

reporting the prior criminal record of someone police had named as a suspect in a murder case would sometimes be justified. Far fewer journalists overall said they could sometimes justify accepting free travel from a company to cover a newsworthy event in which the company had an important stake. Thirty-five percent of francophone journalists, but only 24 percent of anglophones, thought such behavior could sometimes be justified.

We also asked a series of questions about whether it would sometimes be justifiable to publish information that would break the law. We asked for responses about three situations: Publishing or broadcasting the name of a living sexual-assault victim; listening to and reporting on the contents of other peoples' cellular phone conversations; and violating a publication ban issued by a judge.

-----  
Insert Table 2 here  
-----

Substantial minorities of Canadian journalists said they thought such illegal behaviors could sometimes be justified. Table 2 shows that 44 percent of the anglophones and 26 percent of the francophones thought it sometimes would be justifiable to publish or broadcast the name of a living victim of sexual assault. Anglophones also were slightly more likely than francophones to say that violating a publication ban was sometimes justifiable (39 percent to 36 percent). Francophone journalists, many of them no doubt remembering a Quebec government official's attempts in the early 1990s to prevent dissemination of tapes and transcripts of highly newsworthy information from an overheard cellular telephone conversation, were