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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to compare the treatments of issues of three French-language Montreal newspapers with three English-language Toronto newspapers during the last months of the 1981 constitutional debate.

A review of the literature takes into consideration the historical, political, cultural and linguistic background of the constitutional controversy.

Overall, Montreal and Toronto dailies displayed fairly similar agendas (the statistic rho indicating the association between the rank-ordering of issues from the two groups, was of r = .30). The similarity between the groups of papers was particularly strong with regards to technical issues such as those directly related to the constitutional process.

However, other sensitive issues received different treatment in the two groups of media. In general, Quebec newspapers betrayed a concern for Quebec related issues such as Quebec sovereignty, Quebec veto power, language rights, and the Quebec Referendum of 1980. English dailies, on the other hand, were not as concerned with these same issues and focused on other matters such as minority rights and concerns of individual provinces.
Finally, as a qualitative analysis of adjectives describing Trudeau and Levesque showed, the two language groups projected basically similar images of the two leaders. Only, French papers seemed to view Trudeau as a traitor, while English papers did not. On the other hand, English dailies stressed Levesque’s defiant and rebellious attitude, whereas the French press did not.

Thus, although the agendas of the two language groups are similar in some respects, they do have differences which are reflective of their audience’s priorities as well as of the political interests of their management.
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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

1.1 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AND ITS PURPOSE

For Canada, 1981 was rich in political turmoil, since Prime Minister Trudeau had pledged to give his country a constitution by the end of the year. For Trudeau, the constitution had thus become a personal issue, as well as being a national one. Newspapers featured Trudeau's name prominently each time the constitutional debate was covered. As a result, 1981 was for Canada, a stage where Trudeau, the protagonist, met, battled, threatened, and finally became reconciled with his opponents. The audience in this gigantic theater consisted of the media, which faithfully recorded and further explained to the general public the occurrences taking place in the political arena.

It is thus appropriate to observe how these media performed in their roles as links between the political realm and the public, in 1981.

The study will examine which issues of the constitutional debate are given particular emphasis by three French newspapers from Montreal, on the one hand, and three English newspapers from Toronto, on the other hand.
The purpose of this research is to compare the differences and similarities in the agenda-setting of these dailies, and to assess whether or not there is a correlation between language and choice of issues. Press coverage of the political actors involved in the constitutional controversy will be examined. In order to place the study within its appropriate social context, extensive historical and political background on the Constitution and on both English and French cultures will be provided.

Media are often considered to be reflections of a society's or a culture's worldview. In the case of newspapers, the agenda set by a newspaper indicates which issues newspaper management attributes the most importance or which issues it wishes to promote in the minds of the population. This decision-making, or gatekeeping, in turn, is shaped by the paper's perception of its audience's values and expectations. Thus, a newspaper and its readers mutually influence and reinforce their perception of reality; as a result, both are staunchly rooted in a culture to whose creation they have contributed.

Therefore, it is of primary interest, particularly in Canada where two cultures co-exist, to discover whether newspapers from both communities offer a similar or a divergent agenda of issues to their reading publics.

Such a study is of twofold value. First, with respect to the concept of journalism, an additional dimension to lans-
ective reporting would be indicated if the study shows a
difference in issue-emphasis between French and English dai-
lies. Indeed, the term 'subjective reporting' would attain
another dimension since it would no longer apply strictly to
whether there is an obvious bias in a news story, but it
would take into account whether issues are downplayed or over-
emphasized. Second, both sides could become aware of the
other language group's viewpoint on the constitutional de-
bate, based on which issues prevail in the press coverage.
Thus, the media of both cities of Montreal and Toronto could
try and give an equal emphasis on an issue that is particu-
larly stressed in the other city. As a result, the readers
of each city would gain an understanding of the other city's
perception on the debate. A better understanding of each
other's stance may be in the long run conducive to compre-
mise in the political arena.

1.2 DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1.2.1 Impact of News on Society

Within the last decades, world population has undergone a
tremendous boom, the repercussions of which can be seen in
various social aspects. The underlying mechanisms of societ-
ity for instance, had to readjust to and expand in accordance
with the new situation. One of these social developments is
represented by the mass media whose social role has been in-
creasingly recognized on a worldwide basis, most recently
In 1980, in Unesco's *Green Visions*, *One World: Towards a New World Order* was acknowledged as the root of many recommendations made by the committee which produced the Unesco report.

Indeed, when taking a closer look at the part occupied by the media in society, one is struck that they virtually provide the only informative links between each individual and a large-scale society, such as the one forming the global village.

One could of course contend that there exist other forms and levels of communications which are equally important, such as interpersonal interaction or simply first-hand experience. Although these informational nodes do prevail, their impact is limited by their very nature. 

Word of mouth is a powerful medium, for example, yet, its boundaries are set by both geography and time. Obviously then, the media enjoy a unique place in modern society.

They create a link between each individual and the events occurring outside of the personal and interpersonal boundaries; in doing so, the media are intrinsic to society's dynamics.

On a smaller scale, the media enable society's members to commune with and have a sense of participating within a greater entity, thanks to the presentation of facts, events, and people that make up or participate in the system.
At the political level, all informed people help strengthen the very concept and existence of democracy. James Pope expresses the same view:

The true function of a newspaper in a democracy is to make sure that the democracy can work... The conveying of this information is vital for a manifest reason: people who govern themselves have to know the score... The main function of the press as an institution guaranteed certain constitutional rights, is to protect and strengthen democracy which that constitution was undertaking to assure.¹

Thus, the rationale for this idea is that, based on the information people receive, they are able to form opinions, and eventually take steps towards action. In a democracy, being informed is a necessary condition of—being endowed with a capacity for self-defence as well as an ability to preserve and promote democracy.

In the Canadian political arena, the broadcasting media—TV in particular—have been burdened with the task of providing an 'identity' for Canada. However, the underlying assumption is that the media have the power to shape people’s perception of their own environment and, in this case, a perception of their own nation. Such a notion betrays the belief that the media are not neutral and that they all too easily present a skewed view of reality, which in turn molds their audiences’ perception of reality. James Davis’ research lends support to the hypothesis that public opinion

is more reflective of trends in news coverage rather than what actually takes place. His study involved the comparison between the amount of crime news in newspapers and the local crime rates; no consistent relationship was found between both variables. He was thus led to conclude that public opinion varied with the amount of crime news rather than the actual crime rates. The reasons prompting an editor to include more or less of some news in his paper are numerous and will be explored more deeply later.

However, in the case of a newspaper as a whole, the daily edition is a product of various decision and selection processes. The major reason dictating that a choice be made, is simply that the news staff receives an overload of information due to extremely sophisticated newsgathering techniques. The process by which this wealth of information is filtered at different levels in order to determine what is to become news, is called gatekeeping. This series of decisions results in some events and issues being brought to the public's attention over others; this characteristic of the press is referred to as its agenda-setting function.

---

1.2.2 Gatekeeping and Agenda-Setting

The process of gatekeeping is widely recognized and its impact is extensively discussed in the literature. The agenda-setting theory, as mentioned above, stems from the notion of gatekeeping. The argument goes that if management and other forces determine the type of stories and style of the paper, they also choose which issue should be given extended, little or no coverage at all. The amount of information received by the paper is so high that a screening (i.e., gatekeeping) has to be effected in order to publish a paper of a manageable size and coherence at a reasonable cost. Through this screening, an event is transformed into tomorrow's news, and the paper has set the agenda for its readers, as to what is worth knowing; that is, the paper has determined how much and of which events the reader will become conscious. However, as it has been demonstrated in a case study, newsworthiness is contingent upon an organization's news norms for newstories. For instance, some newspaper management such as in the case of tabloids, will value a news item for its sensationalistic aspect, while others might place local appeal at the top of their norms. Lester notes that:

Accounts of newsworthiness do not present reality, rather, they forget it...Generating newsworthiness has a direct bearing on what appears or fails to appear in the paper.3

In other words, the agenda is set according to the paper's criteria of what is news or not news.

Gatekeeping is also reflected in a multitude of other facets within the publishing environment. In the '30s, Lee Brown conducted a survey of journalists and found that 60% indicated they felt subtle pressure designed to make them slant their dispatches in the direction of the publisher's leanings.

The existence of influences exercised by management appeared in a case study by Altheide in Western City TV stations, he concluded that:

Newsworkers and newsmakers did not agree on the nature and purpose of news. Whereas the former approached the events as news in order to do their jobs, the latter equated news with political action and public respectability.

However, whether he is aware or not, and willingly or unwillingly, the reporter does act as a gatekeeper at the level of the story writing. Tuchman points out that the very structure of new stories, consisting in the inverted pyramid approach with leads as introductions, invites the readers to see what is important from the reporters' standpoint.

A selective reality, rather than a synthetic reality as in literature, news reports exist in and of themselves. They are public documents that lay a world before us.

---


Another example of gatekeeping detected by researchers is found in the careful selection and rejection of letters-to-the-editor that reflect the gatekeepers' political tendencies rather than that of public opinion. A case study confirmed that letters-to-the-editor dealing with topics not identified as newsworthy by the newspaper, are not allowed into the letters column. As a result, although letters-to-the-editor are written by members of the audience, the ones chosen for publishing match the priorities and values held by the editors. The letters column thus represents a skewed version of readers' opinions.

Finally, gatekeeping occurs on another plane: in the selection of pictures and in the assignment of front-page stories. Front-page headlines and pictures are subtle in their influence since they are not as blatantly biased as in an editorial. John Larue concluded from his research that the strength of pictures was that they could not be contradicted even if they contained a heavy editorial comment. Others explain that newspapers use pictures as means of attracting the audience's attention:


Sometimes, the newspapers, in search of an attention-grabbing front-page photograph, also distort the image of candidates. So we are treated to a picture of a smiling Mr. Trudeau, surrounded by admirers and being kissed by a pretty girl. At the same time, we are shown a photograph of a grimacing Mr. Stanfield, fumbling a football that was just thrown to him.

Most people seeing these photographs come to the same conclusion—Mr. Trudeau is admired and attractive while Mr. Stanfield is a figure of fun.

Consequently, by the series of choices that editors and reporters make, gatekeeping is enforced. Obviously, gatekeeping is practised both quantitatively—only a few drops from the incoming flow of information are selected—and qualitatively—the stories, the pictures and the letters published, as well as their location in the edition, mirror the newsmakers' values.

However, although newsmen do occupy a major role in the gatekeeping process, they are to a certain extent, exposed to and influenced by public pressure. First, journalists are themselves products of society, if not of the community for which they are writing; therefore, their stories will be permeated with social norms and values that their audiences share. Secondly, no newspaper can afford to ignore profit or at least financial survival. Hence, it is not in the reporters' and publishers' best interest to oppose community values or to offer stories lacking local appeal. In this same vein, William Rivers acknowledges that journalists

can sometimes be under pressures originating from the public and from what is perceived to be of concern or interest to it. Moreover, serelson further stresses how the economic necessity to hold the audience submits the media to the influence of public opinion:

The reporter or commentator or editor or producer may know or may think he knows what the public wants on a given issue, and to the extent that such knowledge affects what he communicates, to that extent public opinion becomes a determinant of communications. However, this view has been recently challenged by lewis donohew who contends that gatekeepers are not so much influenced by what the audience is interested in, but rather on what they think the publishers want. In a later article, his research findings led him to reassert that the public does not set the agenda for the paper, but that paper publishers and gatekeepers do.

Obviously, both stances contain a certain amount of truth. media gatekeepers do have to heed their publisher’s opinion since their employment depends on him; however, the publisher is in turn influenced by public opinion, since his

11 Rivers, The Opinion Makers, p. 175.


13 Lewis Donohew, Public Opinion Quarterly 31 (Spring) 61.

financial position is contingent on whether the paper appeals to its audience or not. Technically speaking, all decisions regarding content and shape of the next edition are made by the media. The concept of agenda-setting thus emerges as an end product of the gatekeeping process.

One of the early notions of agenda-setting can be found in Cohen's *The Press and Foreign Policy* now much quoted in the agenda-setting literature:

> "[The press] may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about." [1]

Even earlier, back in 1946, Wiggins questioned whether, in devoting ample attention to specific issues, newspapers did not shape their audience's perception of which issue was or was not important. [2] Researchers then became increasingly aware of the media's power not only to attract attention to some issues, but also to downplay or omit others. Further, the public not only learns about an event, but it also assigns to it a prominence according to the page on which it appears, the amount of space it is allocated, and its recurrence in later editions.

McCombs and Shaw are considered the 'classic authorities' in agenda-setting literature; they both define the concept at hand in the following terms:

---


Agenda-setting of the press is the hypothesis that the press itself has some power to establish an agenda of political issues which both candidates and voters come to regard as important. 17

Basically, people will be aware or unaware of, play up or minimize certain issues according to what the mass media choose to do. As Eugene Shaw puts it:

People tend to include or exclude from their cognitions what the media include or exclude from their content. 18

Similarly, if an issue is devoted much coverage, people will perceive it as being of importance. Clearly, the press draws a list of issues which are to be treated because of their valued significance; and in being exposed to this list, the public cannot help but adopt it and make it its own. This theory was tested for the first time by McCombs and Shaw during the 1968 presidential election campaign. The data suggested a very strong relationship between the emphasis placed on different campaign issues by media and voters' evaluation regarding the salience of various campaign topics. 19 This study was more or less duplicated in a totally different setting and time. Siune and Morro observed the

---


agenda-setting for the 1971 Danish elections, and demonstrated that the mass media's performance, in ranking issues during the election campaign, played a major role in establishing the priority of issues in the public's mind.\(^{20}\)

In pointing out to the public which events are worth knowing about, the media put some order and structure into a world which may seem more and more threatening and chaotic to those who are literally submerged by a multitude of messages all day long. Shaw mentions that in some respects, agenda-setting can therefore be regarded as beneficial to the individual and for society.\(^{21}\)

After all, it fulfills a need of the citizens to orientate themselves properly toward their environment, an environment that is perceived by them to be ever expanding and increasingly confusing. Both of these perceptions, in fact, are reinforced by the media themselves.\(^{21}\)

Besides these positive effects enumerated and claimed by agenda-setting theorists, there is another aspect which they insist upon mentioning. Eugene F. Shaw is careful to specify that the impact of agenda-setting is not on people's attitudes but on their cognitions.\(^{22}\) Donald Shaw explains that:

This impact of the mass media — the ability to effect cognitive change among individuals to structure their thinking — has been labeled the

---


\(^{21}\) Eugene Shaw, 'Agenda and Communication Theory,' p. 102.

\(^{22}\) Ibid., p. 97.
Such a subtlety can be found at the heart of Cohen's assertion that the media do not tell us how to think but what to think about. Nevertheless, one cannot possibly develop an attitude towards something of which one is not even aware. Our attitudes, therefore, evolve on the basis of our cognitions. In other words, mass media do not affect our attitudes directly, but by heightening certain issues and personalities while downgrading or altogether neglecting others, they indirectly affect our attitudes. People will consequently not vote for someone who did not receive any press coverage since they will not know anything about this candidate. Likewise, there can be no public opinion on a matter which was not dealt with in the news. Becker and others seemed to understand this reasoning when they wrote that that our attitudes are derived from the information provided in the pages of the paper. Therefore, if the agenda of a newspaper is limited, our attitudes will reflect these limitations.24

23 Donald Shaw et al., The Emergence of Political Issues, p. 3.

Not only newsmen, however, are endowed with the power of setting the agenda. Some also contend that other forces shape and modify the news. For instance, candidates manage to retain a certain degree of control in reporter-dominated debates. Such was the finding of Berchtolt and others, during a Carter-Ford TV political debate taking place during the presidential election of 1976. In fact, there was a 'mix' of control by both candidates and reporters. Candidates are only one of many categories of sources which journalists consult. But the interplay between the press and its sources does affect the press agenda as well. Candidates and sources, in turn, are often subject to pressures from other origins. It was discovered, for example, that during the election campaigns, senators were not only pressured by the media agenda-setters, but also by governors who wanted to shift public attention from one issue to another.

Like the gatekeeping process, agenda-setting occurs within a cycle:

[The Agenda-setting framework] specifies a set of relationships, beginning with the impact of the social system on media institutions, and then on their members, particularly reporters and editors.

---


26 Shaw, McCombs et al., The Emergence of Political Issues, p. 152.

These media operatives make decisions which the evidence shows have impact on the cognitions of the media audience members, so the model takes us to a full circle.\textsuperscript{28}

Therefore, each stage of the cycle reinforces and gives a new impetus to the model.

However, it is important to note that although this cycle is valid as a whole, the dynamics of each stage involve intricacies which have to be examined individually. When the public is exposed to the media agenda, for instance, its response cannot be explained in terms of a simple stimulus-response model. On the contrary, media effect encounters a set of barriers raised by individuals. Some researchers stipulate considerations under which agenda-setting is most likely or unlikely to take place. Schramm and his colleagues mention that exposure alone to media is not sufficient and that a certain level of pre-existing issue sensitivity is required within the individual in order for the effects of agenda-setting to occur.\textsuperscript{29} Yet, one can extrapolate from their analysis, and say that time, too, would play an important role in enhancing the impact of the media agenda on the public. Indeed, each time a new issue is being introduced, people might not be sensitive towards it, but if this issue is repeated day after day, the audience will ev-

\textsuperscript{28} Becker et al., in \textit{Political Communication Issues}, p. 57.

\textsuperscript{29} Lutz Erbring, Edie Goldenberg, Arthur Miller, "Front-Page News and Real World Cues: A New Look at Agenda-Setting by the Media," \textit{American Journal of Political Science} 24 (February 1980):40.
eventually develop a sensitivity for it. Such a reasoning
fits with the idea that media values are adopted as one's
own in cases where nothing is competing from one's past ex-
perience. Thus, even though a person might not have any,
pre-existing sensitivity towards a newly introduced issue,
no/she will perceive it similarly to what the media do since
nothing in his/her past experience will be able to resist
what the media said.

Another distinction is made between three types of sali-
ces which are likely to be affected by the content
stressed in the media: 1) The 'individual' issue salience is
the importance attributed to an issue by an individual, ac-
cording to his/her priorities. 2) The 'perceived' issue sa-
lience is the importance which the individual thinks his en-
vironment is giving to an issue. 3) Finally, the
'community' issue salience is the importance which an issue
actually receives from the community. Studies have provid-
ed evidence that media agenda affected more interper-
discussion than interpersonal salience. Agenda-setting on
the individual level might in fact have its impact only aft-
er interpersonal interactions have occurred, so that each
individual will have already identified which of the media

30 L. John Martin, 'Recent Theory on Mass Media Potential in
Political Campaigns,' American Academy of Political and
Social Sciences Annals 427 (September 1976): 130.

31 Becker et al., in Political Communication, p. 43

32 Ibidem.
issues are the most prevalent in conversations and which should be included in his own agenda. In other words, the individual would shape his own agenda based on the media issues which were mentioned during interpersonal discussions. This importance of informal social communication has not been overlooked. Erbring and others stress the idea that

[informal communication] speeds up dramatically the diffusion of public concern whenever new problems make their way onto the political agenda, at first building upon but eventually superseding the initial 'seedling' effects by the news.33

Yet, another obstacle to agenda-setting is selective perception, whereby an individual's priorities and opinions are so strong that they override the power of the media. The individual will distort and reorient the media agenda in such a way that it will match exactly his own ranking of issues. First, it is believed that people tend to expose themselves to material which they know will interest them and which will be congruent with their set of values. Selective exposure, therefore, is considered to be a limiting factor to the impact of agenda-setting. Readers will select items important to them within the agenda of the paper, while other issues covered by the paper will be overlooked. Such a personal selection diminishes the influence of agenda-setting. As Becker and others suggest it:

Voters used the content of the media to support the vote conclusion they would have reached because of their social predisposition.34

33 Erbring, et al., 'Front-Page News,' p. 46.
Second, people tend to hear only what they wish to hear, i.e., they will discard information which clashes with their opinions whereas they will retain information which agrees with their biases. This concept is well illustrated by the following statement made by a political candidate:

Most of the voters I talk with are far more biased in their political views than the newspaper they read. Whatever the newspapers do, most voters will continue to shut their eyes and ears to all except what they agree with.\footnote{As quoted in Rivers, \textit{The Opinion Makers}, p. 186.}

Lang and Lang also realized through their studies that televised debates did not alter drastically, if at all, viewers' political preferences. Instead, images were adjusted to preference by turning to congruent sources of information and by isolation, selective perception and personalization.\footnote{Kurt Lang and Gladys Engel Lang, 'Ordeal by Debate: Viewer Reactions,' \textit{Public Opinion Quarterly} 25 (Summer 1963): 287.}

Obviously, the phenomena of selective exposure, perception and retention do exist; however, they have their own limitations as well. One of these boundaries is set by the informal interaction or interpersonal communication, as it was mentioned above. Indeed, since the media agenda provides a community with a common background for discussion, members will necessarily talk about issues in which they perceive the community as most interested. Therefore, when dealing with issues from the media agenda, individuals interacting

\footnote{Pope, \textit{Understanding the Press}, p. 100.}
with one another remain on safe grounds as to the common experience they share together.

However, there is some doubt as to whether all media do set a common clear-cut agenda. Tipton and others found that papers, television and radio did not present as consistent a view of issues in the state campaign election as McCombs and Shaw found in the presidential election. Tipton's results revealed clear print-broadcast differences; in so far as papers generally emphasized one set of issues (the correlation between newspaper issues was also very high), while radio and TV stressed another.\(^3^7\) Further, not only did people obtain more information from newspapers but their agenda of issues resembled most closely that of the papers. It must be noted that the lack of similarity between agenda from newspaper, television, and radio, may be due to a too restrictive definition of 'agenda.' Cormley reports results of an agenda-setting study which indicate that

If an agenda is defined as a rank ordering of twenty-five specific state issues, five newspapers combined do not set the agenda for state senators who read them, but when agendas are defined in terms of issue areas, there is substantial agreement.\(^3^8\)

\(^3^7\) Leonard Tipton, Roger D. Hancey and John K. Bashehart, "Media Agenda-Setting in City and State Election Campaigns," *Journalism Quarterly* 52 (Spring 1975): 13, 22.

Therefore, Tipton's results might in fact have been that TV, radio and papers did indeed set the same agenda of broad issue areas for the public. However, in terms of agenda-setting effect, other researchers have further documented the newspapers' edge over television. Even with newspapers, though, frequent readers will be more influenced than occasional readers, and will therefore be likely to adopt the same ranking of issues as their newspapers.

Finally, some argue that these results have been inconclusive and that therefore, it appears that the public's agenda has never been set by the media. A study by Kaid, Kale and Williams, for instance, revealed no significant correlation among media coverages of Ford's campaign visit to Oklahoma City on October 23, 1974. Although the correlations between media agendas and public issues were above .50, they were not significant.

As this brief overview of the literature seems to suggest, researchers generally agree on the validity of the agenda-setting theory, although they recognize some of its


40 A.H. Miller et al., 'Type-Set Politics: Impact of Newspapers on Public Confidence,' American Political Science Review 73 (March 1979): 77-78.

countervailing influences such as those originating from news sources and from the public. However, as it was argued, these limitations do not in any manner impede the agenda-setting process. Rather they are part of the cycle which characterizes it. Such a view is challenged by people who pit the notion of agenda-setting against the concept of the press as a mirror of society. Indeed, it was once thought that journalists merely selected and covered stories identified as being of import to society. The media consequently presented a mirror of society's interests. However, in the 1960's, what is now the more prevalent view of news emerged, which suggests that journalists select particular events over others, according to specific guidelines of newsworthiness. By the same token, critics have remarked that in choosing to report a fact, a reporter not only confers status to it, but also defines and shapes that event.

Although these views have traditionally been opposed to one another they are far from incompatible if they are re-considered in the light of a 'social cycle.' As products of their environment and their society, journalists will define newsworthiness in such a fashion that it will reflect society's interests. As a result, although these reporters

---


choose the events to be covered, their criteria for selection are shaped by social values.

Besides, society has become so intricate and complex that there is no consensus as to how society itself should be defined. It is now reduced to a concept which varies from one individual to another, depending upon each individual's perception of his/her surroundings. Man's reality is always shaped by experience. In pre-media times, experience was personal, mythic, or traditional. Nowadays, however, experience is shaped by forces which reach beyond the personal level especially by mass media which communicate a wealth of information about events not directly experienced by individuals. These events reported daily in the media help shape a person's concept of society. In the past, synthetic reality found boundaries in personal experience, nowadays, our perception of reality is nourished by the media. Moreover, there now prevails the highly questionable notion that since people have access to more information, they will come to grips with the 'genuine reality.'

Such a gap between reality and the media's induced perception of it is especially noticeable when comparing two cultures' interpretations of reality. Each will report and interpret facts and events according to its priorities, interests, and biases. And where else but in the media will these differences of perceptions between cultural groups be most evident?
1.2.3 Linguistic and Cultural Differences

Two peoples founded Canada, the English and the French; and although Canada has been a nation for many years, deep-rooted regionalism based to a considerable extent on linguistic differences has prevailed since. Thus, French communities have stood in virtual cultural isolation and self-sufficiency with respect to the rest of Canada, while English Canada grew increasingly restless as to how it should approach its French counterpart. Within a short time, Quebec and Ontario, being the most populous, emerged as the representatives of the French and English communities respectively. Mildred Schwartz has provided us with brief but useful regional profiles of the two provinces. She declares that the Quebec population is predominantly French and Catholic. While Quebec is highly industrialized, the average income of its residents is quite low. Ontario residents, on the other hand, are largely of British stock, but both foreign and internal migration are also important. It has a large cross section of ethnic groups. Also, it is wealthy because it is heavily industrialized.**4

This linguistic divergence is particularly marked in the political arena. Again, Schwartz asserts that

where one lives has been a principal determinant of how one views the federal government. When we examine the relation with party ties, we find that they have some impact, but quite secondary to that.

---

She supports her claim with her findings which indicate that Quebec has consistently shown the least positive orientation to the federal government, while Ontario is highly oriented to it.\(^{46}\)

Furthermore, regionalism might be dramatized by the growth of metropolises. These big cities have gradually come to embody the very province which they are located. Instead of linking various parts of the country with the metropolitan features that they share, these giant cities have come to symbolize cultural differences and thus reinforce pre-existing barriers of a political and physical nature.\(^{47}\)

As a result, Toronto is often thought of as the paradigm of English culture, whereas Montreal is viewed as its French counterpart. With this profound cultural split besetting Canada's heartland, remedies have been sought in order to provide both societies with a common experience.

The media are believed to have the power of unifying people and promoting tolerance among them. Mansfield expresses just such an opinion on the media's role in a society:

\[\text{[The media] facilitate communication among people, especially among a large people, and thus make that people more of a people, a whole that is conscious of itself and that, being so, can move together.}\]\(^{48}\)

\(^{45}\) Ibidem, p. 289.

\(^{46}\) Ibidem, p. 229, 256.

\(^{47}\) Ibidem, p. 368.
such was undoubtedly the idea underlying the much proclaimed tenet that the media must provide Canada with an 'identity.' However, many are skeptical as to the real impact of the press on cultural unification, especially with regards to the French-English problem. Solange Chaput-Rolland, a veteran Quebec reporter submits that both French and English journalists are not really interested in acting as the missionaries for national unity. This unwillingness would seem to account (at least in part) for media from both cultures promoting sometimes opposing viewpoints. In such a case as the constitutional debate, these divergences between both presses are particularly obvious; however, they only offer a dim reflection of the basic cultural differences between French and English.

48 Harvey C. Dunsfield, Jr., 'The Media World and Democratic Repression,' Government and Opposition 14 (Summer 1979): 318.

49 Solange Chaput-Rolland, Recours, vol. 6: Les Maudits Journalistes (Ottawa, Ont.: Le Cercle du Livre de France, l'esc, 1975), p. 120.
Chapter II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

After having provided such an extensive background in the area of agenda-setting, attention must also be directed to other equally important aspects of the study. Indeed, the historical context of the debate, as well as the roles played by culture and language during the controversy, are key elements to a good understanding of the media behaviour during the debate.

Since the constitutional debate is the focus of the research at hand, appropriate facts of Canadian historical development are reviewed. The special status of Canada, and the source and evolution of the constitutional debate will be inspected in light of the French-English controversy. A look at more recent developments in the constitutional debate will be given, particularly those events which occurred during the time period under study. Further, the role of language rights in the controversy will also be given the attention it deserves, since it occupied a predominant place in the French-English constitutional dispute.

Finally, a comprehensive background on past studies related to linguistic differences in the Canadian press will
he provided, particularly regarding philosophies of reporting and coverage of events.

2.2 RESEARCH RELATED TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL DEBATE

2.2.1 Overview of the events leading up to the 1867 debate

Canada possesses a few unique features which have determined or at least influenced its evolution as a nation. During pre-Conederation days, it became inhabited by two peoples who widely differed in spirit, mentality and origin. These two kinds of settlers brought two different sets of lifestyles, languages and customs, and this meant that cultural diversity became an important factor in the history of Canada. Even though these two cultures co-existed within the same country, they developed their own priorities, interests and approaches to the practice of politics.60 Even in the legal domain, Quebec retained the right to carry its system of private law derived from France. Notwithstanding these internal differences, Canada strove towards establishing a solid confederation.

With the British North American Act of 1867 the constitutional development of Canada was brought one step further. Under this Act, Canada [composed of only four provinces] became a self-governing dominion within the British empire.

that Canada acquired the status of a full sovereign state, and was entitled to conduct its own foreign policy independently from Great Britain. However, since Canadians failed to agree on an amending procedure, neither the British North America Act (BNA), nor the Statute of Westminster specified an explicit amending procedure. It was assumed that the British parliament was to be the amending authority.

The lack of formal amendment power in Canada resulted from a distrust between French and English people. Indeed, Quebec had traditionally been wary of placing its constitutional guarantees in the hands of the English-speaking majority and preferred to maintain this authority with the British parliament.

In order to provide Canada with an amending procedure on which everyone agreed, several fruitless debates were initiated during the period between 1920 and 1970.

The need for an agreement was particularly dramatized in the 1960s by the Quebec Quiet Revolution, which expressed the need for the French province to retain greater control over its own affairs. This mood for autonomy which then prevailed in Quebec, is reflected in its attitude during the new round of federal-provincial discussions on a constitutional revision in the 1960s.

From 1968 until 1970, federal-provincial-constitutional conferences unfolded and attempted to progress more towards a constitutional revision. The conference of 1968 focused
on the protection of Human Rights through their constitutional entrenchment. The issue of Human Rights is directly related to federalism since the BNA divides the rights in question between the jurisdiction of provincial legislatures and that of the federal parliament. Some contended that human rights could be best protected if they were entrenched constitutionally. It should be noted that, up until 1970, attention was essentially devoted to what was perceived as being the substantial problems of the Canadian Federation, such as regional economic disparities and language rights.

Yet, early in 1971, several provinces insisted that discussions attend to an amending formula. Consequently, another formula was submitted at the Victoria Conference in February 1971, but was rejected by Quebec once again. The Victoria Charter was unacceptable to Quebec since it did not address the problems which had initially prompted Quebec to request a revision of the political system. Moreover, there were continuing fears in Quebec that any amending formula would place Quebec's political and constitutional future at the mercy of the other provinces and of the federal government.

Concern for a constitutional change was then suddenly revived in 1976, after the election of the Parti Quebecois (PQ), a separatist party, in Quebec.

Ottawa appointed a Task Force on Canadian Unity in late summer 1977 which was to design a two-stage approach to the
revising of the Constitution. The first phase was to deal with subjects defined as being under the federal jurisdiction in the MNA. In addition, an earlier enacted Bill of Rights was also to be refined and given consent and ultimately entrenched in the constitution. The date of completion for this first stage was set for July 1, 1979. It was anticipated that the second stage would be longer (the date of completion was put on July 1, 1981), since it dealt with matters which would require federal-provincial cooperation and assent.

As planned in the first phase, in 1973, Trudeau released the text of a constitutional amendment, which primarily centered on matters falling under federal legislative powers. However, along with the text was a Charter of Rights and Freedoms which, it was anticipated, would raise violent reactions, especially on the part of Quebec. This Charter included some provisions on Languages Rights. It postulated a new right to education in the language of one's choice—French or English—to be entrenched in the province. The provinces could indeed be expected to counter that these proposals infringed upon their law-making competence. In the case of Quebec, these provisions clashed with Provincial legislation which had been designed and promulgated to protect French language rights in the province.
2.2.2 **Summary of events before the climax of the debate.**

Looking back on these events leading to the final dispatching of the constitutional package to London, England, the number of setbacks, political maneuverings and contradictions is particularly striking. The major developments took place during the years 1980–1981. Indeed, with the May 1980 Referendum, Quebeckers knew that they were not only deciding on Quebec's political status within the confederation, but also on whether Quebec would partake in the provincial-federal constitutional negotiations. Thus, when the "no" forces won in the Quebec Referendum and the strong forces for Quebec separation were denied a mandate, the spirit of federalism received a major boost all across Canada. The Quebec Premier, Levesque, on the other hand, announced that he would comply with his people's wish to enter constitutional negotiations with the federal government. He added, however, that he would aim at changing federalism so as to satisfy Quebecers and in a way that would benefit Quebec. Such a declaration was a hint that Quebec would not compromise on matters that it perceived of vital importance to itself.

In the following month, the provinces agreed to meet with the federal government during the summer, for a series of talks, and that these were to end in a four-day conference.

51 The following account of the constitutional debate is a synthesis of selected articles from the Globe and Mail, The Winnipeg Free Press, The Vancouver Sun, and La Re- voir.
of First Ministers in early September. Although all parties
seemed open to discussions, Trudeau threatened that the go-

genment would undertake unilateral action if no compromise
was reached or the talks failed. His argument was that up
to that time, there had been a fifty-year stalemate between
Ottawa and the provinces with respect to arriving at agree-
ments on a new constitution.

Consequently, even before talks had begun, both Levesque
and Trudeau displayed vindictive and uncompromising atti-
tudes which threatened the very spirit of negotiations.
Furthermore, in setting the deadline for an agreement in
September, Trudeau provoked resentment among provincial min-
isters who felt Trudeau was using time pressure to bully
them into a compromise favorable to the federal government.
As a result, time itself became an issue within the consti-
tutional debate; politicians accused one another of exploit-
ing deadlines or of delaying meetings as part of their polit-
tical plays.

Notwithstanding these petty accusations, constitutional
talks unfolded during the summer of 1980 and culminated in
the First Ministers' meeting in Ottawa. However, these neg-

otiations ended in a failure to agree on a major package of
constitutional rights. The last day, the provincial Premi-
ers met for breakfast and reached a consensus subsequently
called the 'Breakfast Agreement' which mainly consisted in
watered down demands. This consensus also comprised an am-
ending formula requiring the approval of seven out of ten provinces with at least 50% of the population and with the provinces having the right to opt-out of an amendment. Trudeau rejected the package for various reasons, one being that he wanted to preserve the entrenchment of Human Rights.

The constitutional package then encountered obstacles from another source. If the House of Commons had unanimously approved a transfer of control of the nation's constitution from the UK to Canada, it was split on the government's proposals that a Charter of Rights be enshrined in the constitution. After an eleven-day debate on the motion, the Liberals invoked closure, contending that there were other matters to be dealt with. A parliamentary constitution committee was set up, however, to study the constitutional proposals put forward by the Commons. Those proposals comprised the patriation of the UN with an entrenched Charter of Rights and a controversial amending formula allowing for future national referenda on changes.

After the disastrous September conference, the provinces were divided. Eight of them opposed the federal package, whereas New Brunswick and Ontario supported it. Ontario was thus mostly associated with the federal government's stance.

The dissenting provinces, on the other hand, worked on finding an amending formula acceptable to all. Their rationale was that such an agreement would enable the patriation of the constitution and that the Charter of Human and Language
Rights could be settled at home later. Finally, in April 1891, after many difficulties, the provinces agreed on what came to be called the 'Vancouver formula' which offered in fact the same formula as did the 'Breakfast consensus'. They then sought to obtain a meeting with Trudeau in order to discuss this alternative amending formula. Trudeau refused to negotiate in a meeting which included only the eight provinces, since New Brunswick and Ontario had not been invited. In response to Trudeau's rejection, the eight provinces launched an advertising campaign to publicize and get public support for their cause.

The final constitutional debate in the Canadian Parliament started in February 1891, but it was so heated and long that Parliament agreed to suspend the debate until April 21-23 and to then resume debate once more for two final days after the Supreme Court of Canada ruled on the legality of Ottawa's proposals. Trudeau had indeed offered to have the Supreme Court decide on whether the federal constitutional package was legal, because the Liberals were under increasing criticisms for unilateral action. Therefore, after Parliament approved of the final form of the proposed new constitution, the Supreme Court still had to be consulted. However, the Supreme Court delayed its decision until September, since it recessed for the summer. At the same time, the Prime Minister's hope of proclaiming a new constitution on July 1 was frustrated. Trudeau nevertheless pledged to
abide by the Supreme Court's decision and to act accordingly. The eight dissident provinces, however, declared they would bring the case to the British Parliament if the Supreme Court ruled the proposals legal; and with this goal in mind, they met in the summer to plan a strategy for it.

On September 28, 1981, the long-awaited Supreme Court ruling brought more havoc into the debate. The decision was not unequivocal; the Court ruled 7 to 2 that the federal government was acting legally in its resolution to patriate the R.A. Act but that it went against the conventions that a substantial measure of provincial approval was needed. As a result, each side claimed victory. Yet, the impact of the ruling was noticeable in Trudeau's and the provinces' willingness to soften their stands on the constitution. Quebec, nonetheless, was an exception. Levesque's reaction was violent. He vowed that the Quebec National Assembly would reject the federal government's constitutional proposals even if they passed in both British and Canadian parliaments. Provincial Liberal leader Claude Ryan gave Levesque full support since he felt, like the PQ, that Quebec's constitutional powers were at stake. The National Assembly then overwhelmingly approved a resolution rejecting the federal constitutional package.

In spite of these protests, Quebec still participated in the last provincial-federal meeting set on November 2, after much haggling over dates. Trudeau threatened it would be
the last meeting before the package would be dispatched to London. On November 5, the conference ended in an agreement between Trudeau and the provinces but once again without the participation of Quebec. Both the federal and the provincial sides yielded on some areas in order to come to a compromise. The government package was to consist in the patriation of the CNA Act with the inclusion of the amending formula suggested by the provinces and a weakened Charter of Rights. This new constitutional package still had to be debated for two days and approved by the Commons. It was then to be sent to the Queen who would then ask the British Parliament to pass a legislation yielding to Canada its authority to amend the document.

Yet, once more in Canadian history, Quebec withdrew from signing a constitutional proposal on which the federal government and all the other provinces agreed. This time, Quebec's reasons for not signing were that the agreement did not contain provisions guaranteeing minority language rights, nor individuals' rights to move freely between provinces to seek work. Finally, the accord did not mention fiscal compensation for provinces opting out of national programs. Levesque was furious and returned to Quebec hinting that a provincial referendum would be held on the agreement. In a now famous speech to the National Assembly, he asserted that Quebec was 'alone.' This theme of isolation was later used by the PQ as an emotional appeal to the peo-
role of Quebec. However, polls gave evidence that Quebecers fully supported the constitutional package. Ryan and his Liberals also ceased to back up Levesque after the latter said he would boycott most federal-provincial meetings on the constitution.

In a final attempt towards an agreement, Trudeau offered a compromise to Quebec in mid-November. The federal government showed it was willing to negotiate a proposal that would be constitutionally acceptable to Quebec. Thus, the proposed package was a response to the three reasons Quebec gave for breaking the talks: it limited minority language rights, granted special status for Quebec on mobility rights, and allowed it financial compensation when opting out of programs affecting culture and language. Levesque ignored these compromises on the part of the federal government and persisted in claiming that Quebec was victim of an 'anglophone conspiracy.' He continued to refuse to participate in any constitutional talks. As a last resource, Levesque contended that Quebec's veto right remained since the seven provinces broke their contract and Quebec was no longer tied by it either. The French Premier thus demanded to suspend the constitutional debate in Parliament until an agreement was reached, not only by anglophone provinces, but also by Quebec. Ottawa's response came in the form of a letter from Trudeau where he explained that since the Supreme Court required 'substantial provincial support,' one
province alone could not effect a veto. Moreover, Trudeau contended that Quebec had surrendered its veto power when it signed its accord with the seven provinces. Being rebuffed in such a fashion, Quebec pursued the matter in the Quebec Court of Appeal in the hope that the case would land in the Supreme Court. Although the constitutional package was cleared on December 8 and dispatched to England with a Charter of human and language rights along with an amending formula, such a victory for Trudeau and the anglophone provinces cost them the political alienation of Quebec. Such isolation was not due to federal lack of flexibility so much as Quebec's inability to have a reason for defying the government in an area which it wanted under its authority: language rights.

2.1.3 Language Rights: a cause for Quebec's reluctance.

Long before the constitutional debate, language issues were a source of conflict between Quebec and the federal government. The Quebec government interpreted the BNA Act differently than did its federal counterpart, particularly in the area of language in education. When Bill 22 was being debated in Quebec, in 1975, Jerome Choquette, then Minister of Education, declared that

---

32 The following account is based on a collation of articles from *The Globe and Mail*, *The Vancouver Sun*, *The Winnipeg Free Press*, and *Le Devoir*.
Freedom of choice in education is something that is not necessarily a basic fundamental right.\textsuperscript{53} The main thrust of Bill 22, however, was to proclaim French as the official language of Quebec. Yet, critics were concerned with the impact and the legality of its provisions on language in education. At the Vancouver meeting of the Canadian Teachers Federation in July 1976, no consensus was reached on bilingualism in education, and Bill 22 was violently attacked by delegates from other provinces. The gap between both parties widened, when the Quebec Supreme Court ruled in April that Bill 22 did not violate the constitutional guarantees in the BNA Act, since these concerned religious and not linguistic rights in education. As a result, Quebec displayed self-confidence with respect to its ability to pass its own language policies.

However, as the constitutional talks became more important, the federal government already indicated its desire to entrench language rights within the constitution so as to override provincial legislation on the language issue in schools. In 1977, while the French province was debating another 'language bill' called Bill \textsuperscript{401}, Levesque called a meeting of all provinces in order to discuss an agreement that would give French schooling to immigrants from Quebec in anglophone provinces, and English education to immigrants from anglophone provinces in Quebec. Levesque's deal was

referred to, on his part, as a reciprocal bargain. Levesque's attempt to strike an agreement with the other provinces ran counter to Bill 101 which proposed severely restrictive measures against English schools, in order to limit the non-French population of Quebec. Yet, such an insistence on Levesque's part to come to an accord on language rights with the other provinces can be easily explained. Education was until then wholly under the provincial constitutional competence under the BNA Act. Yet, Trudeau had seen hints that he wanted to enshrine the language of education right in the constitution in order to ensure that each parent could send his child to a school with the language of his choice. Quebec had heretofore rejected any talk on such amendments and preferred individual agreements negotiated between each province and Quebec. The rationale for this approach was undoubtedly that if Quebec involved the federal government in matters pertaining to language rights in education, it would simultaneously recognize that language in education should fall under the federal jurisdiction.

All First Ministers met together in August 1977, a few days before Bill 101 was passed in the National Assembly. Although the nine provinces rejected Levesque's proposal for reciprocal agreements on minority Language School, they signed an accord that ensured schooling in French whenever the number of students warranted. Levesque nonetheless asserted that such a failure meant that English children mov-
ing to Quebec after the Quebec language law was passed would be unable to attend school in English. He added that he would allow immigrants to go to English institutions if they came from provinces which signed the agreement with Quebec.

After he refused to deal with the Prime Minister on matters regarding language rights in schools, Levesque made a final attempt to reach an agreement with the nine other provinces. In return for any compromise made by the anglophone provinces, Quebec promised to modify Bill 101 in certain aspects. Such persistence in Quebec's behaviour reflects its determination to retain the power to control the language of education of its people. The federal alternative, on the contrary, left to the parents the choice of language in education.

During the final provincial meeting in February 1978, a language rights pact was reached, ensuring that members of minority groups would have the right to education in their own language. Levesque agreed in principle to this, although he refused to sign it. Since the implementation of the agreement was left to each province, the Quebec province did not see any need to alter Bill 101 which required English-speaking newcomers from the rest of Canada to attend French schools.

With the new legislation, children needed 'certificates of admissibility' if they were to attend English schools. These certificates were generally available to children
whose parents were educated in English in Quebec or who lived there when the Bill was passed. Bill 101 embraced other areas as well. In addition, it affected businesses which had to undergo a certain amount of 'francization.' Although this bill seems generally to be drastic in its impact, some have argued that it would allow Quebec to retain its identity within the Canadian Confederation, thereby diminishing any desire to secede from the Federation.

However, others such as Herbert Grubel contend that, paradoxically, bilingualism did more to harm Canadian unity than to preserve it. Indeed, bilingualism was originally envisaged as enabling citizens to deal with their governments in their own language. The hope was to encourage the migration of Quebec people if French was spoken elsewhere. Thus, thanks to bilingualism, French and English would no longer be located in geographically distinct locations, but each people could preserve its language and customs regardless of district or region. Grubel further asserts that in fact, migration was threatening the French culture in Quebec. Bilingualism made it easier for English to move to Quebec and avoid learning a new language, but the reverse was not true; French had more difficulties retaining their language in anglophone provinces. This disparity in the way French and English-speaking Canadians benefited from bilin-

---

54 Herbert Grubel, 'The Impact of Bill 101: It May Be the Saviour of Confederation,' The Vancouver Sun 28 July 1977, p. 4.
equalism led Quebec to take drastic steps. Bill 101 was precisely devised to stop the trend of bilingualism which would have ultimately led to the demise of the French culture. Also, it sought to stop the drop in enrolment in the French schools of Quebec by addressing the issues of language in education, and by imposing restrictions on those eligible to attend English schools. Consequently, Bill 101 might well have allowed for the survival and preservation of the French culture and Quebec within the Canadian Confederation. Bilingualism, on the other hand, might have forced those who wished to preserve the French culture into political decisions and actions beyond the framework of the Federation.

Both Quebec language laws were attacked by the federal government. The Supreme Court of Canada thus ruled in 1979 that

[Bill 101] challenged statutory provisions in direct violation of section 133 of the BNA Act and it was beyond the competence of Quebec Legislature to modify unilaterally prescriptions of that section.55

The judgment restored English as an official language in the National Assembly and in the courts of Quebec; it did not specify whether municipalities, school boards and other agencies should also have English as an official language. Only in 1981, did the Supreme Court decide that the BNA did not require municipalities and school boards in Quebec to

conduct their affairs in both French and English. Although this ruling indicated a victory for Quebec, the French province hardly rejoiced over it, since it was already deeply involved in defining its language rights within the context of the constitutional debate.

During the first provincial-federal meeting in June 1830, Levesque warned that the Constitution should not invade provincial jurisdiction over education by saying that English and French Canadians had a right to attend a school of their choice. Levesque was opposed to enshrining the language rights in the constitution and held his stance until the very last constitutional meeting. He also cited the federal government's minority school rights as one of his reasons for refusing to sign the constitutional proposals. Although later Trudeau offered Quebec a compromise limiting minority language education rights, Levesque remained hostile to the proposals and turned down all the federal offers to cooperate.

There is room for doubt whether Levesque had been negotiating in good faith right from the start and whether he had not overreacted with respect to the entrenchment of language rights in order to blame Quebec's isolation on the federal government. Yet, language rights have been a sensitive issue in Quebec, particularly since the French culture perceived itself as being threatened by an overflow of English imperialism.
Quebec needed to reassert its own identity and culture within the context of Canada, and since language is thought of embodying a culture, it was important that the French language be protected, at least within Quebec. Moreover, if as mentioned above, a language is part of a culture, so too are media carriers of culture. They as such as the language reflect features and values of a society. Consequently, the study of these groups of media rooted within different cultures point to differences and similarities which mirror those existing between the French and English cultures.

2.3 THE LINGUISTIC IMPACT ON THE CANADIAN PRESS

2.3.1 Characterization of French and English Journalists

The nature of the Press in a society bears the imprint of social values, yet it also reflects the journalistic standards, ethics and philosophies to which reporters adhere within this particular culture. In the case at hand, French have often been contrasted with English journalists in their views of their own roles. Hawley L. Black found that, in general, English journalists valued objectivity in their reports of French Canadian events; French reporters, on the other hand, preferred to interpret English Canadian facts to their audience.\(^{56}\) In the same vein, a larger proportion of English than French thought that their readers would most

value the informing function of their paper. As one can see, French reporters place more emphasis on 'editorializing' and 'interpreting,' while the English stress hard news reporting and 'straight facts.' Two of Arthur Siegel's studies confirm this self-image that news men have. In this study on the coverage of the Federal Political Constitutional Conference in 1968, Siegel found a strong emotional tone in French stories, whereas English media offered no such kind of coverage. Also, in his study on the newspaper coverage of the FLQ crisis in 1970, Siegel detected a fair amount of intellectual input by French journalists and none by English news men. However, in the FLQ crisis period, French papers displayed a neutral stand towards separatists, while their English counterparts were highly critical of separatists. Again, in their Quebec Referendum Coverage, English media were more likely to offer evaluative comments than did French media.

In short, although English news men value 'objective reporting' more than French reporters do, ultimately, both sides do offer a certain amount of bias and opinions within their press coverage. English might slant their reports through their choice of words, while French overtly express an opinion within a new story. In either case, the coverage...


58 Ibidem, pp. 70-1
of events is not free from bias.

Black also points out that usually French journalists were more highly educated than English news reporters—most of whom had a post-graduate training while the English did not.59 Of course, French journalists were in turn generally more educated than other Quebecers, and since among the French, the better educated are often more nationalistic,60 one can suspect that French newsmen would take issues involving Quebec more at heart than other Quebecers normally would. Aside from these divergences in philosophies and profiles between French and English reporters, the media themselves bear striking differences in format, story types, and issues.

2.3.2 News coverage comparison between media from both cultures

One marked difference between the two sets of media appears in the amount of space devoted to letters to the editor. Arthur Siegel states that English papers offered 88% more letter space than French papers did.61 Such a characteristic might go hand in hand with the journalists' differences in philosophies. French newsmen believe in editorializing.
their reas in order to help their audience shape an attitude towards an issue; yet, these papers do not allow too many of their readers to have their opinions printed in the letter column. Such behaviour may indicate that French papers have a condescending attitude towards their audience; they find it necessary to orient their readers' opinions as if they could, not do it themselves, and they do not value their audience's ideas enough to allot as much letter space as the English media do. English papers, on the other hand, rate the delivery of 'straight news' highly; and they offer their audience wide possibilities to have their views published.

Beside these differences in format, papers from both languages differ in their selection and emphasis of national news. French newspapers tend to be preoccupied with the affairs of their province and English language newspapers to center on matters affecting their nation. 62 However, among English papers, Ontario papers publish larger amounts of Quebec news than papers from other anglophone provinces. 63 This fact may be explained by the geographical closeness of the two provinces. Yet, in general, English papers covered more news on other provinces than French papers did, and


63 Jean Bruce, A Content Analysis of Thirty Canadian Daily Newspapers Published during the Period January 1-March 31, 1965 with a Comparative Study of Newspapers Published in 1960 and 1955: Report presented to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, June 1966, p. 93.
this gap widens as time elapses. Further, French newspapers seemed more interested in bilingual and bicultural news than were English publications. These basic differences in storytypes are understandable since they mainly correspond to each province's own interests. Similarly, issues vary in emphasis, according to language.

Arthur Siegel makes note in two of his studies that French language papers attached more importance to personalities while English papers stressed the role of institutions. Moreover, French papers devoted much attention to the province of Quebec, while English counterparts placed the emphasis on Canadian Unity. Similarly, in Siegel's content analysis of the coverage of the Federal Constitutional Conference in 1969, French newspapers were found to insist on the international role of Quebec whereas English newspapers showed interest in the safeguards of human and language rights. These emphases are likely to be different in the present constitutional debate, since the interests of Quebec and the rest of Canada have changed.

Now, Quebec is most likely to stress language rights while


65 Black, 'French and English Journalists,' p. 204.

66 Dick MacDonald, ed, Confederation Dialogue, pp. 70-1, and in Siegel, 'French and English Broadcasting,' p. 4.

67 Ibidem.

68 In MacDonald, ed, Confederation Dialogue, p. 70.
the anglophone press might stress other minority rights. Other researches in the past suggest that the issues which are given prominence in the media are those which reflect that society's interests or concerns. In his study of the FLQ crisis coverage, for instance, Siegel notes that negotiations were emphasized in the Quebec press and that manhunt, on the other hand, was a major theme of the anglophone press. Thus, the two societies exhibited different attitudes in face of the FLQ events: the French people worked towards a resolution of the crisis through talks and negotiations with the terrorists, while the English people thought of the resolution of the crisis in terms of apprehending the culprits.69

More recently, a group of researchers indicated that a regional and a linguistic agenda existed with respect to political issues. Although integration issues are of national importance, Quebec displayed more interest in them than the rest of the country did.70 With all these differences dividing the French from the English press, one may question the power of the Canadian press news agency and its unifying role in Canada.

69 Siegel, "Canadian Newspaper Coverage of the FLQ," p. 70.
2.3.3 Role of the CP wire service amidst these differences

The Canadian Press (CP) was relied upon to ensure the flow of information effectively across regional borders; however, the main reason for its fleet in failing to do so is that the editing of wire services was conducted at the local paper level. During the FLQ crisis, for example, CP failed to act as a nationalizing agent, because newsmen were careful to edit all the information even when the papers were virtually dependent on the wire service. Moreover, although CP provided a large number of new stories about other provinces, it was found that most Quebec papers published stories written by local staffs and written about Quebec matters. This scarcity of information about other provinces or about the other culture, plagues the media to such an extent that a gulf separates the French press from the English press, as Solange Chaput- Rolland puts it:

As long as our societies accept their respective solitudes by avoiding opportunities to communicate, the press will reflect the negative attitudes which pervade our country.

Media have often been thought of as the representatives of their cultures, as 'extensions' of their society, and although the bulk of the research suggest a drastic isol-
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71 Siegel, 'Canadian Newspaper Coverage of the FLQ,' p. 237.
72 Jean Bruce, *Content Analysis of Thirty Canadian Newspapers,* p. 100.
73 Chaput-Rolland, 'Les Naudits Journalistes,' p. 113.
74 Ibidem, p. 118.
tion of the two presses in Canada, the majority of Canadian journalists are satisfied with their papers' news coverage of English-French relations. Interestingly, these same reporters (French and English) tended to see the function of the press as interpreting one cultural group to the other or as acting as a link between the two Canadian societies. The Goldfarb research shows that the population at large, however, views the press as performing poorly in terms of representing the other side's views to people. Paul Bernier also contends that the coverage of Quebec in the anglophone press reinforces prejudices that the English community already holds about the French province.

As is apparent in this overview of the literature, scholars and the Canadian population agree that the French and English media do not share much in common and represent two isolated worlds. Nevertheless, if this gap between the two presses is harmful to the formation of a Canadian identity, it is conducive to the shaping of a sound cultural identity for both the French and English peoples. Indeed, cultural identities emerge in relation to one another:

Usually, identities concern different compartments of life and do not conflict with one another, but sometimes one identity is reinforced through being set against other groups—... French Canadian

75 Black, "French and English Canadian Journalists," p. 204.
76 In MacDonald, ed, Confederation Dialogue, p. 57.
Consequently, if these differences between French and English media threaten Canadian identity, they favor cultural identity, which in turn, might ensure the unity of two different but satisfied peoples in Canada.

2.4 HYPOTHESES

Several research hypotheses can be generated from this survey of the literature. Obviously, it is hypothesized that French and English newspapers are likely to display different agendas which would reflect each province's own preoccupations and priorities in the constitutional debate. French newspapers are thus likely to devote more coverage on the Charter of Rights, minority language schooling and language rights, Bill 101, and Canadian duality, since these are issues vital to the preservation of the French culture. Moreover, political themes such as Quebec veto, Quebec Referendum of 1980, opting-out formula, and fiscal compensation are equally likely to receive more coverage in Quebec than in Ontario since they affect the defence of Quebec's political powers and rights.

Furthermore, based on previous findings, the following hypotheses will be tested: French media are likely to attach more importance to personalities, while English media are

---

likely to make higher mention of institutions. Also, the French press uses CP wire stories far less than the English press does. And finally, English newspapers will publish many more letters-to-the-editors than French newspapers will.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY.

The content analysis in this study involved six newspapers, three for each language. An attempt was made to select matching dailies in each city.

The reason why Toronto and Montreal newspapers were selected is because there are very similar media patterns in each of the two cities. As well, Toronto is normally considered to be representative of attitudes of English speaking Central Canada communities, while Montreal holds the same general position with respect to French speaking Quebec. Among Toronto newspapers, the Globe and Mail, Toronto Star and Toronto Sun were chosen while in Montreal, Le Devoir, La Presse and Le Journal de Montreal were examined. These newspapers reflect three categories of dailies which vary according to the status and quality. The Globe and Mail and Le Devoir, for instance, address an 'elite' audience, while the Toronto Star and La Presse are oriented towards the 'general' public. Finally, the Toronto Sun, and Le Journal de Montreal are tabloids which share the same sensationalistic approach to journalism. Although each paper

---

do appeal roughly to the same sort of readership. Thus, an accurate insight can be obtained into similarities and differences between the French and English presses as these may be represented by readers in Montreal and Toronto.

In each newspaper, three pages only were studied. The front page, the editorial and op-ed (feature) pages. The rationale for this choice is that stories rated as relevant by the paper appeared on these pages. Therefore, the agenda was more likely to be set by the issues recurrently appearing on these pages than on any other ones. When a story continued onto another page, the remaining part of it was also coded. In the case of La Presse, the front-page only featured headlines of major stories and the pages on which these appeared within the body of the paper. Therefore, those stories the title of which appeared on the front page were studied and considered as front-page stories.

A story was coded if it was obviously related to the constitutional debate or to constitutional issues. If a relevant picture or a cartoon appeared by itself, it was counted as an individual item. If however, a picture accompanied a story, it was coded as a 'story with picture.'

Since the constitutional debate had been unfolding for over fifty years and was revived during the last two years, a restricted time frame for the study had to be chosen.

Therefore, the last stage of the debate was selected, starting when the Supreme Court issued its ruling on 28 Septem-
ber, 1981 and continuing until the Constitution was sent to
Great Britain, on 8 December, 1981. This time period actual-
ly corresponds to the most heated part of the constitutional
negotiations, since the issues most important to all parties
were constantly on the bargaining table and received wide
press coverage.

Due to the number of issues to be dealt with within this
time period, papers were sampled every third day, starting
September 28. However, since all newspapers had different
publishing days on week-ends, each paper was sampled individ-
ually. 30 When a sample day happened to fall on a day on
which a paper did not publish, if this date was even the ed-
iton of the following day was sampled; if the date was odd,
then the edition of the previous day was chosen.

Data from each story were then collected on a coding
sheet which had been specially designed. The coding sheet
was created on the basis of a review of the literature, of
the derivative hypotheses, and on the basis of readings of
the newspapers of the period.

'Each coding sheet featured references of the item (such
as the newspaper it appeared in, the date, title, author).
The source of the item was also recorded in terms of wire-
services or local-staffs. If no source was indicated, the
source was considered as 'unknown'; the source for the let-
ters-to-the-editor was entered under this category.

30 See appendix I on publishing days.
A story was labeled a 'lead' if its headline, location on the front-page and length emphasized it as the obvious dominant story on the first page. If a lead story was not obviously so, the item was classified into one of the three remaining categories.

The coding sheet allowed for various aspects of the debate to be covered. Political actors, issues pertaining to the nature of the constitution, its patriotism, the Charter of Rights and diverse political themes were included as sections of the coding sheet. Two other sections concerned the qualitative aspect of the analysis. First, adjectives describing political leaders, parties, or issues were collected. Second, positions taken or printed by papers with respect to key actors, issues or parties were recorded as well. If a relevant issue or personality was mentioned, it was entered under 'other' and specified.

91 For further details, consult the reproduction of a coding sheet in appendix B.
Chapter IV

RESULTS

After having compiled all the necessary data on the coding sheets, these were entered in the computer and processed so as to obtain statistics which would enable the detection of relationships between French and English newspapers.

The study led to interesting findings, since both English and French papers displayed not only similarities but also divergences.

In general, Toronto-based newspapers offered a greater number of constitution-based stories than did the French press: 55.6% of all stories examined were in English while the remaining 44.2% were in French. However, French papers seemed to make mention of more issues and politicians than their English counterparts did. Thus, although there were fewer French articles in the overall study, these covered more ground than did English articles.

The more prestigious publications, such as the Globe and Mail and Le Devoir, appear to contain more news items; the number of items on the constitution decreased with the status of the paper (The Toronto Star and La Presse represented the mid-point on our somewhat arbitrary prestige scale, while The Toronto Sun and Le Journal de Montreal came last in the scale of prestige).
4.1 **TABLE 1**

As seen from table 1, most of the news items were news stories appearing on the front-page (37.5%), but these were closely followed in number by the letters-to-the-editor (30%).

The story source differed dramatically according to language group. As expected, Montreal newspapers had more (57.9%) of their stories written by their local staff than Toronto newspapers did (40.3%). Moreover, contrary to our hypothesis, French also tended to use more CP stories, than did the English with an average of 8.2% as compared to 2.3% for the English papers. However, English papers had 3.2% of their stories from other Canadian wire services, while the French drew only a meager 1.2% from the same source.

Although French papers offered fewer stories on the constitution, they accorded them greater prominence: 11.7% of French stories were leads, as opposed to only 4.2% on the English side. Moreover, the French showed more of a propensity to publish pictures with stories or by themselves, than the English media did. The percentage of French stories accompanied by pictures was 17%, but only 11.1% of English stories were accompanied by photos. The above findings, indicating that French papers attached more weight to constitution stories, are further supported by the fact that French papers featured far more front-page stories than Eng-
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82 All the tables referred to in this chapter can be consulted in Appendix C.
lish papers did: 45% vs. 29.2%. However, English papers did publish roughly twice as many letters-to-the-editor as French papers did. This relationship was particularly apparent with an Eta figure of .17.

4.2 TABLE 2

As seen on Table 2 or 3, Trudeau emerged as the chief political protagonist in the debate, as roughly three quarters of the stories mentioned him. This amount of coverage can be easily explained since Trudeau initiated the whole constitutional debate two years before and more or less dominated the debate on the political scene. He spurred intensive press coverage since he repeatedly convoked meetings, refused to cooperate or to attend others, threatened politicians or sought a compromise with them. Levesque was the second most mentioned political actor, receiving even more coverage than Bennett, the representative of the eight dissenting provinces. This fact suggests that the French Premier's reactions were regarded as being more newsworthy than those of the premiers of the other dissenting provinces.

Thus, the constitutional debate was pictured in the press more in the nature of a confrontation between Levesque and Trudeau, who respectively embody Quebec and the Confederation. Even though the 'No' forces had won in the referendum of 1980, Quebec's status within the Confederation was still perceived as precarious and fragile.
Finally, Chrétien and Bennett received approximately the same amount of coverage; thus, Bennett being the representative of the eight dissenting provinces was considered no less newsworthy as Chrétien who occupied a federal position. Ryan and Davis, two provincial figures, lagged behind.

Among the institutional actors, the Supreme Court attracted the most coverage, no doubt due to the controversy on the legality of federal unilateral action.

Surprisingly, British and Canadian parliaments received almost equal coverage. The two parliaments were thus both viewed as being important. The Canadian Parliament was mentioned for its constitutional debates, while the British Parliament was probably reported because of its power to ratify the constitutional package.

Interestingly, both the Parti Québécois (PQ), and the Liberal Parti of Quebec (PLQ), Quebec provincial parties, emerged higher in the agenda than did the federal parties. This pattern suggests that the media considered the role and responses of these Quebec parties during the constitutional debate as being more newsworthy and being more of public interest than were the federal parties.

Among the issues, the Charter of Rights turned out to be the primary item on the agenda. Its entrenched within the Canadian constitution triggered many discussions and attracted wide coverage. The following four issues at the top of the agenda concerned themselves with issues directly re-
lated to the process of the constitutional talks: federal-provincial negotiations, the amendment formula, the proposed federal unilateral action and its legality. A second set of issues pertained to Quebec problems: language rights, minority school rights and Quebec sovereignty. Finally, the third set of issues cannot be defined as clearly as the preceding ones. It consisted mainly on the one hand, of provincial-federal concerns such as provincial-federal relations, the opting-out provision, Quebec's veto, the role of the MNA act, fiscal compensation, the Vancouver consensus; and on the other hand, it comprised such issues as minority concerns like native, women's and individual rights. In Table 3, the rank ordering of these three blocs of issues suggests that the very process of the constitutional negotiations was at the center of attention, while Quebec's demands too gained a considerable degree of recognition in the Canadian press. In comparison, the division between provincial and federal powers and minority rights were relegated to the background of the constitutional debate.

4.3 **Table 3**

The coverage allotted to political actors was fairly similar in the two language groups. Spearman's rho is commonly used as a measure of association between two sets of rankings. Here, the rho was 0.72, indicating a strong similarity between the English and French rankings of political actors.
Trudeau, for instance, stood out as the major actor in the constitutional arena. In contrast to this, the Supreme Court, Bennett as a representative of the group of eight, the Canadian and British parliaments, and Davis, were roughly given the same amount of attention in French and English presses. However, there were obvious statistically significant differences between the two groups as well. Being French, Levesque, Ryan and Chrétien received far more coverage in French papers than they did in Ontario. The correlation between language and personality salience is indicated by the statistic phi. The most dramatic difference in coverage concerned Levesque with a phi of .28. Then came Ryan with a phi of .23, while Chrétien was subject to only a small difference as the phi of .10 indicates. Moreover, as expected, Quebec political institutions were dealt with more in the French press. It should be mentioned however, that there was a bigger difference in the English and French coverages of the PLQ (with a phi of .22), than there was in their coverages of the "Q (phi of .13). Such data imply, ironically, that the PQ has impact on the federal scene, in spite of or because of its separatist orientation. Thus, in terms of newspapers coverage, the QLP appears to be closer to the definition of 'provincial' party than the PQ.

Surprisingly, federal parties such as the liberal party and the NDP also got a bigger share of coverage in the French media.
As far as rank-ordering of political actors was concerned, the agendas displayed by the two language groups were fairly similar, with a few exceptions. Chrétien, for instance, appeared fourth on the French agenda, while he was seventh on the English one. Similarly, Ryan, Levesque, the PLQ and the PQ were placed higher on the French agenda than they were on the English. In contrast to these figures, Davis was eighth on the English ladder, but he was at the bottom of the French agenda. So far, results only point to a vague pattern in the salience of political actors. Although French papers are attentive to their own institutions and personalities, overall, both language groups tend to end up with roughly similar rank orders.

4.4 TABLE 4
With regards to their ranking of constitutional issues, French and English newspapers displayed relatively similar agendas, as the rho of +.39 indicates. However, here, differences between both language groups were more pronounced than in the previous table.

As hypothesized, language rights and issues dear to Quebec (Quebec veto, Quebec sovereignty and Referendum of 1980) appeared with much greater frequency in French papers than in their English counterparts. Moreover, the issue of an amending formula, the Vancouver consensus and fiscal compensation were given particular attention by the French media,
undoubtedly because Quebec was one of the eight dissident provinces proposing the Vancouver consensus as an alternative to the government's constitutional package. In addition, fiscal compensation was of prime interest to Quebec, since it wanted to be able to opt-out of cultural and social programs and receive financial compensation despite its withdrawal. Other than those just mentioned, the remaining issues and particularly those related to the constitutional process, received almost an identical amount of coverage in both groups.

When looking at the ranking of issues, minority rights (such as individual, Native and women's rights) were generally ranked higher in the English media than in the French press. French newspapers, in contrast, attributed more importance to Quebec political issues—such as the Quebec veto, sovereignty, and the Referendum of 1980. Yet, the Vancouver consensus and fiscal compensation also commanded a higher rank in the French agenda than in the English one. Therefore, it generally appeared that Ontario and Quebec papers differed in issue salience.

Some issues, which were not covered enough to be included within the twenty main issues, are worth mentioning because they point to interesting characteristics of the English and French media. The theme of National unity in Canada was given the same amount of attention in both presses, contrary to what might have been expected. Indeed, since Quebec
places so much value on its own autonomy, whether it be social or political, one could have anticipated that it would have downplayed national unity while Ontario newspapers would have maximized this same issue. Canadian duality, nevertheless, did receive some attention in French papers (6.4% of the French articles mentioned it), while none was given to it by the English media. 83 Similarly, Bill 101, the restrictive Quebec language law, was mentioned significantly more in French papers than in the English ones. 84 Finally, the Victoria agreement, which Quebec rejected in 1971, appeared more often in the French media, 85 certainly because it remained so vivid in the memory of the French collectivity.

A closer study requires that a papers be individually examined for story placement in the front-page, editorial and letter-to-the-editor sections.

4.5 TABLE 5

An examination of the front-pages came up with no significant results, that is to say, the two groups displayed hardly any difference at all in the number of times they would treat an issue. One might assert that a certain degree of objectivity was thus preserved, at least in the 'hard' news.

83 $p = .15, \text{significance} = .0005$
84 $p = .12, \text{significance} = .02$
85 $p = .12, \text{significance} = .02$
section. That is, they all devoted approximately the same amount of coverage and the same ranking with respect to the twenty items as the rho of 1.69 shows. The two language groups put emphasis on issues related to the constitutional process, such as federal-provincial negotiations, the amending formula and the Charter of Rights. They also downplayed the same issues such as individual rights and Women's rights. However, some remarks can be made about the placement of some issues on the ranking scale of French and English papers. For instance, front-page findings still showed that French papers ranked Quebec political problems higher than their English counterparts did: in French papers, Quebec veto was in the fifth rank, whereas it was tied for eleventh place in English papers. The issue of Quebec sovereignty also merited differing rankings in the French and English agendas. Finally, this front-page analysis indicated that in French papers, language rights rated sixth place in their agenda, whereas the issue was again tied for eleventh in the English one.

4.6 **TABLE 6**

When editorials and feature articles are studied as a common group, the two language groups display greater divergence, as indicated by the rho of 1.28. Again, English and French papers place almost equal emphasis on issues respecting the constitutional process. Yet, political matters peculiar to
Quebec, but which should also interest the English media because they might one day affect Canadian unity, are dealt with more extensively by the French media: Quebec sovereignty with a phi of .35, Quebec veto power with a phi of .24, and Quebec referendum with a phi of .32 were covered significantly more in the French group of papers. Furthermore, French editorials also attached more importance to federal unilateral action than English editorials did, and the phi reached as high as .25. A reason for this result might be that Quebec envisioned tragic consequences for itself if the federal government were to have acted without considering French interests.

The agendas offered by editorials assume a contour similar to those of the overall analysis. The English agenda thus gives top priority to the legality of unilateral action, opting-out and timing while the Quebec agenda stresses Quebec problems and betrays a concern for unilateral action and fiscal compensation.

4.7 TABLE 7
A study of letters-to-the-editor yields results which further replicate the above findings. Issues concerning the constitutional process rated again at the top of each group's agenda.

Also, Quebec sovereignty was much more covered and discussed in letters to French newspapers than in the English, and this is indicated by a high phi of .40.
However, in contrast with preceding findings, the Charter of Rights was given much more emphasis in English letters than in the French mail to the editor, as indicated by the phi of .22.

The agendas for letters also varied slightly from other agendas. As in previous cases, the legality of unilateral action, Native rights and the Charter of Rights are situated in the upper part of the English agenda; on the other hand, the Charter of Rights does not emerge at the top of the agenda in Quebec letters, as it did in the front page and editorials of French papers. Moreover, minority school rights are seen as the third most important issue in the letter agenda, while it only occupied a moderate place in the other pages. Such a characteristic perhaps mirrors what the readers perceive as affecting them the most directly, while they downplay the Charter of rights, probably because its applicability and impact were not so readily apparent; they stress the role of minority school rights since its outcome was easily foreseen in the French province. Furthermore, Quebec sovereignty, the Québec veto, the referendum of 1980 and the issue of fiscal compensation rated higher on the French letter-agenda than in the English one.

Overall, the findings yielded by the study point to a basic similarity between French and English media regarding their issue salience during the constitutional debate. Both groups of papers placed their primary emphasis on the proce-
dure of negotiations. However, while the English media shared its attention among remaining issues, such as minority rights and federal-provincial problems, Quebec papers highlighted issues related to Quebec's status and power within the confederation.

Interestingly, the emphasis on one issue or another varied with the page being studied. The front-page analysis, for instance, presents reliable evidence that the reporting of the constitutional debate remained fairly objective within the 'straight news' category. Editorials seemed to stress issues which journalists regarded as important. However, the letters-to-the-editor displayed a very similar agenda to the one found in editorials, although a few issues were given more coverage because they affected the audience more directly. This similarity in agendas can be explained by the fact that letters published are selected among many others, and that this selection has been shown to mirror the editorial stance of a paper or to reflect similar concerns.

4.8 Table 8

A further evaluation of the coverage was conducted in terms of how many positive, neutral or negative reports of key politicians and issues there were.

The findings here show that English and French media covered Trudeau in the same fashion in the two groups of pa-
pers; a majority of the stories mentioning him in both French and English took either a neutral or a negative position towards him.

Moreover, although Levesque received roughly the same number of negative stories in the two language groups, the French media offered significantly more positive coverage on the Quebec Premier. The correlation between language and the treatment of Levesque was indicated by a high Cramer’s V of .35.

Finally, the Charter of rights, the major issue discussed during the debate, seemed to have been much more a subject of controversy among the English papers, where it received more positive and more negative reports than in the French press. Moreover, the French media offered a greater number of neutral stories on the Charter of rights than English papers did.

4.9 Table 8, 10, 11
As mentioned in the previous chapter, one section of the coding sheet included a qualitative dimension to the content analysis: adjectives which described major politicians or issues were recorded. It must be noted that adjectives describing key actors only have been examined, since the papers seemed to concentrate mainly on these people. It turned out that each group of papers had nearly as many adjectives as the other: the French averaged one normative
adjective peri 2.0 stories while the English rated one normative adjective peri 2.5 stories. Trudeau, once again, triggered the most emotional coverage. Both French and English media displayed the same proportions of positive and negative adjectives used to characterize Trudeau, and in both cases, the majority was negative. The two groups offered approximately the same profiles of the Prime Minister. When viewing the adjectives, Trudeau was described most often as a "power-hungry" politician who is skilled in manipulating people in order to achieve his "dictatorial" goals. Both sides, however, recognized his great bargaining and persuasive capabilities. Yet, the French newspapers did contrast with their English counterparts with regards to one particular word describing Trudeau; the label "traitor" occurred six times in the French articles being studied, while none of the English articles ever mentioned this word. Quebec, it would seem, holds a grudge against Trudeau, a francophone, who chose to give priority to Canada over Quebec.

Lévesque attracted less adjectives than Trudeau, however, the two language groups displayed roughly the same number of negative adjectives. However, French papers contained some positive comments, while English media did not have a single one. Again, English media present an image of Lévesque which resembles the one portrayed by French media—Lévesque is generally viewed as being separatist, manipulative, authoritarian and childish in his reactions. Nevertheless, in
contrast to French dailies, English newspapers labelled him 'a defiant rebel' and 'an ultra nationalist.' Such a choice of words reflects a federalist perspective on the part of Ontario papers. Levesque is also depicted as a threat to Canadian Unity because of his ardent separatist goals.

Ironically, both Trudeau and Levesque attracted the same kind of adjectives in the English and French media; the two opponents were described by the Canadian press as being unpredictable, manipulative, aggressive and stubborn.

The Charter of rights was the third item which drew enough adjectives to be included within the analysis. As it appeared in the findings above, the Charter of rights generated more response in the English group. Altogether, all adjectives except one (in an English article) were negative. In the English media, the Charter was fiercely attacked. It was said to encourage a Soviet-type, enslaving regime, while Trudeau, its instigator, was dubbed as a socialist. The French newspapers, although they were unfavorable to the Charter of rights, were neither as harsh nor as emotional. The document was merely criticized for its flaws and not for what it might bring about in the future. Such a divergence might lead to the assertion that the English group attached more importance to the nature and implications of the Charter than the Quebec people did. Quebec was too engrossed with its own interests and worries to spend any surplus of energy debating a matter which it considered only of secondary importance.
Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS

5.1 DISCUSSION

In general, the above results tend to lend support to the hypothesis that although basically similar, the agendas of the two language groups, as these agendas are evident through the study of Toronto English-language and Montreal French-language newspapers, exhibit peculiarities of their own.

Indeed, both English and French media placed issues related to the constitutional process at the top of their agendas, and statistics show that there exists a positive association between the issue saliences of French and English newspapers—-even though this association is weak as far as editorial and op-ed pages are concerned.

Yet, the French media placed more stress on Quebec personalities and concerns. Levesque, Ryan and the French political parties thus appeared more often in French newspapers, while issues such as language rights, Bill 101, Canadian duality, and the Quebec referendum of 1980, were also given ample treatment. The Charter of rights, however, was equally covered in the two presses; however, the English media seemed to be more interested in the controversies the
Charter initiated during the debate. Thus, it seemed to
cover the Charter of rights more because the issue raised
temper and conflicting opinions in the heated debate. The
French press was preoccupied with the linguistic aspect of
the charter, but dealt with it as a separate matter alto-
gether. It was similarly attracted to the issue of the le-
gality of federal unilateral action because of its obvious
emotional weight in the debate.

As hypothesized, the French group contained more stories
on political themes such as the fiscal compensation, Quebec
veto power and sovereignty. However, in contrast to what
was expected, it did not place the opting-out possibility as
high in its agenda as the English media did. The only ex-
planation which can be offered for this finding is that Que-
bec papers found it unnecessary to deal extensively with the
opting-out formula which they took for granted, choosing to
focus more on the claims for financial compensation if Que-
bec were to withdraw from a federal program. Another result
reflects Quebec's alignment with the eight dissentent prov-
ces: the Vancouver consensus appears higher in the French
agenda than in the English one.

The study at hand clearly demonstrates that although the
two groups of papers place their main emphasis on the same
issues, Montreal dailies tend to devote their remaining at-
tention to Quebec issues, while the rest of English focus is
on general federal issues. It is expected that papers will
to a certain extent give coverage to issues which have a local appeal, but if French papers stress more Quebec issues than English papers stress Ontario issues, then, one may conclude that Quebec papers are more centered on their provincial affairs than Ontario papers are.

Thus, it was strongly apparent that Quebec mirrored its own political and cultural interests in its salience of issues during the constitutional debate. These two groups of newspapers set differing agendas regardless of the existence of CP—whose unifying virtue cannot be extolled in the present study. Indeed, CP wire stories were hardly used at all. Most of the stories were written by the staff or by the papers' own correspondents in Ottawa. Such a tendency would predictably foster a regional and linguistic bias in reporting. The Montreal agenda showed an inclination toward being inward-looking and parochial, while the Toronto agenda addressed issues and concerns over and above those of Ontario, and therefore presented more of a 'federalist' perspective in the debate. Toronto writers emphasized intricacies and problems entailed by constitutional talks; they were open to discussing minority rights while they gave attention to the language rights about which Quebec was so concerned. However, Ontario media did minimize political issues and claims which Quebec did so much to underline.

Apart from issues related to the core of the constitutional procedure, agendas reflected two different sets of emphases and concerns that each province had.
Yet, one can safely assert that Quebec newspapers were so absorbed by their province's political and cultural concerns that they unfortunately downplayed minority and human rights. Indeed, Quebec media might have been able to preserve the French culture by overemphasizing language claims, yet, in the process, these newspapers might not have placed enough value on human rights, a very little covered but equally important to the health of a society. The only excuse for such behaviour would be that being so concerned about the survival of the French culture, French newspapers could not afford the luxury of paying attention to rights of the individual. Even letters-to-the-editor portrayed this trend in the French media: they placed Quebec sovereignty at the top of their agenda. Actually, letters-to-the-editor basically followed the same pattern as editorials but, they did so in a much stronger fashion. Furthermore, letters-to-the-editor tended to portray issues which lent themselves to unreflective criticisms and shallow discussion; editorials on the other hand, were mostly concerned with 'harder' political issues calling for profound and complex analyses. Such a characteristic held particularly true for English letters which were not so politically oriented and seemed more interested in minority and human rights. French letters, however, with the exception of a few issues, reflected a higher concern for politics. Thus, interestingly, although Quebec newspapers published only few letters, these mirrored the
same concerns as editorials. In other words, letters did not add to or complement issues already dealt with in editorials. Instead, they duplicated them. On the other hand, English letters placed emphasis on human rights, while editorials stressed 'serious' political matters; so that between those two formats, a balance was thus reached between the types of issues treated.

Thus, the contrast between French and English media can be drawn deeper. French media published few letters, but those published merely reinforced the editorials agenda. English, however, presented not only more letters, but also a wider variety of issues. As a result, the French press nurtured the illusion of offering a forum for debate; but in reality, the English press, much more approximated this concept.

The English media were not without their weaknesses though. It appears that instead of placing at the top of their agenda issues of political importance, they gave priority to those which were the most likely to have an emotional impact. In light of these facts, the concept of newsworthiness can be questioned: is an issue newsworthy because it elicits emotional response or because it has political significance?

---

66 These results further support findings reported by Siegel in his research on the coverage of the FLQ crisis: he had indeed found that English papers tended to allot more space to letters-to-the-editor than French papers did.
Overall, one can conclude from this study that, depending on the type of issues, media from the two cultures see the same events from either a similar or a different perspective. In this case, for instance, the two groups of dailies considered the events and issues directly connected with the constitutional process as being of prime interest. However, sensitive issues such as language rights or Quebec political events were dealt quite extensively in the French press, as compared to the English media. In this study, it appears that papers from the two cultural groups give the same amount of issue salience to "hard news", but diverge in the coverage of issues prone to editorial comments. It is also apparent that a paper's cultural background and environment determine the salience of issues or agenda.

As seen in the literature review, Becker and others maintain that agenda-setting takes on the form of a full cycle: issue salience is therefore determined by the journalists, who in turn, are influenced by their readers expectations and leniencies. Thus, one can speculate that Quebec dailies gave particular emphasis to Quebec issues not only because these were of importance to them, as journalists, but also because French reporters knew that Quebecers held these Quebec issues at heart. Ontario papers, on the other hand, gave weight to language rights, and Quebec's political claims because they recognize the importance of

87 Becker and others, *The Emergence of Political Issues*, p. 57.
these in the confederation. However, these Toronto dailies also knew perhaps that too much coverage of these Quebec issues would spur boredom among their Ontario readers.

There are serious implications to this difference in agendas. First, French and English cultures could become even more alienated from one another if these respective presses reinforce their basic divergences on a daily basis.

Second, if reports of the same events are so dissimilar, questions should be raised about the objectivity of the media. A new dimension of concept of subjectivity emerges, whereby bias is seen as something that can be instilled, not through opinions blatantly expressed, but more imperceptibly by issues being played up while others are being stifled. Agenda-setting entails a subtle kind of slant. Quebecers, for instance, because of the scarce coverage of Quebec papers on Native rights, might have been encouraged to disregard these Native claims; such agenda-setting may therefore lull people into a sort of convenient narrow-mindedness and confine them to their own egocentric spheres.

Finally, possible repercussions of these differing agendas would be that they not only widen the gap between Quebec and Ontario per se, but also between Quebec and the rest of Canada, since the Toronto papers in this study can be assumed to reflect the priorities of English-speaking Central Canada. Thus, although the media in this study may fulfill their roles as representatives of their own provinces, they
can all too easily fail to bridge wide disparities and to heal misunderstandings between the two cultural groups. Obviously, Canadian identity cannot possibly be promoted with such a parochialism pervading Canadian media. Yet, the preservation of provincial identity might well be the only viable path to Canadian unity: if each linguistic group and province is granted the identity it longs for, they would have less grounds to yearn for separatist goals. The different groups would co-exist peacefully and help make up a Canadian "mosaic." Here, the press of a linguistic group might make its members more aware of their own culture by stressing the issues which are pertinent to them. Media would thus provide their audience with a common set of concerns. It is this sharing of the same concerns, values and priorities among a number of people which helps them shape a cultural group.

Thus, if media within each cultural group choose to overplay issues which are dearest to the public, while deemphasizing remote problems, these media do not merely reflect the culture they exist in, but also reinforce its values, and its priorities. In thus allowing each culture to express its own identity, the difference in agenda-setting between the French and English dailies plays a role which may be found one day to have contributed to the preservation of Canada as a confederation.

88 As seen in Becker and others (p. 57).
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Other studies could be done with regards to the agenda-setting in the press coverage of the constitutional debate. For instance, a comparison could be drawn between Canadian newspapers from the eight provinces opposing the government and the two provinces (Ontario and New Brunswick) supporting it.

An agenda-setting study involving the comparison between French and English newspapers at the beginning of the constitutional debate (during the last months of 1940) and at the end of the controversy, can also be done. Both French and English papers may show quite different agendas at the opening and at the closing of the debate--by then, circumstances might have led them to emphasize or de-emphasize certain issues.

Further, similar agenda-setting studies may take into account the coverage supported by other mass media, such as television, or radio.

Finally, one could study the coverage of the constitutional debate by Ontario and Quebec print media, and examine their respective selection of photographs (of leaders, events, etc.). One could test whether French print media run more negative pictures of their perceived 'rivals' in the constitutional debate, as compared to their 'defenders,' and whether Ontario print media, on the other hand, offer more flattering pictures of supporters of the federal constitutional package as compared to its opponents.
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Appendix A

The six newspapers selected for the purpose of this study had different publishing days, as it can be seen from the information below: Le Press was published everyday except Sundays; Le Devoir every morning except Sundays, Le Journal de Montreal was published every day, Sundays included. The Toronto Star was published every morning, Sundays included, The Globe and Mail every morning except Sundays, and finally The Toronto Sun was available every morning, except Saturdays, but including Sundays.
Appendix B

A copy of the coding sheet used in the study appears on the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Content</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Staff</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Tor</td>
<td>Star Can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Political Actors**
- Trudeau: BNA Act 1867, Levesque
- Chrétien: Stat. of West, Trudeau
- Broadbent: Amending Form's, Christian
- Diefenbaker: Vancouver Cons., Bennett (on behalf of group)
- Levesque: Other, Federal Libs.
- Bennett: Other, Federal PC
- Bennett (on behalf of group): Other, Federal NDP
- Davis: Charter of HR, Chart of Rights
- Haultain: Bill of R, Amending Form's
- Peckton: Min'y Lang Sch., Fed unilat. action
- Blakeney: Lang R, Other
- Lyon: Native R, Other
- Buchanan: Treaty R, Other
- MacLean: Women's R, Other
- Thatcher: Mobility R, Other (Unfav) (Neut.) (Fav.
- Supr. Court: Other, Levesque
- Can. Parl'mnt: Other, Trudeau
- British Parl'mnt: Other, Bennett (on behalf of group)
- Fed: Policy Themes, Bennett (on behalf of group)
- Fed. Libs: Fed Libs
- Fed. Cons.: Legal vs conv., Fed NDP
- Interest Groups: Fed-prov neg, Chater of R
- Que. Govt Agency: Fed, Amending Form's
- Other: Fed unilat action
- Nature of Const.: Other
- Prov-Fed relations: Other
- Que. Veto: Other
- Resources R: Other
- Economic Power: Other
- Fiscal Compensation: Other
- Que. Sovereign: Other
- Nat'l Unity: Other
- Specified details/Story Abstract: Other

**Kind of Content**
- Lead: Just story
- Story & photo: Just photo

**Kind of Content**
- Political Leaders/Descriptive
- Adjectives, Just story

**Title**
- Author/Artist

**Newspaper Coverage of the Constitutional Debate**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story type</th>
<th>English stories</th>
<th>French stories</th>
<th>Total stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.8% N=216</td>
<td>44.2% N=171</td>
<td>100% N=387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-page stories</td>
<td>29.2% (63)</td>
<td>48.0% (82)</td>
<td>37.5% (145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorials</td>
<td>14.8% (32)</td>
<td>18.7% (32)</td>
<td>16.5% (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>9.3% (20)</td>
<td>9.4% (16)</td>
<td>9.3% (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoons</td>
<td>5.6% (12)</td>
<td>7.6% (25)</td>
<td>6.5% (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters-to-the-editor</td>
<td>41.2% (89)</td>
<td>16.4% (28)</td>
<td>30.2% (117)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Story type distribution of all constitutional stories, by language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R/O</th>
<th>Political actors</th>
<th>% of stories</th>
<th>R/O</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>% of stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trudeau</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Charter of Rights</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Levesque</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fed-prov. negotiations</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supreme Court</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amendment formula</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>British Parliament</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Federal unil. action</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bennett as rep. of 8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Legal vs conventional</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Canadian Parliament</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Language Rights</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chretien</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Minority School rights</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Quebec sovereignty</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prov.-fed. relations</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Opting-out</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>QLP</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Native rights</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Que. veto</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Federal Liberals</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>BNA Act</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fiscal compensation</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Vancouver consensus</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>National referendum</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Que. Ref. '80</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Women's rights</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Individual rights</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 -- Rank-ordering of major political actors and Constitutional issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>% of English stories</th>
<th>% of French stories</th>
<th>Phi</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Trudeau</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Supreme Court</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Levesque</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 British Parliament</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bennett (representing the dissenting group)</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Canadian Parliament</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Chretien</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Davis</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 PQ</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 NDP</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ryan</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Federal Liberals</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 QLP</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 -- Percentage of all Constitution stories dealing with major political actors, by language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>% of English stories</th>
<th>% of French stories</th>
<th>Phi</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter of Rights</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provinical-federal negotiations</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Formula</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal vs. conventional</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Unilateral action</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNA act</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opting-out provision</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native rights</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial-federal relations</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language rights</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority School rights</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's rights</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National referendum</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual rights</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver consensus</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal compensation</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec veto</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec sovereignty</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec referendum 1980</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 -- Percentage of all Constitution stories dealing with major issues, by language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>% of English stories</th>
<th>% of French stories</th>
<th>Phi</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Federal-provincial negotiations</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Charter of Rights</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amendment Formula</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Federal Unilateral action</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opting-out provision</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Legal vs conventional</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Minority School rights</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Native rights</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. BNA act</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fiscal compensation</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Quebec veto</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Timing</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Language rights</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Vancouver consensus</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Quebec sovereignty</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Provisonal-federal relations</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. National referendum</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Women's rights</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Quebec Referendum</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Individual rights</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5--Percentage of front-page stories dealing with major constitutional issues, by language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>% of English stories</th>
<th>% of French stories</th>
<th>Phi</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Charter of Rights</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Legal vs conventional</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Amendment formula</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Provincial-federal relations</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Federal-provincial negotiations</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Opting-out provision</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Language rights</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Native rights</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Timing</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Federal unilateral action</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Women's rights</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Minority school rights</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Vancouver consensus</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 National referendum</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 BNA act</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Quebec sovereignty</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Quebec referendum 1980</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Individual rights</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Fiscal compensation</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Quebec veto</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 -- Percentage of editorials and feature stories dealing with major constitutional issues, by language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>% of English stories</th>
<th>% of French stories</th>
<th>Phi</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Charter of Rights</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Legal vs conventional</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BNA act</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Federal unilateral action</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Federal-provincial negotiations</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Native rights</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Individual rights</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Language rights</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Provincial-federal relations</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 National referendum</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Women's rights</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Amendment formula</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Minority school rights</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Opting-out provision</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Timing</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Fiscal compensation</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Quebec sovereignty</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Vancouver consensus</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Quebec referendum 1980</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Quebec veto</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 -- Percentage of letters-to-the-editor dealing with major constitutional issues, by language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudeau</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levesque</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter of Rights</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8—Percentage of all stories dealing with Levesque, Trudeau, and the Charter of Rights, where a position was taken by the newspaper, by language.
| French adjectives on Trudeau  
| N=52 | English adjectives on Trudeau  
| N=56 |
| Positive (17.3%) N=9 | Negative (82.7%) N=43 | Positive (19.6%) N=11 | Negative (80.4%) N=45 |
| determined | -power thirsty | -eloquent | -egomanic |
| skilled in strategy | -authoritarian | -persuasive | -authoritarian |
| bargainer | -conservative | -flexible(II) | -dictatorial(III) |
| audacious | -harrow-minded | -firm(II) | -manipulator(III) |
| in-good faith | -unscrupulous | -good bargainer | -monarch-like(II) |
| sincere | -anti-democratic | -prudent | -mad scientist |
| resolute | -unflexible | -genius | -elitist |
| conciliatory(II) | -stubborn(II) | -reasonable | -obsessed(II) |
| machiavellian(II) | -dictatorial | -credible | -yoracious |
| uncompromising(II) | -credible | -unpredictable | -unflexible |
| capable of immoral | | | |
| or illegitimate action | | | |
| sly(II) | | | |
| deceptive(II) | | | |
| liar | | | |
| traitor(VI) | | | |
| bad personality | | | |
| villain | | | |
| sadist | | | |
| vain | | | |
| arrogant | | | |
| disrespectful | | | |
| violent | | | |
| haughty | | | |
| irresponsible | | | |
| contradictory(II) | | | |
| scornful | | | |
| unreasonable | | | |
| impatient | | | |
| undecisive | | | |

Table 9--Adjectives describing Trudeau, by language
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French adjectives on Levesque</th>
<th>English adjectives on Levesque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive (12.5%)  N=3</td>
<td>Positive (0%)  N=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-loving</td>
<td>-defiant rebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sincere</td>
<td>-Napoleon-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-full of dignity</td>
<td>-unflexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-separatist(V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-machiavellian(II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-with ill-intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-intransigent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-sulking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-suspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-thoughtless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-puzzled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (87.5%)  N=21</td>
<td>-theatrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-volatile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (100%)  N=19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-bitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-inconclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-unsincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-angry(II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-childish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Adjectives describing Levesque, by language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive(0%)</th>
<th>Negative(100%)</th>
<th>English adjectives on the Charter of Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative(0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive(0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonably good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ridiculous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empty document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deceiving(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enslaving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monstrous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soviet-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Illegitimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11-- Adjectives describing the Charter of rights, by language.