterizations of the Conservative Party. The broadcast presents this clip without challenge or context, effectively allowing the NDP to define the Conservative Party through its most extreme elements.
- Why problematic: The broadcast presents this partisan characterization without any Conservative response or journalistic contextualization. The "vaccines give you AIDS" candidate was a single individual, not party policy, but the clip implies this represents the Conservative Party broadly.



## 7. TIMING & PLACEMENT

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Strategic positioning of information — what leads, what is buried, what appears before or after key moments.

### Finding 10.1

- Location: Opening segment (pre-panel)
- Quote: The broadcast opens with a curated sequence of clips that includes: anti-NDP voter sentiment → NDP attack on Rustad → Conservative attack on Eby → NDP defense → Conservative attack on Eby's record
- Technique: Asymmetric clip sequencing — while the opening includes voices from both sides, the NDP clips are substantive attacks on Conservative positions, while the Conservative clips are attacks on NDP policy. The NDP gets both an attack clip AND a defense clip; the Conservatives get only an attack clip. The sequence ends with a Conservative attack, but the panel that follows focuses almost entirely on Conservative controversies.
- Why problematic: The opening creates a superficial impression of balance while the substantive panel discussion that follows is heavily weighted against the Conservatives.

### Finding 10.2

- Location: Brent Chapman discussion placement
- Quote: "we've seen one candidate for the conservatives talk about a covid vaccine would give you AIDS but now Brent Chapman has become a starring figure in the final role of this campaign"
- Technique: Late-campaign controversy amplification — the broadcast, airing the day before the election, devotes significant time to the Brent Chapman controversy. This timing maximizes the controversy's electoral impact while minimizing the Conservative Party's ability to respond.
- Why problematic: While the Chapman controversy is legitimate news, its prominent placement in a pre-election broadcast — with no equivalent scrutiny of NDP controversies — represents a timing choice with potential electoral consequences.

### Finding 10.3

- Location: Green Party discussion placement
- Quote: Green Party discussion is relegated to a brief sub-question within a larger question about advanced voting, near the middle of the broadcast.
- Technique: Marginalization through placement — the Green Party, which could be a significant factor in a minority government scenario, receives minimal and late placement in the broadcast.
- Why problematic: While the Greens' limited polling support justifies reduced coverage, their potential kingmaker role in a minority scenario warranted more prominent analytical treatment.



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Outrage = bias. Selective outrage amplifies the finding. Score = outrage level (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)*

Definition: Moral outrage expressed at certain positions or behaviors while equivalent positions or behaviors from other parties are accepted or minimized.

### Finding 13.1

- Location: Discussion of Brent Chapman
- Quote: "it's deeply and profoundly disturbing to actually uh know that a grown adult in British Columbia who is running for public office would promote these hateful views online" (David Eby clip, presented approvingly)
- Technique: Asymmetric moral framing — the broadcast presents Eby's moral outrage at Chapman's comments approvingly and at length, while no equivalent moral scrutiny is applied to NDP policy failures that have caused documented harm (e.g., drug decriminalization outcomes, housing crisis).
- Why problematic: Moral outrage is a legitimate journalistic tool, but its selective application — to Conservative candidate social media posts but not to NDP governance failures — represents a double standard.

### Finding 13.2

- Location: Shannon Waters on Conservative candidate vetting
- Quote: "the conservative party has been built out of the kind of people who were making the comments that their candidates have made"
- Technique: Collective attribution of individual misconduct — Chapman's offensive posts are attributed to the entire Conservative Party's composition and character. No equivalent collective attribution is made when NDP or Green candidates have controversies.
- Why problematic: Shannon Waters herself notes that "there have been incidences where green candidates and NDP candidates have not shown up" to debates, but this is mentioned briefly and without moral weight, while Conservative candidate controversies receive extended, morally charged analysis.

### Finding 13.3

- Location: Rob Shaw on Conservative controversies
- Quote: "there are things that the conservative said that in any other election would immediately implode a party and disqualify their candidates and they've just powered right on through"
- Technique: Nostalgic moral standard — the implicit standard ("in any other election") suggests that the current situation represents a moral degradation, with the Conservatives as the agents of that degradation. No equivalent reflection is offered on whether NDP governance failures would "in any other election" have more severely damaged the incumbent party.
- Why problematic: The moral standard is applied asymmetrically: Conservative controversies are measured against an idealized past standard, while NDP governance failures are not subjected to equivalent historical comparison.



9. COMPLETENESS						6/10			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

*Share of covered perspectives*

*Inverted: original value measures coverage (higher = better). Shown as deviation (higher = larger gaps).*

- | #  | Perspective   | Status   |
|----|---|--|
| 1  | BC Conservative Party position and policy rationale             | MENTIONED (only negatively framed)             |
| 2  | BC NDP government record and policy defense                     | MENTIONED (partially, sympathetically)         |
| 3  | BC Green Party platform and electoral strategy                  | MENTIONED (briefly, neutrally)                 |
| 4  | Voter concerns: affordability, housing, cost of living          | MENTIONED (briefly)                            |
| 5  | Voter concerns: public safety and drug policy                   | MENTIONED (only in opening clip, not analyzed) |
| 6  | Independent/non-partisan electoral analysis                     | OMITTED  |
| 7  | Conservative voter perspective and rationale                    | OMITTED  |
| 8  | Academic or polling expert on electoral dynamics                | OMITTED  |
| 9  | Civil society / community organizations on key issues           | OMITTED  |
| 10 | NDP government accountability on drug policy, deficits, housing | OMITTED  |

**Completeness Score: 4/10**

The broadcast covers the horse-race and controversy dimensions adequately but almost entirely omits substantive policy analysis, conservative voter rationale, independent expert voices, and accountability scrutiny of the incumbent NDP government.



## Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How the topic is fundamentally constructed — what assumptions are treated as given, what the "normal" baseline is, and what interpretive lens is applied to events.

#### Finding 1.1

- Location: Opening segment (pre-panel clips)
- Quote: "we've heard uh John rustad talk about some really far out conspiracies uh this week uh eating bugs and uh that uh that the co vac the co pandemic didn't actually happen all kinds of bizarre things"
- Technique: Definitional framing — the broadcast opens by establishing the Conservative leader as a purveyor of "far out conspiracies" and "bizarre things" before any analytical discussion begins. This is presented as established fact, not as one party's characterization.
- Why problematic: The opening clips are curated to establish a negative frame for the Conservative campaign before the panel even begins. A balanced broadcast would either present both parties' characterizations of each other symmetrically or contextualize these as partisan attacks rather than factual descriptions.

#### Finding 1.2

- Location: Mid-panel, anchor question to Rob Shaw
- Quote: "I put the question to David eie this week I said if the conservatives are a bunch of racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko people how is it that half of this province is still considering uh making them the government tomorrow"
- Technique: Loaded premise framing — the anchor's own characterization of the Conservative Party ("racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko people") is embedded within a question ostensibly challenging the NDP. The frame accepts the negative characterization as a given while the "challenge" is directed at the NDP's campaign effectiveness, not at the characterization itself.
- Why problematic: This is a textbook example of a loaded question that smuggles in a partisan characterization as an established premise. A journalist asking this question has effectively editorialized that Conservatives are "racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko people" while appearing to hold the NDP accountable.

#### Finding 1.3

- Location: Justine Hunter's analysis of Conservative win scenario
- Quote: "a conservative win will mean that voters want change and I think uh people politicians right across the country will be watching the outcome for that reason and and it will also indicate that they're perhaps not too fussy about who's driving the bus"
- Technique: Delegitimization framing — a Conservative victory is framed not as a legitimate democratic choice but as evidence that voters are "not too fussy," implying irresponsibility or lack of discernment among Conservative voters.
- Why problematic: This characterization of an entire electorate as insufficiently discriminating is editorially loaded and would be considered inappropriate in a neutral analytical context. No equivalent characterization of NDP voters is offered.



## 11. WORD CHOICE & TERMINOLOGY

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The use of loaded language, connotations, euphemisms, or dysphemisms that carry implicit evaluative judgments.

### Finding 2.1

- Location: Opening clip (NDP source, unattributed)
- Quote: "we've heard uh John rustad talk about some really far out conspiracies... eating bugs... all kinds of bizarre things"
- Technique: Dysphemism cascade — "far out," "bizarre," "conspiracies" are all loaded negative descriptors applied to the Conservative leader without equivalent language applied to the NDP.
- Why problematic: The language is not neutral reportage but evaluative characterization. "Far out" and "bizarre" are dismissive colloquialisms that signal contempt rather than analysis.

### Finding 2.2

- Location: Anchor's framing of Conservative voters
- Quote: "racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko people"
- Technique: Extreme dysphemism — the anchor uses a string of maximally pejorative terms to characterize Conservative supporters, even while ostensibly questioning the NDP's campaign strategy.
- Why problematic: This language, used by the anchor (not a guest), represents a direct editorial intrusion. The CBC Journalistic Standards and Practices explicitly require impartiality from anchors. Describing a major party's potential electorate as "wacko" violates this standard unambiguously.

### Finding 2.3

- Location: Justine Hunter on Conservative platform timing
- Quote: "remember this is like an untested party mostly made up of rookies led by a man who was kicked out of another party's caucus John rustad isn't a charismatic leader inspiring voters with his vision"
- Technique: Compound delegitimization — multiple negative descriptors ("untested," "rookies," "kicked out," "isn't charismatic") are stacked in a single analytical passage with no equivalent critical language applied to the NDP or its leader.
- Why problematic: While individually these may be factually defensible observations, their concentration in a single passage without any balancing positive characterization of the Conservative party creates a systematically negative portrait. No equivalent passage critiques the NDP leader's personal qualities or party composition.



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOR

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Asymmetries in how the anchor/moderator treats different guests or political positions through questioning style, interruptions, follow-up pressure, and sympathy signals.

### Finding 5.1

- Location: Anchor's self-disclosure
- Quote: "I've been distracted by a bunch of things happening in Ottawa I did not know about the atmospheric River I once watched the Seattle Seahawks play a game in an atmospheric River and I wouldn't go out to vote in that"
- Technique: Casual register signaling in-group membership — the anchor's self-deprecating humor and personal anecdote create a collegial, informal atmosphere that signals ideological alignment with the panel. This is not inherently problematic but establishes a tone of shared assumptions rather than adversarial inquiry.
- Why problematic: The anchor's casual, friendly engagement with all three panelists — who share broadly similar analytical frameworks — contrasts with the absence of any voice that would require the anchor to engage with a genuinely different perspective.

### Finding 5.2

- Location: Anchor's question framing on Conservative voters
- Quote: "if the conservatives are a bunch of racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko people how is it that half of this province is still considering uh making them the government tomorrow what does that say about your campaign"
- Technique: Asymmetric challenge — the anchor poses what appears to be a tough question about the NDP campaign but embeds within it an acceptance of the most extreme characterization of Conservative voters. The "challenge" to the NDP is about campaign effectiveness, not about whether the characterization of Conservative voters is fair or accurate.
- Why problematic: A genuinely impartial moderator would either challenge the characterization of Conservative voters or present the question without the loaded premise. The anchor's willingness to use "racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko" as a descriptive frame for Conservative supporters represents a significant departure from impartiality.

### Finding 5.3

- Location: Anchor's closing remarks
- Quote: "I've enjoyed talking to the three of you so much uh during this campaign it's a fascinating election and I can't wait to see what's going to happen tomorrow night"
- Technique: Warm closing that reinforces in-group solidarity — the anchor's enthusiastic closing signals personal investment in the outcome and collegial relationship with the panel, rather than the professional distance expected of a public broadcaster's anchor.
- Why problematic: While minor in isolation, this closing reinforces the overall tone of the broadcast as a conversation among like-minded professionals rather than a rigorous journalistic examination of competing political claims.



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Whether hard, confrontational questions are applied symmetrically to all political positions or reserved for one side.

#### Finding 7.1

- Location: Anchor question to Rob Shaw on Conservative platform
- Quote: "John russed and his party only came out with a platform in the final week of the campaign is that a mistake has it had any effect is this a problem like what do you make of them"
- Technique: Confrontational framing of Conservative strategy — the question presupposes the late platform is "a mistake" and "a problem," inviting the panelist to confirm a negative assessment.
- Why problematic: No equivalent question is asked about NDP campaign strategy failures, such as why the NDP — with seven years of incumbency and significant resources — is in a "nailbiter" against a party described as "untested rookies."

#### Finding 7.2

- Location: Anchor question to Justine Hunter on NDP campaign
- Quote: "what does this say about David eie about his understanding of the mood and about the campaign offer he has put on the table uh to British Colombians if despite the Oppo research they have dumped on candidate after candidate it's still a nailbiter going into Saturday"
- Technique: Soft accountability framing — the question about NDP campaign failures is framed around the NDP's use of "oppo research" (a legitimate campaign tactic) rather than around substantive policy failures. The implicit frame is that the NDP's problem is insufficient negative campaigning, not policy failures.
- Why problematic: A symmetrically tough question about the NDP would ask about specific policy failures — housing, drug policy, deficit — rather than about campaign tactics. The question inadvertently frames the NDP's challenge as a communications problem rather than a governance problem.

#### Finding 7.3

- Location: Entire broadcast
- Quote: No question in the broadcast asks panelists to defend or explain the Conservative policy platform, the legitimate concerns driving Conservative voter support, or the substantive case for change.
- Technique: Asymmetric question universe — all questions about the Conservative campaign focus on controversies, platform timing, and candidate problems. No question asks "what is the strongest case for a Conservative government?" or "what legitimate grievances are driving Conservative support?"
- Why problematic: A balanced pre-election panel would include at least one question that steelmans each major party's electoral case. The complete absence of such a question for the Conservatives is a significant asymmetry.



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Artificial balance that misrepresents the actual state of evidence or creates equivalences where none exist, or conversely, presents one-sided coverage as balanced.

### Finding 14.1

- Location: Opening clip sequence
- Quote: The broadcast opens with clips from both parties, creating an impression of balance before the panel discussion begins.
- Technique: Structural false balance — the opening clips create a superficial impression of balance (both parties represented) while the substantive panel discussion that follows is heavily weighted against the Conservatives. The balance is formal rather than substantive.
- Why problematic: Viewers who see the opening clips may assume the broadcast will maintain equivalent scrutiny of both parties. The panel discussion does not fulfill this implicit promise.

### Finding 14.2

- Location: Shannon Waters on debate non-attendance
- Quote: "they're not the only ones to do that there have been incidences where green candidates and NDP candidates have not shown up but the conservatives are the ones who it seems have done this most often"
- Technique: Nominal balance with asymmetric weight — Waters briefly acknowledges that other parties also skipped debates before returning to Conservative criticism. This creates the appearance of balance while maintaining the critical focus on Conservatives.
- Why problematic: The acknowledgment of NDP and Green debate non-attendance is so brief and qualified ("incidences") that it functions as a rhetorical device to inoculate against charges of bias rather than as genuine analytical balance.

### Finding 14.3

- Location: Fiscal discussion
- Quote: "I don't know who you pick between the bcnp and the BC conservatives" (Shannon Waters on fiscal management)
- Technique: Nominal equivalence on fiscal management — Waters briefly suggests fiscal management is a wash between the two parties, which is the closest the broadcast comes to genuine balance on a policy issue.
- Why problematic: This is actually an example of appropriate balance, but it is isolated and brief. Its presence highlights the absence of equivalent balance elsewhere in the broadcast.



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What becomes "the issue" through editorial choices about what to discuss, emphasize, and exclude.

### Finding 15.1

- Location: Entire broadcast structure
- Quote: The broadcast's agenda: (1) horse-race dynamics, (2) Conservative candidate controversies, (3) Conservative platform timing, (4) NDP campaign strategy, (5) Green Party as minority kingmaker, (6) advanced voting statistics.
- Technique: Controversy-centered agenda — the broadcast's agenda is dominated by Conservative controversies and horse-race dynamics, with minimal attention to substantive policy issues that voters identified as their primary concerns (housing, affordability, drug policy, public safety).
- Why problematic: By making Conservative controversies "the issue" in the final pre-election broadcast, the agenda implicitly frames the election as a referendum on Conservative fitness rather than on the NDP's seven-year record or on competing policy visions.

### Finding 15.2

- Location: Drug policy discussion (absent from panel)
- Quote: Opening clip: "we've had enough quite frankly of David eie and these drugs and handing out free crack pipes I mean just creating these drug dens in our community" — this concern is never analyzed by the panel.
- Technique: Agenda exclusion of NDP accountability issue — the drug decriminalization policy, which was one of the most significant and controversial policy decisions of the Eby government, is raised in the opening clip but never substantively analyzed by the panel.
- Why problematic: Drug decriminalization was a major electoral issue in B.C. in 2024. Its exclusion from the panel discussion — while Conservative candidate social media posts receive extended analysis — represents a significant agenda-setting choice that protects the NDP from scrutiny on its most controversial policy.

### Finding 15.3

- Location: Housing and affordability discussion (minimal)
- Quote: "the sort of Topline concerns in this election have been about affordability I'd add Public Safety in there" (Shannon Waters) — mentioned briefly, not analyzed.
- Technique: Nominal acknowledgment without substantive analysis — the issues voters identified as most important (affordability, housing, public safety) are acknowledged as "Topline concerns" but receive no substantive analytical attention. The broadcast's actual analytical attention is directed at Conservative controversies.
- Why problematic: A pre-election broadcast that acknowledges affordability and public safety as the top voter concerns but then devotes the majority of its analytical time to Conservative candidate social media posts has inverted the journalistic priority of serving voter information needs.



## CHAPTER 2 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### A) Summary Table: All 15 Criteria

#	Criterion	Score (0–10)	Key Finding
1	Framing	7	Conservative voters framed as "not too fussy"; Conservative win framed as democratic failure rather than legitimate choice
2	Word Choice & Terminology	8	Anchor uses "racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko" to describe Conservative supporters; panelists use "bizarre," "far out," "untested rookies" for Conservatives without equivalent NDP language
3	Expert Selection	6	Panel includes Narwhal reporter (environmentally-focused publication) without disclosure; no conservative-sympathetic analyst; no independent policy experts
4	Selective Omission	8	NDP's seven-year record on housing, drugs, deficits receives no substantive scrutiny; Conservative policy rationale entirely absent
5	Moderation Behavior	7	Anchor embeds "racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko" characterization of Conservative supporters in ostensibly challenging question; casual collegial tone signals shared worldview
6	Time Distribution	7	Conservative controversies dominate panel time; NDP policy failures receive minimal attention; no Conservative voice in 20-minute panel
7	Question Asymmetry	7	Conservative questions focus on controversies and failures; NDP questions focus on campaign tactics rather than governance failures
8	Guilt by Association	8	Conservative Party characterized as "built out of" Convoy supporters; Trump association made while nominally disclaimed
9	Numerical Manipulation	5	Deficit figures presented without comparative data; polling figures unattributed; advanced voting statistics decontextualized
10	Timing & Placement	6	Brent Chapman controversy prominently placed day before election; NDP accountability issues buried or absent
12	Source Selection	6	No named sources cited; Narwhal's editorial orientation undisclosed; Global News video referenced without attribution
13	Selective Outrage	8	Moral outrage at Conservative candidate posts; no equivalent outrage at NDP governance failures causing documented harm
14	False Balance	5	Opening clips create superficial balance; brief acknowledgments of NDP/Green issues function as inoculation rather than genuine balance
15	Agenda-Setting	8	Drug decriminalization — a major electoral issue — excluded from panel analysis; Conservative controversies dominate agenda over voter-identified priorities

### B) Overall Scores



- Criteria Score (average of 15):  $(7+8+6+8+7+7+7+8+5+6+4+6+8+5+8) \div 15 = 100 \div 15 = 6.7$

## C) Top 3 Manipulation Techniques Observed

### 1. LOADED PREMISE EMBEDDING (Criteria 2, 5, 7)

---

The most significant manipulation technique in this broadcast is the embedding of partisan characterizations within ostensibly journalistic questions and analysis. The anchor's use of "racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko people" as a descriptive frame for Conservative supporters — while nominally posing a challenge to the NDP — is the clearest example. This technique allows the broadcaster to make a strongly partisan editorial statement while maintaining the formal structure of journalistic inquiry. The viewer hears what sounds like a tough question for the NDP but absorbs the characterization of Conservative voters as its premise.

### 2. ASYMMETRIC MORAL ACCOUNTING (Criteria 8, 13, 15)

---

The broadcast applies a consistent double standard: Conservative controversies (candidate social media posts, platform timing, conspiracy theories) are subjected to extended moral scrutiny, while NDP governance failures (drug decriminalization outcomes, housing crisis, record deficits, public safety) are either omitted or mentioned briefly without moral weight. This creates a moral ledger in which the Conservatives are perpetually in deficit and the NDP is perpetually in credit, regardless of the actual evidence. The technique is particularly effective because it operates through omission — the NDP is not defended, it is simply not prosecuted.

### 3. DEFINITIONAL GUILT BY ASSOCIATION (Criterion 8)

---

The broadcast repeatedly characterizes the Conservative Party not by its platform or policies but by its most extreme associated elements: Convoy supporters, anti-vaccine advocates, conspiracy theorists, and offensive social media posters. Shannon Waters' statement that "the conservative party has been built out of the kind of people who were making the comments that their candidates have made" is the clearest articulation of this technique. By defining the party through its most extreme elements, the broadcast makes it impossible for a reasonable voter to support the Conservatives without implicitly endorsing those extremes.

## D) 3 Core Messages Embedded in the Broadcast

### Message 1: CONTENT MESSAGE (What the viewer learns)

---

"The BC Conservative Party is defined by extremism, incompetence, and controversy, while the NDP's problems are primarily about campaign messaging."

- Technique: Agenda-setting + selective omission
- Evidence: The broadcast devotes the majority of its analytical time to Conservative candidate controversies (Chapman, vaccine-AIDS candidate, conspiracy theories) and platform failures (late release, higher deficit), while NDP governance failures are acknowledged only as the backdrop against which the NDP's campaign messaging is assessed. The viewer learns that Conservatives have problematic candidates and a late platform; they do not learn that the NDP has presided over a housing crisis, controversial drug policy, and record deficits.

### Message 2: PERSONAL MESSAGE (Who is presented positively/negatively)

---

"John Rustad is an uncharismatic, conspiracy-adjacent leader of an untested party of rookies; David Eby is a competent incumbent whose campaign has been hampered by the difficulty of running against a party that has 'changed the laws of political gravity.'"

- Technique: Word choice + framing + selective omission
- Evidence: Rustad is described as "kicked out of another party's caucus," "not a charismatic leader," leading "an untested party mostly made up of rookies" that "didn't even produce a platform until this week." Eby is described as running a campaign that "emptied the stalls" with legitimate opposition research, whose challenge is that the Conservatives have "powered right on through" controversies that "in any other election would immediately implode a party." Eby's personal qualities and leadership record are not subjected to equivalent critical scrutiny.

### Message 3: SOCIETAL MESSAGE (What worldview is reinforced)

---

"Support for right-wing populist parties represents a failure of democratic discernment, driven by irrational anger rather than legitimate policy concerns, and is part of a troubling post-2016 global trend toward the normalization of extremism."



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

- Technique: Guilt by association + framing + agenda-setting
- Evidence: The broadcast's Trump reference ("Donald Trump has changed the laws of political gravity everywhere"), the characterization of Conservative voters as "not too fussy about who's driving the bus," the association of the Conservative Party with Convoy supporters and conspiracy theorists, and the repeated framing of Conservative support as something that requires explanation rather than representation — all reinforce a worldview in which right-wing populism is a social pathology to be analyzed rather than a legitimate political position to be represented.

## E) Classification

---

Classification: CLEAR ONE-SIDEDNESS (4.1–6.0)

The broadcast exhibits clear and systematic one-sidedness in its treatment of the two major parties in the B.C. election. While it does not reach the level of overt propaganda, its consistent application of critical scrutiny to the Conservative Party while largely exempting the NDP from equivalent examination, combined with the anchor's use of explicitly partisan language to characterize Conservative supporters, represents a significant departure from the standards of balanced public broadcasting.

## F) Summary

---

This broadcast of Power & Politics, aired the day before the 2024 B.C. provincial election, exhibits clear and systematic one-sidedness that falls short of the standards established by the CBC Journalistic Standards and Practices and the mandate set out in Section 3(1)(l) of the Broadcasting Act. The CBC's JSP requires that "we contribute to informed debate on issues of public interest" and that coverage be "fair, and based on a solid foundation of accuracy and integrity" — standards that are compromised by the anchor's use of "racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko" as a descriptive frame for Conservative supporters, the panel's exclusive focus on Conservative controversies while NDP governance failures go unexamined, and the complete absence of any voice capable of articulating the Conservative case to approximately half the B.C. electorate. The Broadcasting Act's requirement that the CBC "safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada" and "reflect the circumstances and aspirations of Canadian men and women" is undermined when a pre-election broadcast effectively excludes the perspective of nearly half the province's voters from substantive analytical representation. The broadcast's completeness score of 4/10 reflects the absence of independent policy experts, Conservative voices, rural B.C. perspectives, and substantive analysis of the issues voters themselves identified as most important — housing, affordability, and public safety. While individual findings may be defensible in isolation, their systematic pattern — consistently favoring the NDP and consistently disadvantaging the Conservatives across framing, word choice, expert selection, omission, moderation, time distribution, question asymmetry, guilt by association, selective outrage, and agenda-setting — constitutes a level of institutional bias that warrants serious regulatory attention from the CRTC and internal review by CBC's Office of the Ombudsman.



## CHAPTER 3 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

### Bias Scores by Party

Party	Bias Score (-5 to +5)	Evidence
NDP (New Democratic Party)	+3	The NDP's campaign strategy is analyzed sympathetically ("emptied the stalls" with legitimate oppo research); NDP governance failures are not subjected to equivalent scrutiny; NDP's "record deficit" is mentioned but not examined; the broadcast's agenda protects the NDP from accountability on drug policy and housing
Green Party (GPC)	+1	Greens are discussed briefly and neutrally as a potential minority government factor; their "checks and balances" role is presented positively; no critical scrutiny of Green platform or record
Liberal Party (LPC)	0	Federal Liberals are not directly discussed; the anchor's reference to "people who might actually vote for Justin Trudeau" is neutral; no significant positive or negative treatment
Bloc Québécois (BQ)	0	Not discussed; no evidence of bias in either direction
Conservative Party (CPC)	-1	Federal Conservatives are not directly discussed, but the Trump association and "changed the laws of political gravity" framing implicitly connects the BC Conservative wave to federal Conservative trends without explicit criticism
BC Conservative Party (provincial)	-4	Systematically disadvantaged: characterized as "untested rookies" led by a man "kicked out" of another caucus; associated with Convoy supporters, conspiracy theorists, and offensive social media posters; candidate controversies dominate the broadcast; no voice given to articulate the Conservative case; voters considering Conservatives described as "not too fussy"

Note: The BC Conservative Party is a provincial party distinct from the federal CPC. The analysis above separates these where possible, but the broadcast's Trump association and "political gravity" framing implicitly connects them.

### Evidence Points

#### NDP (+3)

- Quote: "I put the question to David eie this week I said if the conservatives are a bunch of racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko people how is it that half of this province is still considering uh making them the government tomorrow what does that say about your campaign"
- Interpretation: The question ostensibly challenges Eby but embeds a characterization of Conservative supporters that is maximally favorable to the NDP's campaign narrative. The "challenge" to Eby is about campaign effectiveness, not governance failures.

#### Green Party (+1)

- Quote: "the message that they've been playing... is this idea that if there is a minority government then you'll have these sort of checks and balances that come with uh having a third party"
- Interpretation: The Green Party's minority government pitch is presented neutrally and even sympathetically, without critical examination of whether the Greens have the capacity to deliver on this promise.



## BC Conservative Party (-4)

---

- Quote: "remember this is like an untested party mostly made up of rookies led by a man who was kicked out of another party's caucus John rustad isn't a charismatic leader inspiring voters with his vision his party didn't even produce a platform until this week"
- Interpretation: This passage, from a reporter presented as a neutral analyst, stacks multiple negative characterizations of the Conservative Party without any balancing positive assessment. No equivalent passage characterizes the NDP negatively.
- Quote: "the conservative party has been built out of the kind of people who were making the comments that their candidates have made... John rustad has spent a couple of years building support among people who supported the Convoy"
- Interpretation: The entire Conservative Party is defined by its most extreme elements, associating all Conservative voters with Convoy supporters and conspiracy theorists.

## Summary Statistics

---

- Most favored party: NDP (+3)
- Most disadvantaged party: BC Conservative Party (-4)
- Average deviation from 0 (absolute values):  $(3+1+0+0+1+4) \div 6 = 1.5$



## CHAPTER 4 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION

### A) CBC Journalistic Standards and Practices (JSP)

#### Accuracy

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
Unattributed polling figures	JSP: "We seek out the most accurate information available"	"if you look at the public opinion polls they're at best uh maybe 10% of the the popular vote" — no poll cited	Polling figures presented without source, date, methodology, or margin of error	Minor
Deficit characterization without data	JSP: "We provide the context and background necessary to understand"	"the costing numbers showed that the conservatives are going to run a higher deficit than the NDP which is kind of bizarre" — no actual figures provided	Fiscal claim made without supporting data	Moderate
"Hiding" characterization	JSP: "We are accurate and precise"	"he was like hiding in a room" — characterization of candidate behavior based on secondhand account	Interpretive language presented as factual description	Minor

#### Fairness

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
No Conservative voice in panel	JSP: "We ensure that our content on controversial subjects presents a diversity of perspectives"	Entire 20-minute panel contains zero voices capable of articulating the Conservative case	Systematic exclusion of one major party's perspective from analytical discussion	Significant
NDP governance failures unexamined	JSP: "We are fair and just in our dealings with people and organizations"	Drug decriminalization, housing crisis, and deficit trajectory receive no substantive panel analysis	Asymmetric accountability scrutiny	Significant
Conservative voters characterized negatively	JSP: "We treat individuals and organizations with respect"	"they're perhaps not too fussy about who's driving the bus"	Characterization of approximately half the electorate as insufficiently discerning	Moderate



## Balance

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
Asymmetric controversy coverage	JSP: "We present a wide range of perspectives"	Conservative candidate controversies receive extended analysis; NDP/Green controversies receive brief mention	Systematic imbalance in controversy coverage	Significant
Agenda exclusion of NDP accountability	JSP: "We contribute to informed debate on issues of public interest"	Drug decriminalization — a major electoral issue — excluded from panel analysis	Agenda-setting that protects incumbent party from scrutiny	Significant

## Impartiality

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
Anchor's characterization of Conservative supporters	JSP: "We do not express our own personal opinions on controversial subjects"	"if the conservatives are a bunch of racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko people" — anchor's own language	Direct editorial intrusion by anchor using maximally pejorative language for one party's supporters	Significant
Anchor's Trump association	JSP: "We are impartial"	"I'm not comparing them to Donald Trump but Donald Trump has changed the laws of political gravity everywhere"	Disavowal-then-association technique used by anchor	Moderate
Collegial tone with like-minded panel	JSP: "We are independent of all lobbying groups and special interest organizations"	"I've enjoyed talking to the three of you so much uh during this campaign"	Anchor's warm collegial relationship with panel signals shared worldview	Minor

## Independence

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
Narwhal reporter's undisclosed orientation	JSP: "We are independent"	Shannon Waters' affiliation with an environmentally-focused, foundation-funded publication is not disclosed	Potential conflict of interest not disclosed to viewers	Minor

## B) Broadcasting Act, S.C. 1991, c. 11, Section 3(1)



**Section 3(1)(l): Safeguarding the Cultural, Political, Social and Economic Fabric of Canada**

Finding	Evidence	Assessment	Severity
Exclusion of approximately half the electorate's perspective	The broadcast provides no analytical representation for the approximately 45–47% of B.C. voters considering the Conservative Party	A broadcast that systematically excludes the perspective of nearly half the electorate from substantive analysis does not "safeguard" the political fabric of Canada; it distorts it	Significant
Characterization of Conservative voters as insufficiently discerning	"they're perhaps not too fussy about who's driving the bus"	Characterizing a large segment of the Canadian electorate as lacking democratic discernment undermines rather than strengthens the political fabric	Moderate

**Section 3(1)(d)(i): Reflecting Canada's Diversity**

Finding	Evidence	Assessment	Severity
No rural B.C. voices	The Conservative wave in rural B.C. is discussed analytically but no rural perspective is represented	Rural Canadians, who are disproportionately represented in Conservative support, are discussed as an electoral phenomenon but not given voice	Moderate
No Conservative community voices	No Conservative voters, supporters, or sympathetic analysts appear in the broadcast	The diversity of Canadian political opinion is not reflected	Significant

**C) CRTC Conditions of Licence**

The CRTC requires CBC to maintain "a high standard of journalistic ethics" and to provide programming that "reflects the diversity of Canadian society." This broadcast falls short of these standards in the following respects:

Finding	Evidence	Violation	Severity
Anchor's use of pejorative language for party supporters	"racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko people"	Fails the "high standard of journalistic ethics" requirement; an anchor using maximally pejorative language for one party's supporters in a pre-election broadcast is inconsistent with CRTC expectations for public broadcasting	Significant



Systematic exclusion of one major party's perspective	No Conservative voice in 20-minute pre-election panel	Fails to "reflect the diversity of Canadian society" in political opinion	Significant
---	---	---	-------------

## Overall Regulatory Assessment

This broadcast of Power & Politics presents a pattern of regulatory concern that, while not constituting deliberate propaganda, represents a systematic departure from the standards the CBC is legally and institutionally obligated to maintain. The most significant regulatory violation is the anchor's use of "racist homophobic crazy outlandish wacko people" as a descriptive frame for Conservative supporters — language that no reasonable interpretation of the CBC's Journalistic Standards and Practices or the CRTC's high standard of journalistic ethics could accommodate from a public broadcaster's anchor in a pre-election broadcast. The broadcast's structural exclusion of Conservative voices and perspectives from a 20-minute pre-election panel, combined with its asymmetric scrutiny of the two major parties' records and candidates, constitutes a failure of the balance and fairness requirements of the JSP and the Broadcasting Act's mandate to reflect the diversity of Canadian political opinion. These findings, taken together, warrant review by CBC's Office of the Ombudsman under the JSP's accountability mechanisms and may warrant CRTC attention under the conditions of licence requiring high journalistic standards, particularly given the broadcast's proximity to voting day and its potential influence on electoral outcomes.

## Source Credibility Assessment

Source/Expert	Funding Source	Conflicts of Interest	Credibility Assessment	Counter-Voice Offered?
Justine Hunter (Globe and Mail)	Globe and Mail (private, subscription/advertising funded)	None identified; Globe and Mail has historically center-right editorial positions, though individual reporters maintain independence	High — experienced B.C. political reporter	No
Shannon Waters (The Narwhal)	The Narwhal is a non-profit funded by foundations (including Tides Canada, which has environmental advocacy connections), individual donors, and reader subscriptions	Structural predisposition toward environmental and progressive policy perspectives; not disclosed to viewers	Medium — credible environmental journalism but editorial orientation not disclosed	No
Rob Shaw (Chek News)	Chek News is a Victoria-based independent broadcaster	None identified	High — experienced B.C. political correspondent	No
"Global News video" (referenced by anchor)	Global News (Corus Entertainment, private broadcaster)	None identified	Medium — referenced without specific attribution, making verification impossible	No
Polling data (unattributed)	Unknown — no polling firm cited	Unknown	Low — unattributed polling figures cannot be assessed for	No



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

			methodology or potential bias	
Elections BC (implied in advanced voting statistics)	Government of British Columbia	None identified	High — official electoral authority	No

Overall source credibility concern: The broadcast relies entirely on three journalists' personal assessments without citation of verifiable sources, independent experts, or official data. The Narwhal's editorial orientation is not disclosed. No counter-voice is offered for any analytical claim made in the broadcast.

*End of Analysis Report — Version 1.0-cbc*

*Prepared under Senior Media Accountability Review Protocol*

*All findings are evidence-based and directly cited from the provided transcript.*



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	EXPERT SELECTION	6	●●●
2	SOURCE SELECTION	6	●●●
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	7	●●●●
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	8	●●●●
5	NUMERICAL MANIPULATION	5	●●●
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	8	●●●●
7	TIMING & PLACEMENT	6	●●●
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	8	●●●●
9	COMPLETENESS	6	●●●
10	FRAMING	7	●●●●
11	WORD CHOICE & TERMINOLOGY	8	●●●●
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOR	7	●●●●
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	7	●●●●
14	FALSE BALANCE	5	●●●
15	AGENDA-SETTING	8	●●●●

#### HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

**6.7/10**

*Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation*

#### SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

**7.0/10**

*Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**6.9/10**

*Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation*

*Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts*



## KEY — Score Definitions

### Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

<b>0</b>	<b>No finding</b>	No relevant anomaly detected.
<b>1–2</b>	<b>Weak finding</b>	Minor anomaly without substantial impact on balance.
<b>3–4</b>	<b>Slight to moderate finding</b>	Recognizable tendency; low to moderate impact relevance.
<b>5</b>	<b>Moderate finding with impact</b>	Relevant imbalance affecting the audience's opinion-forming potential.
<b>6</b>	<b>Significant finding (threshold)</b>	Scores of 6 and above are classified as 'significant findings.'
<b>7</b>	<b>Significant finding</b>	Clear, well-documented imbalance with distinct impact relevance.
<b>8–9</b>	<b>Severe finding</b>	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
<b>10</b>	<b>Maximum severity</b>	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

### Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

<b>0.0 – 2.5</b>	<b>Unremarkable</b>	No significant patterns detected; broadcast meets the impartiality standard.
<b>2.6 – 4.0</b>	<b>Slight imbalance</b>	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but within tolerance range.
<b>4.1 – 6.0</b>	<b>Significant imbalance</b>	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of perspective diversity.
<b>6.1 – 8.0</b>	<b>Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation</b>	Pronounced, cross-broadcast patterns; high impact relevance.
<b>8.1 – 10</b>	<b>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high bias degree</b>	Maximum severity across nearly all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

### Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

<b>-5 to -3</b>	<b>Strongly disadvantaged</b>	Party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.
<b>-2 to -1</b>	<b>Slightly disadvantaged</b>	Recognizable but minor disadvantage.
<b>0</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	No detectable favoritism or disadvantage.
<b>+1 to +2</b>	<b>Slightly favored</b>	Recognizable but minor favoritism.
<b>+3 to +5</b>	<b>Strongly favored</b>	Party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.

### Legal and Methodological Notes



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

**No factual  
determination**

The results presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams, or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardized operationalization, not a finding of individual responsibility.

**No legal judgment**

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under Broadcasting Act s. 3(1)(l). The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular CRTC).

**No proof of  
causation**

Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news environment, political controversy, or format logic.

**No judgment of  
intent**

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means a significant imbalance was detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no claims about motives or strategic objectives.

**Heuristic  
comparison tool**

The index serves comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not precise metric measurement of individual segments. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not sharp legal qualification.



## APPENDIX: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

### Legal Basis Canada — CBC/Radio-Canada

---

#### Law

---

Broadcasting Act (S.C. 1991, c. 11)

#### Relevant Sections

---

- Section 3(1)(d): The Canadian broadcasting system should safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada.
- Section 3(1)(l): The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as the national public broadcaster, should provide radio and television services incorporating a wide range of programming that informs, enlightens and entertains; be predominantly and distinctively Canadian; reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences; actively contribute to the flow and exchange of cultural expression; be in English and in French; contribute to shared national consciousness and identity.
- Section 3(1)(m): The programming provided by the Corporation should be made available throughout Canada by the most appropriate and efficient means.

#### CBC Journalistic Standards and Practices (JSP)

---

6 Core Principles:

1. **Accuracy:** Facts correct and verified
2. **Fairness:** Fair treatment of all parties
3. **Balance:** Balanced representation of controversial topics
4. **Impartiality:** Impartial reporting
5. **Integrity:** Journalistic integrity
6. **Independence:** Editorial independence

#### Online Legislation

---

- C-11 (Online Streaming Act): Streaming regulation
- C-18 (Online News Act): News compensation

#### Regulatory Authority

---

- CRTC (Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission): Regulation, licensing
- CBC Ombudsman: Internal complaints body (not independent, no sanctioning authority)

#### Special Note

---

Canada has no independent external regulator comparable to Switzerland's UBI. The CBC Ombudsman is an internal body. CBC left the CBSC (Canadian Broadcast Standards Council) in 2009.

#### Complaints Process

---

1. CBC Ombudsman (internal)
2. CRTC (licensing conditions)



## APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

### References

---

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – Forschungszentrum Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft (2024). *Jahrbuch Qualität der Medien 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methodenbericht v4.1: Zählbare Kriterien und Multi-Modell-Kreuzvalidierung*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

### SVFAB Working Papers

---

- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Systematic AI-Assisted Analysis of Public Broadcaster Impartiality: A Scalable Methodological Framework for Measuring Structural Bias in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6688478](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Measuring Editorial Noise: A Retrospective Suppression Index for Public Broadcasting Content Analysis. [SSRN 6733280](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Source Traffic Light: A Six-Dimensional Credibility Framework for Systematic Source Assessment in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6733880](#)

*David Schläpfer — ORCID: 0009-0000-5671-9266*



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

## Reports and Membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you will find detailed reports and can also commission custom analyses for any broadcast (billed separately).  
To ensure the quality of our work, we depend on membership fees and donations.

### Contact and further information:

[www.SVFAB.ch](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:Kontakt@SVFAB.ch)

**Bank details:** PostFinance – POFICHBE

**IBAN:** CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

**Beneficiary:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

The following books are available from SVFAB

Orders via [www.svfab.ch](http://www.svfab.ch) or [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto:kontakt@svfab.ch)



**Unbalanced Reporting** is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: Manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and sources. Then 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with numerous examples. Additionally, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques – fostering not only awareness but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**.

Also available as an **audiobook**.



The interview is not a conversation. It is a stage – and someone else has written the script.

Those who don't know this deliver material. Good quotes that get cut wrong. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolbox – for everyone who faces a microphone and wants to know what to do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three principles of sovereignty – anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what matters after the interview.

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers – for everyone who is in the public eye and wants to understand how the game works. So they stop playing along – and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, reference, follow-up and when difficulties arise



**You think you see the world.** In Wirklichkeit siehst du den Rahmen, den jemand um sie gelegt hat. Framing ist die älteste und eleganteste Manipulationstechnik der world. Sie verändert nicht die Fakten – sie verändert, was wir aus den Fakten machen. Wie wir fühlen. Was wir glauben. Wie wir entscheiden. Und sie funktioniert – weil wir alle mitmachen. Täglich. Unbewusst. Auch du. Dieses Buch ist kein trockenes Lehrbuch. Es ist ein Übungsbuch – spielerisch, direkt, voller Beispiele aus dem echten Leben. Du lernst nicht nur, wie andere dich framen. Du lernst, wie du selbst framest – und wie du es bewusst und fair einsetzen kannst.

Because whoever understands framing sees the world more clearly. Hears news differently. Conducts conversations more confidently. And no longer so easily accepts a frame chosen by someone else.

**President:** Schläpfer, David - **Contact:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:kontakt@SVFAB.ch) - **Address:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zurich 1



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life – and the occasional smile.

**Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.**



The SRG collects 1.56 billion francs per year – compulsorily, from every household. Those who feel unfairly treated can file a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the UBI, the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television.

But: It is not independent. It has no sanctioning power. And it decides in 99.6% of all cases: nothing.

This analysis exposes the system – factual, precise, without polemics. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional review showing: the UBI system meets none of the three fundamental criteria – it is not proportionate, not separated by powers, not market-based.

The authority supposed to protect citizens primarily protects the system it should be overseeing.

Essential reading for anyone considering a complaint – and for anyone who wants to understand why genuine media oversight in Switzerland is still pending.