



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Public Affairs Television and Informational Value: A Case Study of the
"Journal's" Coverage of Free Trade in the 1988 Canadian Federal Election

Bushra F. Pasha

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Media Studies

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

June 1995

©Bushra F. Pasha, 1995



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file / Votre référence

Our file / Notre référence

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN
IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE
LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL
LIBRARY OF CANADA TO
REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR
SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY
ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR
FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS
AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED
PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE
IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE
PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE
NATIONALE DU CANADA DE
REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER
OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA
THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET
SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT
POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE
CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES
PERSONNE INTERESSEES

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP
OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER
THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR
SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT
MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE
REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER
PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE
DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE
SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES
EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-
CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU
AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON
AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-612-05095-5

Canada

To my parents, Ghouse Pasha Sahib and Bathula Begum

ABSTRACT

Public Affairs Television and Informational Value: A Case Study of the "Journal's" Coverage of Free Trade in the 1988 Canadian Federal Election

Bushra F. Pasha

The 1988 Canadian federal election represented the continuation of a national debate on a historically divisive issue -- free trade with the United States (FTA). The "Journal," a public affairs television program on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation constituted one of the few national forums for the opposing views. As such, it drew the attention of both researchers and critics who focused on the objectivity of the media in presenting FTA.

This study adopts a different strategy. Its central aim is to analyze the *informational value* of the "Journal" segments on free trade during the election campaign. The analysis of informational value is intrinsically linked to the presentation of FTA in accordance with the level of knowledge/expertise ascribed by the "Journal" to its audience. Thus the first phase of the study establishes a profile of the viewers the program appears to be primarily addressing. It does so by examining the "Journal's" on-going coverage of Canadians described as "ordinary." That is, the factors that define a particular image of "ordinary" Canadians also outline a profile of the viewers with whom the program assumes a shared common-sense with respect to this image. The second phase of the study analyzes the "Journal's" coverage of FTA. It concludes that it is the "Journal's" predilection with the equal criterion of objectivity that inhibits its informational value. The program places an onus on allocating time to opposing views over addressing the confusion among "ordinary" Canadians projected throughout its coverage of this sector of the electorate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Martin Allor, for his patience and insightful guidance. I would also like to thank the members of my committee for their comments and suggestions. I gratefully acknowledge the support and encouragement of my husband, Mahmood Iqbal, whose intense discussions on the media's coverage of public policy issues initiated the idea for this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. THE CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT: THE BASIS FOR THE OPPOSING POSITIONS	17
3. FREE TRADE AND THE CANADIAN ELECTORATE THE "JOURNAL'S" NOTION OF AUDIENCE	45
4. THE INFORMATIONAL VALUE OF THE "JOURNAL'S" COVERAGE OF FREE TRADE IN THE 1988 CANADIAN FEDERAL ELECTION	87
5. CONCLUSION	153
WORKS CITED	157

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Free trade has historically been a contentious issue for Canadians, dating as far back as 1846 -- the first interest in negotiating freer trade with the United States. Over the years, major Canadian organized groups have shifted their stance on such a bilateral deal, reflecting the changes in their own social, economic and political agendas within Canada. These shifts have often shaped the economic policies of the federal political parties, as well as influenced the outcome of several federal elections. The high political stakes surrounding the issue of free trade with the United States have consequently resulted in public debates that are often characterized by emotional rhetoric rather than in-depth analysis of the opposing positions.

Free trade once again formed the central platform of the 1988 Canadian federal election. But unlike previous public debates on this issue, this election saw the mass media play a prominent role in presenting the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (Agreement /FTA) to the Canadian electorate. The media also weathered much criticism, during and subsequent to the election, with respect to its coverage of this key issue. Accusations ranged from not providing enough coverage to outright bias. The "Journal," the only Canadian public affairs television program that aired daily, excluding weekends, was no exception. It was criticized by both the opponents and proponents of the Agreement of

favouring the other side.¹ The program ran for ten years, until October 1992, on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) and attracted an average of 1 1/2 million viewers (Decision CRTC 87-140, 1987 p. 23).

The rich history behind free trade combined with the presentation of this highly divisive issue on a mass medium such as television offers an interesting object of study. In particular, the approach adopted by the "Journal" in presenting FTA during the federal election offers a unique opportunity to analyze from two distinct yet related perspectives a public affairs program's coverage of a complex national issue. The initial phase of the analysis, in this study, thus focuses on the "Journal's" segments on "ordinary" Canadians and establishes a profile of the audience the program appears to be primarily addressing. The second phase examines the *informational value* of the segments in which politicians and experts debate FTA, in terms of how the presentation of issues in each relates to the program's assumptions of the knowledge and expertise of its audience.

While the concept of informational value will be elucidated further, in the course of outlining the methodology of the research, some basic positions need to be briefly stated at the outset regarding a factor that is implicitly connected to it -- objectivity. First, the term "objectivity" in this study goes beyond the more conventional norms, associated with mass media, of "equal" representation given to opposing positions (Ericson 1987, 107). The study begins by acknowledging that even a publicly funded television network, such as the CBC, can literally not afford to promote one particular ideological stance (Ericson 1987, 34). Such a bias would risk alienating sectors of the mass audience

¹An article in *This Magazine* (Salutin 1988, 35) accused the CBC, and more specifically, the "Journal" of reflecting the "main Tory line on the deal," while research conducted by the Fraser Institute (Miljan 1988, 6) concluded that the CBC's coverage of free trade, along with most other media, was predominantly negative.

that may not share the program's point of view, and jeopardize the ratings needed to attract advertisers (Ericson 1987, 34; Gilsdorf 1993, 171). This position suggests that a program such as the "Journal" cannot consistently exclude major positions on a national issue, and thus sets the grounds for an analysis that goes beyond trying to establish whether opposing positions on free trade were accorded a relatively "equal" treatment.

Second, quantitatively gauging the rudimentary structures of objectivity -- the time allotted to opposing positions, qualifications of the people nominated to voice these positions, the number of times something positive or negative was said about free trade etc.-- cannot be considered sufficient for analyzing information presented by a public affairs program. Such a quantitative analysis overlooks the one significant factor that principally distinguishes public affairs from news -- time. It is the benefit of relatively more time that allows the former to examine the grey areas between opposing positions, or to present a more in-depth coverage of the issues (Hall 1976, 53-54). Thus, in the context of this study, the often blurred distinction between news and public affairs is made by associating the latter with informational programming that has the time to examine the basis for opposing points of view. And in doing so, offer a broader perspective on the often diametric positions adopted on controversial issues.

Third, the social variables influencing the decoding of mass media messages may not necessarily allow a homogeneous interpretation of these messages (Hall 1980, 134-135; Morley 1980, 149-150). As such, to isolate specific elements of the content to reflect the objective position of the program would be to make broad assumptions of how these elements were actually interpreted by audiences. The last two points, in particular, will be elucidated in the course of establishing a theoretical position and an empirical base for the study. In

doing so, it is the aim of this introductory chapter to identify some of the major approaches to analyzing the media.

ANALYZING THE MEDIA: SOME MAJOR APPROACHES

In a discussion on the agendas in mass communication research, Jay G. Blumler and Michael Gurevitch point to the eclectic nature of existing research as the result of contributions by social scientists from a variety of disciplines -- sociologists who have examined the media as organizations; economists who have studied the media as businesses; political scientists who have attempted to trace the media's relationship to government, public opinion, and social groups; cultural and rhetorical studies, which have examined the media as suppliers of patterned texts and discourses; and social psychologists who have viewed the media as builders of audiences seeking certain gratifications and open to certain effects (Blumler and Gurevitch 1987, 17).

The different focuses in mass communication research can generally be attributed to two main schools of thought -- critical and empirical -- with various theoretical positions and methodological approaches existing within each. Initially, studies originating from these two schools were conducted in conceptual isolation of each other. However, there have been studies in mass communication that have not only recognized the need for consolidating the various positions within and between these two schools, but also the development of approaches that do not necessarily fall within the strictly empirical and critical traditions (Lemert, 1989; Blumler and Gurevitch, 1987; Slack and Allor, 1983). While recognizing this, it is the aim of this section to only highlight the major distinctions between these two paradigms in order to arrive at a framework that consolidates those approaches most appropriate for analyzing the "Journal".

Empirical Approaches

During the 1940s and 1950s, empirical approaches to mass media research in the United States represented a departure from the European tradition. European researchers, affiliated with the Frankfurt School, focused on a qualitative and philosophical analysis based on 'critical' social theory and proposed a direct link between the ruling elite, media messages and social behaviour of the masses (Morley 1980, 2-4). American researchers, on the other hand, emphasized the need to study the "effects" of media in the context of intermediary social structures between the leaders and the masses -- social behaviour was recognized as not being precipitated by the media alone. Still, much of the focus was restricted to observing the responses to media messages in isolation of other social factors. The focus also centred on quantitatively dissecting the content to serve as evidence of certain hypotheses on either the cohesiveness or breaks in the causal relationship between media messages and their social effects (Morley 1980, 2-4; Stempel and Westley 1981, 17-22).

Along with the clinical and quantitative focus of the message-effects research, the empirical tradition is also characterized by a functionalist approach. While the former area of research generally seeks to isolate those elements of the media message which precipitate certain effects, the latter is based on the assumption that the audience avails the media in order to satisfy certain individual needs. The audience-based research employed from this perspective is most notably associated with the uses and gratification model. Such an approach has been criticized for its "overestimation of the 'openness' of the message," and for its psychological rather than a social orientation (Morley 1980, 12-13). In the first instance, the model overlooks the fact that although media messages may be interpreted in a variety of ways,

"society/culture tends, with varying degrees of closure, to impose its segmentations... its classifications of the...world upon its members." (Morley 1980, 12-13). And in the second instance, by concentrating on the individual, it overlooks the socio-historical factors which result in the sub-cultural differences in assigning meaning to the media messages (Morley 1980, 12-13).

Initial efforts of bridging the gap between quantitative and qualitative approaches to studying the media are perhaps reflected by some of the methodologies employed by ethnographic studies. In these studies, observation is conducted within a more natural setting rather than a controlled clinical environment, characteristic of approaches that attempt to isolate causal forces; emphasis is placed on analyzing media organizations and cultural texts within a social and historical context, rather than drawing conclusions from content analysis conducted in isolation of such a context; and open-ended interviews take precedence over highly structured surveys. Implicit in such a transition is the incorporation of some of the theoretical positions of the critical school, as reflected by the studies of Gaye Tuchman, in *Making News* (Tuchman 1978) and David Morley, in *The Nationwide Audience* (Morley 1980). Some of the major positions of this school are highlighted below.

Critical Approaches

The various approaches within the critical school can be grouped under the headings of Classical, Cultural/Hermeneutic, and Structural/Discursive (Grossberg 1984; Hall 1986). A brief outline of the theoretical position of each offers additional insight into the conceptual tools that may be employed in analyzing the media.

According to the Classical approach the media is considered a vehicle for advancing the interests of the political and economic elite by creating a "false

consciousness" among the subordinate groups within society (Grossberg 1984, 394; Lemert 1989, 27). While the presentation of discrepant information by the media is recognized, its function is attributed to enhancing the credibility of the media in objectively questioning the existing systems of power rather than considered a serious challenge to the fundamental hegemonic principles (Hartley 1982, 55; Gitlin 1980, 52). The cultural text within the Classical approach is analyzed in terms of the ways in which it demands to be consumed or the modes of production involved in its signification. The basic assumption behind such points of inquiry being that both the text and the manner in which it is decoded are direct products of the economic base which produces them (Grossberg 1984, 396-398).

The major weakness of the Classical approach appears to lie in its inability to distinguish cultural text from other forms of commodities produced in a capitalist economy. That is, the production and consumption of the cultural text is disassociated from the complexities involved in the encoding and decoding moments of the communication process. As such, the audience is considered passive, reflexively responding to the intent of the messages, and culture is viewed as a site of a struggle for power only if there exist radically alternative and competing economic and political systems of media production (Grossberg 1984, 394-398).

The Classical approach has been referred to as the conspiracy thesis in "The 'Unity' of Current Affairs Television" (Hall, Connell, and Curti 1976, 51-57). While this study accepts the position that the broadcaster and the political elite operate within the same ideological framework -- in the case of Britain a capitalist state within a parliamentary democracy (also applicable to Canada) -- it suggests that each can take opposing positions within it. Such a point of view is reflective of the Hermeneutic approach, or the Cultural paradigm, which

considers the cultural not merely a means of promoting the legitimacy of the elite, but a site of mediation where social experience serves as the mediating factor between the cultural (signifying practices) and the social (structures of power) (Grossberg 1984, 399-409; Hall 1986, 39).

A conceptual framework elucidating such a view is offered in the discussion by Stuart Hall on the process of communication, more specifically television communication, in "Encoding/Decoding" (Hall 1980) (an edited version of "Encoding and Decoding in the TV Discourse," Stencilled Paper no. 7, 1974, CCCS, Birmingham). Hall considers the production of television programs (cultural texts) a requirement, or the end product of the institutional structures of broadcasting. The programs result from the production structures, which include such factors as the knowledge concerning the routines of production, historically defined technical skills, professional ideologies, institutional knowledge, and assumptions about the audience (Hall 1980, 129). Although these production structures shape the television discourse, a wider socio-cultural and political structure of sources and discursive formations is also examined for their topics, treatments, agendas, events, personnel, images of the audience, and 'definitions of the situation' (Hall 1980, 129). Production and reception, or encoding/decoding of cultural texts are thus regarded as the result of distinct yet related moments within the total framework of the social relations involved in the communicative process (Hall 1980, 131).

An inherent feature of the above model is the concept of "preferred reading." This concept can be summarized as systems of signification which, although relatively open to different interpretations or meanings, operate within specific hierarchical boundaries of codification. That is, the codes of signification employed by the cultural text are based on certain assumptions of the common-sense or taken-for-granted knowledge by the audience of the

existing social structures. While codes of signification based on such assumptions are viewed as perpetuating the dominant structures of power, they are considered a necessary element in creating a common ground for bringing into as close an alignment as possible the encoding/decoding processes. Within such a concept of preferred reading, the differences in encoding and decoding are attributed to the lack of cohesion between the preferred readings, or dominant codes of signification, and the codes shared by different groups and classes within society (Hall 1976, 68; Hall 1980, 134-135).

An analytical application of the concept of preferred reading is illustrated by the study cited above, "The 'Unity' of Current Affairs," which is an analysis of a *Panorama* program aired during the October 1972 general election in Britain. The study identifies different levels of signifying practices that can be involved in the "common-sensical" contextualization of key election issues -- national unity and the economy -- as well as the links between and the tacit understanding of these levels by the various "players" appearing on the program. The analysis focuses on how both the verbal and visual systems of signification, and the lexical and non-linguistic elements respectively associated with each, are employed in an attempt to obtain an ideological closure between the program and its audience, while maintaining an objective position for the former in its selection and appropriation of the topic. An adherence, not only by the program but the guests appearing on it, to the implicit rules of codification signifying neutrality is noted as being essential to the credibility of both.

Although the encoding/decoding model and the concept of preferred readings were also central to the study by Charlotte Brunsdon and David Morley in "Everyday Television: *Nationwide* " (Brunsdon and Morley 1978), in a critical postscript to the second part of this study, "The *Nationwide*

Audience," (Morley 1980) Morley highlights the shortfalls of the model and the concept of preferred reading. The weakness of the encoding/decoding model, as outlined by Morley (Morley 1981, 4-5) is attributed to the tendency, in the course of the analysis, to shift the focus away from the examination of textual properties towards an attempt to recover the subjective intentions of the sender of a particular message. Implicit in such a redirection of the analysis is a view of language as a mechanism for sending messages rather than a medium through which consciousness takes shape (Morley 1981, 4-5). As a result, the main emphasis of the analysis is placed on the content with insufficient attention paid to the form. Morley argues that to neglect the transformational effect of the linguistic form is to overlook the fact that "the 'same' content encoded through different linguistic forms has different meanings." With respect to the decoding process, he suggests that within the encoding/decoding model, this concept tends to be understood as a single act of reading. Instead, it needs to be viewed as "a set of processes -- of attentiveness, recognition of relevance, of comprehension, and of interpretation and response" (Morley 1981, 5).

In "The *Nationwide* Audience," (Morley 1980) Morley also points to the shortfalls of the Structural Paradigm (Hall 1986), labelled by Grossberg in the last of the three critical approaches, as Discursive (Grossberg 1984, 409). The various positions within this approach differ from the positions within the Hermeneutic, or the Cultural paradigm in that they reject the notion of social experience serving as a mediating factor between signifying practices (the cultural) and structures of power (the social). Instead, these positions suggest that social experience is itself the product of the cultural. That structures of power do not exist outside the cultural, but are inherent in its signifying practices. As such, encoding is considered reflective of the dominant forms of decoding. Within the Discursive approach, the text is analyzed in terms of its

competing forms of signifying practices, or the different ways in which it locates the subject within its construction of experience. The possibility of different decodings is attributed to the existence of different positions accorded by the text (Grossberg 1984, 409-418).

Morley rejects the Structuralist assumption, with the findings of "The *Nationwide Audience*" serving as evidence, of a passive audience that is incapable of appropriating and interpreting the text in ways other than those determined by the text. He suggests that "if we are to speak of the reproduction of a dominant ideology, we must see that such an ideology can *only* have effectivity in articulation with the existing forms of common sense and culture of the groups to whom it is addressed" (Morley 1980, 149-150).

In the postscript of the "The *Nationwide Audience*," Morley also re-conceptualizes the relationship between the text and audience. In doing so, he appears to be addressing some of the shortfalls of the Cultural and Structural paradigms. The three main points of analysis within this approach include: 1) The need to apply the notion of 'the reader inscribed by the text' in relation to specific genres rather than specific texts. 2) To specify the concept of "ideal reader" in terms of the cultural competence required for reading different genres. And 3) make a distinction between the recipient -- the actual historical reader; the addressee-- the author's conception of whom s/he is addressing; and the reader -- a formal textually defined entity (Morley 1981, 12). While these points of analysis lean more towards an ethnographic approach to audience-based research, the second point in particular can be reformulated to serve as a tool for analyzing the "Journal."

In expanding the term "cultural competence" Morley argues that each genres "requires the viewer to be competent in certain forms of knowledge and to be familiar with certain conventions which constitute the ground or

framework within/on which particular propositions can be made." He further states that "current affairs TV presumes, or requires, a viewer competent in the codes of parliamentary democracy and economics. The viewer is again required to have available particular forms of knowledge and expertise, because the assumptions/frameworks within which reports/discussion move will rarely be made explicit within the programmes" (Morley 1981, 12). Such a position reiterates a fundamental aspect of the cultural text: assumption of a shared common-sense with its audience, or taken-for-granted knowledge of social structures and conventions. And in the context of Morley's criticism of the Structuralist paradigm, which redefines the relationship between the social and the cultural, these assumptions are implicitly narrowed. In other words, Morley's suggests that effectivity in articulation takes place within the existing forms of common sense and culture of the group being addressed (Morley 1980, 149-50). This position thus infers that the signifying practices of more focused issues must also accommodate the shared codes of the group(s) being addressed. In outlining the methodology of this study, this position is defined further.

A METHODOLOGY FOR ANALYZING THE "JOURNAL"

The concept of "cultural competence" is central to the analysis of the "Journal's" informational value. And a knowledge of the broader social structures and conventions, attributed to the viewers of public affairs television by Morley, is slightly narrowed in the context of the "Journal's" coverage of FTA during the election campaign. It is identified as: 1) A recognition of the three main political parties running in the election, their respective leaders and representatives, and a parliamentary democracy that binds them. 2) An acceptance of the credibility of the institutions, groups and individuals offering

their points of view on FTA, and a capitalist economy that defines their positions. 3) A familiarity with the "Journal" as a source of information on FTA, and the conventions of the television medium within which it is produced. In keeping with Morley's position, the "Journal's" assumptions of this shared knowledge, or codes of signification with its audience are best reflected by the tacit boundaries within which the discussions/presentation of specific issues take place.

This study also adopts a more focused view of Morley's position on the Structuralist paradigm. It suggests that *information* can only have *value* if it is articulated within the cultural competence of the group being addressed (Morley 1980, 149-150). In other words, it is the assumption of the audience's knowledge, or shared codes on a particular issue that accords value to the information presented on that issue. For example, an article on the repercussions of FTA in an academic journal would be based on a set of assumptions quite different from one published in a news magazine. The former may assume that the reader is familiar with the basic historical, socio-economic and/or political contexts within which the opposing positions are generally argued. The latter, catering to a less select group, may have to present the opposing positions within these contexts, in an attempt to advance an understanding of the issues.

As stated at the outset, the "Journal" aired segments on "ordinary" Canadians during the six-week election campaign. These segments give evidence of the program's notions of its primary audience, as the factors that project a particular image of "ordinary" Canadians also profile the viewers with whom the "Journal" assumes a shared common-sense with respect to this sector of the electorate. These assumptions are most acutely reflected by the representation given to some socio-political and/or cultural groups over

others, and by the manner in which opposing voices from within these groups are accorded a forum. They are more implicitly reflected by how the role of the reporter is rationalized, or how the objective position of the program is projected in the course of structuring a particular image of "ordinary" Canadians.

Thus the central aim of analyzing these segments is not to establish the balance in the coverage given to "ordinary" Canadians favouring or opposing free trade. Instead, the main focus is on how the production choices of the program reflect an assumption of shared common-sense with its audience regarding these choices. The third chapter of this study, therefore, analyzes the "Journal's" patterns of nominating "ordinary" Canadians and the patterns of appropriating and advancing the issues. Emphasis is placed on a qualitative analysis. The focus is not only on how many times specific individuals are nominated, but also on how their opposing views are juxtapositioned against one another. The analysis not only highlights the issues raised but also how they are raised, both in terms of who initiates these issues as well as the narrative structure that characterizes their presentation. As inferred above, these points of analysis outline the program's assumptions of the knowledge/expertise of its audience of "ordinary" Canadians on FTA.

The above approach lays the groundwork for analyzing, in the fourth chapter, the segments in which politicians and experts are nominated to present their positions on FTA. Again, the central aim of the analysis is not to establish the coverage given to the opposing sides, but to focus on the contexts within which issues on FTA are presented, and the patterns of appropriating and advancing the issues that characterize their presentation. The latter highlight the factors that either enhance or inhibit the program's informational

value, or its attempts to present FTA in relation to its assumptions about its audience.

The analysis of the informational value of the "Journal, " thus reconceptualizes the notion of objectivity. It does so by giving precedence to *how* the various positions are explained as opposed to whether or not they are equally presented. In this respect, the bias of the "Journal" is not significantly reflected by the time allotted to each position, by the credentials of the guests invited to air their views, or even by the specific statements made on the issues. In other words, the bias is not in relation to whether or not the program favoured or opposed the Agreement. Instead, the "Journal's" bias is viewed in terms of a presentation that assumes either a greater or lower level of cultural competence of its audience than one projected by the program through its coverage of "ordinary" Canadians. The relative presence or absence of such a bias is in turn reflective of the "Journal's" perception of its own role, either merely as a forum for airing opposing views or a source for facilitating informed decisions on public policy.

It will not be possible to analyze the "Journal's" coverage of FTA without first outlining the national debate on this issue. The second chapter of this study, therefore, examines FTA within contexts that offer the reasoning or basis for the opposing positions on issues such as jobs, social programs, national sovereignty, culture, and natural resources. Such an examination illustrates the complex nature of the projections made by both sides of the FTA debate. It also reinforces the inability to establish an understanding of the Agreement by restricting the discussion to a point-counter-point format of diametric projections.

The empirical analysis of the "Journal" is based on transcripts obtained from the National Media Archive of the Fraser Institute in Vancouver. In the

October 1988 issue of *On Balance*, a monthly in-house publication, the Institute published the results of a content analysis of the coverage given to free trade, by the *National*, the "Journal," and the Globe and Mail for a year commencing May 31, 1987. It should be noted that the results of this study, both because of the period covered and the methodology of the research employed, will not form the basis of any premiss for the research being undertaken here. A segment of the analysis, in the fourth chapter, will also be based on videotapes of the "Journal" programs accessed through the National Archive of Sound and Moving Images in Ottawa.

CHAPTER 2

THE CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT: THE BASIS FOR THE OPPOSING POSITIONS

This chapter outlines some of the basis for the opposing positions on the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (FTA/Agreement) during the 1988 Canadian federal election. It also outlines the stance taken by the three main political parties, and cites examples of the partisan rhetoric that generally characterized most discussions on this issue. As such, it examines the debate on FTA within the context of: (1) History (2) Market Forces (3) International Precedent/Alternatives (4) The Three Federal Political Parties/Rhetorical Position.

In outlining the history of free trade between Canada and the United States the focus is on the dramatic shifts in the stance taken by some of the major Canadian organized groups on this issue. These shifts are significant, for they demonstrate how, in 1988, some of the organized groups adopted a position traditionally held by their opponents. In doing so, they reveal less clearly defined borders between the opposing positions, and suggest that the often diametric projections made by each be assessed from a broader perspective.

As stated at the outset, the wavering support for free trade also indicates that it is a policy whose interpretation is contingent upon the changing socio-

economic and/or political agendas of its interpreters. Thus resulting in different approaches to a single problem -- the Canadian economy and its future. These approaches can mainly be attributed to a preference for one of two distinct models of governance: one emphasizing government intervention as an instrument for safeguarding the "public interest," the other placing its confidence in the market forces for serving these interests. This point is elucidated further when examining opposing arguments that centred on how the market forces could affect jobs, social programs, sovereignty, cultural industries and natural resources as the result of FTA.

In some instances, arguments over FTA were substantiated by references to the trade policies of other countries. Those who opposed the Agreement also offered a few alternatives. An overview of these arguments and alternatives is presented when examining the opposing positions in the context of "International Precedent/ Alternatives." Most discussions on the Agreement, however, were predominantly governed by the campaign strategies of the three main political parties whose primary objective was to get elected. As a result, partisan rhetoric often took precedence over in-depth discussions. The term rhetoric in this study is in reference to projections about the repercussions of the Agreement without any specific reasons being given to back them up. A brief background on the position of the three main political parties on FTA, and the partisan rhetoric that was often associated with any discussion on this issue, is presented under "The Three Federal Political Parties/Rhetorical Position."

The purpose of outlining the above contexts, or the background of some of the major arguments on FTA is to establish a point of reference when analyzing the informational value of the "Journal" in Chapter IV. That is, by outlining the historical, socio-economic and/or political reasoning that guided

those favouring or opposing the Agreement, the ground is set for analyzing the extent to which the "Journal" did the same, in relation to its assumptions about its audience.

Prior to a discussion of the issues within the contexts stated above, a table briefly lists some of the major Canadian organizations and their stance on FTA during the election.

TABLE 2.1

Organizations Favouring FTA

- The Conservative Party
- The Cdn. Manufacturer's Assoc.
- Business Council on National Issues
- Canadian Chamber of Commerce
- Canadian Petroleum Association

Organizations Opposing FTA

- The Liberal Party
- The New Democratic Party
- Canadian Labour Congress
- Council of Canadians
- Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops

1. FTA in a Historical Context

The first Canadian interest in free trade with the United States resulted from changes in Britain's trade policy. In early 1846 Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel announced drastic reductions on timber tariffs, and gradual replacement of the Corn Laws. As a result, the timber and wheat industries of the four provinces of pre-confederation British North America -- Canada, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island -- which had enjoyed preferential tariffs accorded to the colonies, suffered a great loss (Gray 1988, 5-6; White 1989, 43).

Freer trade in Britain meant that Canadian businesses now had to compete with the United States in a previously secure market, while trying to overcome growing protectionism of the U.S. trade policy. The difficulties in

adjusting to the new rules of international trade were perhaps most acutely felt in Montreal, where bankruptcies were rampant and the economy was further burdened by the arrival of Irish refugees escaping the famine (Gray 1988, 6). Some community leaders proposed a solution that went beyond curing the ailing economy. Fears of political domination by the French-speaking majority of the Province of Canada cultivated the idea of both economic and political union with the United States, resulting in the Annexation Manifesto (Gray 1988, 6). Such a union was to have a positive impact on farm prices and the cost of imports, increase exports, and engulf the French in a large Anglo-Saxon nation (Gray 1988, 6). Among those who endorsed the Manifesto were Alexander Tilloch Galt, one of the fathers of confederation, and John Abbott who later became prime minister of Canada.

Not all community leaders were receptive to the idea of annexation, and as an alternative they proposed a reciprocity treaty with the United States. This proposition received little enthusiasm from most U.S. politicians, however, who also felt that the British North American colonies should simply become part of the United States. But after several years of negotiations and a few concessions by Lord Elgin, the chief negotiator for Canada, the Reciprocity Treaty was finally signed in 1854. The concessions included free access to the St. Lawrence River and fishing in Canadian waters off the Atlantic provinces (White 1989, 45).

The Treaty allowed either party to abrogate after a period of ten years, and in 1866 the United States acted upon this provision. A number of reasons have been cited for the U.S. decision, included among them are growing protectionism on both sides of the border, a hope that Canada could be annexed if the treaty was abrogated, and resentment over the British and British North

American sympathies for the South during the Civil War (White 1989, 55; Gray 1988, 8-9; Garos 1990, 7).

Once the Reciprocity Treaty was abrogated, several attempts were made by both the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party to renegotiate a similar treaty. In 1869, Conservative leader John A. Macdonald sent his minister of finance, John Rose, to initiate the talks and in 1871 went to the United States himself, but neither attempt was successful. In 1874, the Liberal leader Alexander Mackenzie sent George Brown, who was successful to the extent that he obtained a draft agreement, which listed for free trade 60 natural products, agriculture implements and 37 other categories. The U.S. Congress, however, rejected the agreement (Gray 1988, 9; Stevens 1987, 9).

In the election of 1878, with no possibility of another reciprocity treaty with the Americans in sight, John A. Macdonald proposed the National Policy. Aside from giving the Conservatives a platform with which to oppose the Liberals, this protectionist policy was to support the manufacturing sector by placing high tariffs on imports, and promote economic and political links running east-west rather than north-south. Protectionism was also to overcome economic disadvantages resulting from a vast geography and a sparse population, and develop industries that could not compete internationally but could be successful within Canada (Gray 1988, 10-11; White 1989, 61-63; Garos 1990, 7).

Support for the National Policy was divided. The industrial sector endorsed it, while those wanting commercial union with the United States -- farmers, fishermen, lumbermen and miners -- opposed it (Gray 1988, 10). Even with the staples producers against them, the Conservatives managed to win four consecutive elections on the National Policy platform -- 1878, 1882, 1887, and 1891. Advocating protectionism did not prevent Macdonald from pursuing

a reciprocity treaty, however. He sent Charles Tupper to the United States in 1887, and made one last attempt at obtaining the treaty in 1892. Macdonald's position towards freer trade was that he was not against such an arrangement, but that he was against one that was unfair to Canada -- something he accused the Liberals of negotiating (Stevens 1987, 9).

In the election of 1891, the last on the National Policy platform, the two political parties were further polarized by the endorsement of unrestricted reciprocity by the new Liberal leader, Wilfrid Laurier. Unrestricted reciprocity called for complete free trade with the United States in both natural and manufactured products (White 1989, 69). Macdonald fought the issue by reinforcing the patriotic sentiments of Canadians towards Britain. He referred to unrestricted reciprocity as "the 'veiled treason' which attempts ... to lure our people from their allegiance" (Gray 1988, 12).

The patriotic sentiments of Canadian labour, which was just beginning to organize, are interesting to note here. In a journal of the Toronto Trades and Labor Council, labor stated that building Canada as a separate nation was "the greatest and most stupendous blunder," for which the "CPR was built, the protective tariff created, the northwest land monopolies endorsed, and the people's money squandered in immigration." (Gray 1988, 12).

By placing the issue of free trade -- whether restricted or unrestricted -- on the back burner, and opting for a more protectionist policy, the Liberals matched the Conservative victories by winning the next four consecutive elections -- 1896, 1900, 1904 and 1908. Understandably, the Liberals were accused of preaching free trade when in opposition, but practicing protectionism when in power (Gray 1988, 12-13). One year after winning the first of these elections, however, Laurier did go to Washington to try to stir American interest in freer

trade, but when met with an unenthusiastic response he left it up to the United States to initiate any future talks (Stevens 1987, 9-10; White 1989, 86).

It was not until 1910 that interest in a new Reciprocity Treaty resurfaced. This time, however, the Americans led by President William Howard Taft initiated the talks. President Taft saw potential political advantages in a trade agreement that promised lower newsprint costs for the mass-producing American publishing industry (White 1989, 87). The initial Canadian response by Laurier's finance minister, W. S. Fielding, was to exempt manufactured goods from any negotiations and restrict the talks to resource products alone (White 1989, 89). The final document, known as the Taft-Fielding Agreement included only a few manufactured products where both parties agreed to minor tariff reductions. Still, the Treaty was the most comprehensive yet negotiated between the two nations (Gray 1988, 14).

Although the debate on freer trade had dominated previous elections, the election of 1911 is considered the first on this issue, for the country was never more close to achieving an agreement, since its abrogation in 1866, than at this time (Gray 1988, 13-14). As before, Canadians remained strongly divided. Some feared eventual annexation by the United States while others, like the Western farmers, remained staunch supporter of freer trade, and yet others changed camps in the debate (White 1989, 90). Lumber interests now demanded protection along with the manufacturing sector and the railways. The Canadian Manufacturers Association endorsed protectionism as the "only politics the Association should recognize" (Gray 1988, 13-15).

The division caused by this Reciprocity Treaty was not restricted to specific sectors of the Canadian economy, it also resulted in some politicians changing camps. A few Conservatives from the West could not help but

support the deal, while 18 prominent Liberals from Toronto including Clifford Sifton, minister of interior in Laurier's government, opposed the deal (White 1989, 92-94). The efforts of the Conservatives, who were now led by Robert Borden, combined with the support of some of the Liberals who had broken ranks with their leader resulted in a Conservative victory of 134 seats compared to 87 seats for the Liberals (Gray 1988, 14).

With the defeat of the Liberals in 1911, the issue of free trade was not brought to the forefront of Canadian federal politics until the election of 1988. Although political history of the country does record various efforts for lower tariff rates with the United States, particularly by the Liberal administration of William Lyon Mackenzie King who continued the negotiations started by his Conservative predecessor Richard Bedford Bennett in 1933. Soon after King returned to power in 1935, for the second half of his long tenure as prime minister (1935-1948), his efforts materialized in the first of two trade agreements his administration would sign with the United States. Although not as comprehensive as the one negotiated by Laurier's government in 1910, this treaty did reduce tariff rates between the two countries. The second agreement was signed in 1938 (Garos 1990, 8; White 1989, 112-113).

King's administration came the closest to negotiating a free trade agreement with the United States in 1948, when the Americans suggested a modified customs union through which there would be considerable free trade between the two countries while each would set its own tariffs with its other trading partners. Both the minister of trade, C.D. Howe, and minister of finance, Douglas Abbott, strongly supported such a deal. But King, cautious of the political repercussions such a deal had wrought in the 1911 election in which he had lost his own parliamentary seat, opted not to pursue the issue (Gray 1988, 15-17; White 1989, 113; Garos 1990, 8).

In the debate over free trade during the 1988 election, proponents of FTA based some of their arguments on the more recent historical developments. For example, the traditional reliance on natural resources had become increasingly less secure after the Second World War. As a result, the proponents thought it essential that Canada change from a resource-based economy to one that is assured a large market for its manufacturing and service related industries. Thus a transition from a primary to a secondary and tertiary economy was considered a prerequisite if Canada was to compete internationally in goods and services. GATT was not considered a sufficient avenue for securing the markets for Canada as previous negotiations through GATT had proven extremely complex and drawn out over several years (Herrick 1988, 48; Lipsey 1987a, 59; Chapman 1987, 9).

A rise in protectionist sentiments in the United States was also a cause for concern for those markets which Canada already had access to. A 35% tariff imposed on Canadian exports of cedar shakes and shingles in 1986 was cited as an example. Other examples included a petition filed by the U.S. Coalition for Fair Lumber Imports requiring a 27% duty on Canadian softwood lumber, as well as protectionist actions against such Canadian products as steel forklifts, carnations, sugar products, whole, fresh groundfish and steel tubular products. As well, complaints by U.S. producers of hydro-electricity, uranium, oil, natural gas and steel, against importing these products were given as evidence of a growing protectionist sentiments in the United States as the result of record high trade deficits (Chapman 1987, 18-20). Comparisons were also made of how Canada had prospered due to trade liberalization after the Second World War, and how protectionism in the past had culminated in the world Depression of the '30s, resulting in massive unemployment (D'Aquino 1988, 57).

The opponents of FTA argued that throughout history the Canadian government has been assisting the private sector in overcoming great distances, a harsh climate and a sparse population to enable it to compete with a more populous and powerful neighbour. In their opinion, effective industrial development policies would require the Canadian government to play a complementary role by assisting the initiatives of the private sector. This cooperation between the government and the private sector could find precedent in modern day economic policies of Japan, West Germany, Sweden and Austria. More importantly, it was pointed out that such a cooperation has been in effect in the United States, where defence related programs have supported some sectors of the U.S. industry while other government programs have provided support to other sectors (Hyndman 1988, 5).

This history of the politics of free trade makes one keenly aware of the dramatic shifts, during the 1988 Canadian federal election, in the traditionally held positions of some of the major Canadian organized groups. The Canadian Manufacturer's Association, which had been persistent in its opposition to free trade, joined the Business Council on National Issues and the Chamber of Commerce to support the deal. Labour, which once considered Canada a "blunder," sided with such organizations as the Pro-Canada Network, and the Conference of Catholic Bishops to voice its concerns over the impact of free trade on Canadian sovereignty. The Conservative Party, which had promoted protectionism through its National Policy saw free trade as the only way of saving Canada from a bleak economic future. And the Liberals, who had consistently favoured free trade -- although at times only tacitly -- were among the staunchest opponents of such a deal.

The changing stance of the economic and political sectors was in turn reflected in the regional support for FTA. Western and Atlantic provinces,

which in the past had been strong advocates of free trade, now opposed it. Of the two provinces which had previously been against free trade -- Quebec and Ontario -- only Quebec changed its position. Ontario and Manitoba remained the only provinces committed to their traditional stance of opposing free trade (Chapman 1987, p. 10).

2. FTA in the Context of the Market Forces

As stated at the outset, opposing views on FTA can be related to a preference for one of two distinct models of governance. And a key factor distinguishing the model of governance based on government intervention from one based on the market forces is the perception of "public interest," or collective good in each. Historically, collective good was a concept related to the needs and goals of large groups of people transcending national boundaries, united either by their ideology, religious beliefs, or other factors such as continentalism or race (Smith 1989, 11).

More recently, Western countries espousing the benefits of private enterprise have narrowed the notion of collective good in reference to people living within the national borders. And to ensure a balance between the private and the public, these countries have identified and prioritized those public sectors deemed essential for assuring long-term collective benefits as opposed to relatively short-term private gains (Smith 1989, 11). In accommodating the public in this manner the state has been vested with the authority to provide specific services, regulate the private sectors which provide these services, or legislate national or regional policies related to these services (Smith 1989, 12). In this new context, the implication is "of the existence of a natural conflict between ... strivings of people for their own

betterment and the social benefit which might ensue from a partial or temporary denial of self-gain" (Smith 1989, 11).

In Canada, the concept of collective good has led to a prominent role for the government in ensuring regional parity in areas such as health care, transportation, social welfare, education, and telecommunications. It has also resulted in government intervention, through tariffs and other incentives, for developing indigenous private sectors unable to compete in an open world market.

While public sectors similar to Canada's also exist in the United States, the notion of "public" is not necessarily as broad nor the services provided as liberal. For instance, 42% of the service in the U.S. health care system is provided by the public sector while 58% is provided by the private sector. In Canada, 75% of the health care system is provided by the public sector and 25% is provided privately. In relation to the Canadian economy the U.S. public sector as a whole is about two-thirds the size of its Canadian counterpart. And at the municipal level, the Canadian public sector extends to such services as garbage collection, road and street maintenance, parks and recreational services while these services are offered by the private sector in the United States (Calvert 1988, 42).

Central to the 1988 FTA debate was Canada's ability to maintain the status quo in the face of a rapidly changing world economy, either through the restructuring of national policies or through exploiting private initiatives in a free market. In both instances, the role of the government would have to be redefined, and in the case of the latter the more traditional perception of "public" would have to be re-examined. Under the model of governance based on a free market the notion of public would become synonymous with the term "consumer" and the collective good defined in terms of access to cheaper

and more diverse products and services provided by the private sector (Smith 1989, 12). The proponents of this model were of the view that by opening its borders Canada would generate revenues to not only sustain, but improve the services currently offered by the state.

A freer market implies a return to the notion of "collective" that is without any well-defined borders. In the FTA debate, it was perhaps the absence of clear economic borders and the redirection of the government's role as a regulatory body for the private markets (Mosco 1989, 91) that caused some to be concerned. That is, in this new economic arrangement would the definition and priorities of "public interest," or collective good be reassessed in accordance with the priorities of the larger trading partner?

PROPONENTS OF FTA

When advocating their position on FTA, the proponents of the Agreement derived their arguments from the classical theory of international trade (Chapman 1987, 4). Any discussion favouring the Agreement included at least some of the basic principles of this theory. Thus, it was argued that free trade would rationalize, or restructure the manufacturing industries so as to fully exploit economies of scale (Wigle 1987, 92; Chapman 1987, 4). This would result in mass production of specialized products where Canada already had a comparative advantage rather than small-scale and less cost-effective production of previously tariff-protected products (a market of at least 100 million people is considered a prerequisite for fully exploiting new technologies and achieving economies of scale) (Chapman 1987, 4-8; Chapman 1988, 3).

An economy based on comparative advantage would mean that it would not be the cost of production of a specific Canadian product compared to its

American counterpart that would be important, but the cost of producing specific Canadian products compared to other Canadian products. Such specialization on each side of the border, it was proposed, would increase trade in both directions (Wigle 1987, 92). The Agreement would also promote efficiency and lower the prices of domestically produced goods as the result of increased competition; there would be an increase in the consumers' disposable income due to lower prices of imports; and access to a huge U.S. market would encourage investment, accelerate technological diffusion within an industry, and promote research and development (Chapman 1987, 4; Chapman 1988, 3; D'Aquino 1988, 59).

Jobs

The sheer size of the U.S. market -- ten times that of Canada -- led some to forecast the creation of 75,000 new jobs if Canada were to increase by just one percent its share of the government procurement market in the United States (D'Aquino 1988, 57). The expected rise in unemployment due to lower priced imports competing against more expensive Canadian products was to be offset by an increase in the demand for Canadian products by the United States, and the Government estimated that 120,000 new jobs would be created by the fifth year of the Agreement (Chapman 1988, 5).

Although 80% of Canada's exports to the United States were already duty-free by 1987, the removal of the remaining U.S. tariffs, and an assurance that they would not be reimplemented were considered essential in encouraging the Canadian manufacturing sector to reorganize (Chapman 1987, 5-7). FTA was to enable such a reorganization in two ways. First, greater access to the U.S. market would mean that Canadian companies would have to become more efficient in order to compete effectively. Second, companies

manufacturing only for the domestic market would also have to restructure their production methods as they would be faced with competition from imports (Chapman 1987, 4). Short-term costs of rationalizing the industry and the displacement of some of the labour force during the transitional period were to be offset by long-term gains in Canada's GNP and a more secure market for the labour force. An increase in wages was also projected as the result of lower production costs (Chapman 1987, 5; Chapman 1988, 4).

Social Programs

Proponents of free trade saw the future of Canada's social programs strengthened. In keeping with the tradition of classic economy theory, financing of social programs was attributed to the redistribution of revenues generated through income tax. While the fiscal harmonization of income tax, through fairly similar tax structures, was a strong possibility under free trade, the distribution of the revenues generated was to be left up to the government of each trading partner. And since free trade was expected to increase economic activity, resulting in an increase in income tax revenues, no real danger to the social programs was foreseen (Reisman 1988a, 39; Hum 1988, 27-43).

The safeguarding of Canada's social programs was also attributed to two specific sections of the Agreement. The introduction to Chapter 14 of the Agreement, it was argued, specifically exempted government-provided services from the negotiations, and Article 1601, paragraph 3, would not allow the United States access to Canadian health and social services. While management services of health care facilities could be contracted out, this could only be done with the Government's approval (Norquay 1988, 17).

Sovereignty

The proponents of FTA conceded that international agreements restrict sovereignty. However, they proposed that these restrictions be seen in light of the benefits such agreements offer. In the case of FTA, the benefits were to outweigh any restrictions placed on Canada. To further their point of how relatively insignificant these restrictions can be in the overall sovereignty of the country, the proponents pointed to the fact that since 1940 duties collected on U.S. goods had fallen from approximately 13% of the value of total imports to less than 3% in 1986. During this period of trade liberalization, Canada continued to pursue its own national policies, reflected in its social programs (Chapman 1988, 5; Lipsey 1987b, 255).

Cultural Industries

As far as the cultural industries were concerned, Article 2005 of the Agreement was cited as evidence that they were largely exempt from any negotiations (Campbell 1988, 20). Some of the changes that did affect the cultural industries were considered minor. They included the elimination of higher postal rates applied to U.S. magazines; payment by Canadian cable television companies for any U.S. or Canadian television signals they might use; and in the event Canada required the divestiture of indirect acquisitions of Canadian subsidiaries in the cultural industry, the sale of such a subsidiary at a fair market value, determined by an independent and impartial assessment. Some who favoured FTA considered the exemption of the cultural industries a loss for Canadian artists who could have otherwise benefitted from easier access to the U.S. market (Lipsey 1987b, 251).

Natural Resources

The future of Canada's natural resources, especially water and energy was also among the points of contention. The proponents of FTA reiterated their stance that diversion of water was not on the negotiating table, and that "nothing in the free trade agreement even indirectly placed obligations on Canada with respect to large scale water exports" (Reisman 1988b, A7). Energy, however, was negotiated and the outcome was considered one of the strongest points of the agreement favouring Canada. The proponents assured Canadians that they were under no obligation to sell energy to the U.S., that it was the market forces rather than a pre-arranged agreement that was to determine the price of energy, and that there was also no obligation to renew contracts if brownouts were feared in the future. There was, however, one obligation on the part of Canadians -- not to cut off supplies to existing U.S. customers during a period of shortage. This was thought to be a fair compromise in exchange for a free and secure access to a large market (Reisman 1988b, A7).

OPPONENTS OF FTA

Opponents of FTA pointed to the implications of an economic policy based on market-oriented values. Such a policy, they argued, would enable large corporations to benefit at the cost of labour-intensive industries; Canada's economic, social and cultural policies would eventually become harmonized with the U.S.; such a policy would promote the concept that the market contained an in-built system whereby wealth in the hands of a few would eventually trickle down to the many; and Canadian economic policies would be pressured into making further reductions in the country's environmental standards (Ethical Choices & Political Challenges 1987, 12-19).

Businesses were expected to consider the strong Canadian labour laws a hindrance to their competitive edge and re-establish South of the border. Such pressures were considered a threat to the substantial gains Canadian labour had made in the last twenty-three years. The Canadian labour movement had increased its membership from 30% to 37% of the non-agricultural work force between 1965 and 1988, while the American labour movement had its membership drop from 30% to 17% in that same period. This was considered the lowest percentage of unionized workers in the industrial world, and was attributed to American labour laws, which made it much more difficult to organize a workplace. Weaker American labour laws were also noted with respect to the minimum wage -- nine U.S. states had no minimum wage legislation, and where such legislation existed, the rates were usually lower than in Canada. American workers were also not obligated to belong or pay fees to the union of their workplace, but these same workers had to be included in any bargaining the union engaged in on behalf of its members. This was considered a blatant attempt to undermine the financial stability of the unions. Since strong Canadian labour laws were considered essential factors in guaranteeing the continuation of social programs; defending the rights of women, minorities, and the disabled; and protecting collective bargaining, any attempt at bridging the gaps between the labour laws of the two countries were viewed with extreme caution (Lynk 1988, 18-20, 36).

Jobs

Massive dislocation of jobs and high transition costs were foreseen as the immediate consequences of tariff removal. The inability of the Canadian manufacturing sector to compete with its larger and better established U.S. counterpart was considered a strong possibility, eventually leading to the

replacement of Canadian jobs by those created in the United States. The removal of tariffs was also seen as an incentive for U.S. companies to shift production from Canadian branch plants and serve the North American market from their home base. These and other such projections, coupled with the fact that there were no specific plans in place to address the adjustment process and the high transitional costs, increased the anxieties towards FTA (Chapman 1988, 4; Surich 1987, 196-197)

Opponents of FTA referred to the consistent decline in the Government's projections of how many jobs would be created. It specifically pointed to early estimates made by the Economic Council of Canada of 350,000 new jobs, later brought down to 250,000 and reduced even further by the Department of Finance to 120,000 jobs over five years. Such estimates were considered insignificant compared to the number of jobs created through normal growth of the economy and the number of jobs estimated to be lost through FTA by studies conducted by the Ontario Government and the B.C. Federation of Labour (Council of Canadians 1988a, Issue Sheet #6). The projection of the loss of jobs in the thousands, and the absence of any assured compensation for the workers served to further confirm the position of those opposing FTA.

Social Programs

Among the social programs, the future of unemployment insurance and worker's compensation was considered the bleakest under FTA. Insecurities about these programs were based on the fact that a consensus on what would constitute a subsidy was not to be reached until five to seven years into the Agreement. By that time, it was argued, Canada would be so committed to the changes in the industry brought on by free trade that it would not be able to

exercise its option to opt out of the deal. Thus, it would be forced to negotiate the definition of subsidy from a weakened position (Lynk 1988, 20; Hum 1988, 37; Tsalikis 1988, 103).

Concerns over the future of Canadian health services were based on Chapter 14 of the Agreement, which enabled American management firms to access such areas of Canadian health care facilities as hospitals, nursing homes, ambulance services and specialized clinics. Allowing these firms to develop in Canada was considered a serious threat to the Canadian health services as they would encourage a "two-tier care structure" similar to that of the United States, and add pressure for harmonizing the Canadian health services with those of the United States (Council of Canadians 1988a, Issue Sheet #2).

Sovereignty

In answering the question of whether Canada could maintain its sovereignty under free trade, the opponents of the Agreement gave several reasons as to why this would be increasingly difficult: The Agreement would place pressures on Canada to eliminate economic policy differences between itself and the United States, thereby preventing Canada from implementing industrial development programs specific to its needs; Canadian companies would demand cuts in their contributions to social programs, in order to compete with their U.S. counterparts. These cuts would in turn threaten the continuation of Canada's social policies; and Canada would also find it increasingly difficult to take independent stance on issues sensitive to the United States. Such policy-restricting implications of FTA were considered a serious infringement on Canada's sovereignty (Council of Canadians 1988b, 15-15).

Cultural Industries

Opponents of FTA observed a fundamental ideological difference between Canada and the United States with regard to each country's view of cultural industries. They argued that Americans have considered these industries mainly as commercial operations, while Canadians have looked upon them as a means of cultural expression and development. The opponents of FTA accepted the fact that Article 2005 exempted the cultural industries from the Agreement, but pointed out the notwithstanding clause in paragraph 2 of this Article. Such a clause, it was argued, would place Canadians in other economic sectors at risk of an American retaliation if these sectors were to provide economic support for Canadian cultural development (Council of Canadians 1988a, Issue Sheet #5).

Natural Resources

In the area of natural resources, especially water and energy, the opponents of FTA refuted the Government's claims by stating that water was included in the Agreement by way of the GATT schedules. This line of reasoning stated that since item 22.01 of the Tariff schedule permitted exports of water, and since under FTA American companies would be able to establish themselves in Canada and receive "national treatment," the Canadian Government would be able to do little to prevent these companies from exporting water to the United States (Council of Canadians 1988a, Issue Sheet #1).

With respect to energy, the opponents of FTA felt that Canada had accepted under the Agreement what had consistently been rejected in the past -- a continental energy policy. Such a policy would be the result of allowing the U.S. equal rights of access to Canada's energy resources, agreeing to share these

resources in times of shortages, and not permitting lower domestic energy prices as a means of developing Canadian industries. The opponents thought it ironic that while the price of energy was to be determined by the market forces, Canadians could not benefit from a higher market price as they, too, would have to be charged the same as the Americans. This, coupled with the fact that the Agreement included non-renewable energy resources, led the opponents to believe that Canada had locked itself in a situation where any attempt to regain control over its energy supplies would mean abrogation of the Agreement (Council of Canadians 1988, 10 in Guide to Main Issues; Council of Canadians 1988c, 7).

3. FTA in the Context of International Precedent/Alternatives to FTA

Proponents of the Agreement cited examples of countries who have liberal trade policies and yet continue to pursue their own social programs. Sweden was said to have more generous social policies than its European trading partners. Belgium and Holland were also given as examples of countries who have different social policies, while both have engaged in a customs union even prior to the European Community (Lipsey 1987b, 254). It was further pointed out that neither the 72 countries involved in free trade nor the Canadian provinces and the American states have their social policies completely harmonized. This was to serve as further proof of how little one government could do to pressure another into such an action (Lipsey 1987b, 254).

In response to examples of how free trade among the European countries had done little to harmonize their social programs, opponents of FTA pointed out that similarities between the existing social programs of the European Economic Community appear to be greater than the differences.

Although social policies may be omitted from the Agreement, it is the institutional factors, they argued, that lead to eventual harmonization (Drover 1988, 50).

While opponents of FTA agreed that the Canadian manufacturing industry needed to modernize, become more productive, increase its exports, and develop its services industry, they maintained that these objectives could be achieved by a comprehensive industrial strategy rather than a bilateral free trade agreement. Increased competition from the United States was rejected as one of the more significant means of promoting efficiency in the manufacturing sector (Chapman 1987, 6; Hyndman 1988, 2). Such institutional factors as the attitudes of labour, the state of labour-management relations, and the state of government-industry relations were considered equally important. Britain was cited as an example to support this point of view. It was the absence of these institutional factors from the British industry, which prevented it from achieving improved efficiency once Britain entered the European Common Market (Chapman 1987, p. 7).

In general, opponents of the Agreement recognized that protectionism could not be an option for Canada. And given the importance of trade to the Canadian economy they proposed that Canada's interests lie in freer trade on a multilateral level under GATT rather than a comprehensive bilateral agreement with a partner as large as the United States (Hyndman 1988, 3). The opponents of FTA considered it essential that FTA be preceded by effective industrial development policies, as well as policies on foreign investments and control. The absence of such policies, coupled with Canada's weak industrial structure and limited financial resources led some to believe that the costs of such a deal in terms of loss of jobs and business failures would outweigh the benefits (Hyndman 1988, 4-5).

The Canadian industrial structure would have to change from one that is predominantly foreign owned to one that is mostly owned by Canadians. While foreign firms brought know-how, technology, and marketing facilities, there were also disadvantages resulting from high levels of foreign ownership -- 45% overall in manufacturing and 50% to 80% in many other sectors, mostly by U.S. multinationals (Hyndman 1988, 6). The foreign owned firms failed to conduct indigenous research and development essential for Canada's future, and limited Canada's ability to serve other foreign markets. As a result, the Canadian industrial structure was highly dependent on the United States -- 75% of the foreign-owned firms' exports were noted as intra-firm transactions with their parent company, making up 60% of Canada's total trade to the United States (Hyndman 1988, 6).

Some options were offered to remedy the dependency on the United States and to change the structure of the Canadian industry. Among the more significant were changes to the government's economic policies to provide better financial support and facilities to Canadian businesses; encourage R&D to take place within Canada, and diversify the exports of foreign-controlled firms; remove trade barriers between the provinces; and establish more public or private-public firms that are both at arms length from governments and responsive to market forces. Such firms as La Caisse des depots, les Caisses Populaires, Quebec and Ontario Hydro were cited as examples (Hyndman 1988, 13-14).

A negotiating process between the federal and provincial governments, business, and labour to implement a strategic plan for improving the state of the Canadian economy was also considered a better alternative to FTA. Such a process, it was suggested, could be approached sector by sector and include the

active participation of universities in the areas of research and technology (Hyndman 1988, 11-12).

4. FTA in the Context of the Three Federal Political Parties/Rhetorical Position

The three main political parties running in the election included the Conservative Party led by Brian Mulroney, the Liberal Party led by John Turner and The New Democratic Party (NDP) led by Ed Broadbent. As indicated in the table above, the two latter parties opposed FTA. As a result, both ran a risk of a split vote that could prevent either from forming a majority government (Frizzell, Pammett, Westell 1989, 48).

The challenge for the NDP was to distinguish itself from the Liberals. It attempted to do so by associating Turner with Bay Street values as opposed to the Wall Street values of Mulroney (Frizzell, Pammett, Westell 1989, 48). The electorate was also reminded by Broadbent of Mulroney's unkept promises, and more specifically his rejection of free trade in the 1983 leadership race. This strategy, along with a reliance on Broadbent's initial popularity was not enough, however, to even meet the Party's progressively lower expectations of a role in a minority government (Frizzell, Pammett, Westell 1989, 47, 51, 59).

Unlike Ed Broadbent, John Turner's popularity rose during the campaign. At the outset, his effectiveness as a leader was questioned even within the party ranks. But his success in the leaders' debate caused many to reassess such a view. (Frizzell, Pammett, Westell 1989, 31, 64). A more significant distinction between these two parties was NDP's initial strategy to deflect attention away from FTA. In contrast, the Liberals wanted FTA to be the central issue of the election. In fact, Turner described fighting FTA as the "cause of his life" (Frizzell, Pammett, Westell 1989, 33-34, 48, 58).

The Conservative Party's strategy initially focused on its leader's ability to govern, as well as relied on endorsements of non-party spokespersons to suggest that the party had broad based support (Frizzell, Pammett, Westell 1989, 19, 22). Soon after the leaders' debate, in which Turner was declared the winner by the media and the polls, the strategy changed in two significant ways. First, the Conservative ads became more partisan and aggressive in that they challenged the credibility of the Liberal leader. Second, the party published a pamphlet entitled "Ten Big Lies," which addressed ten major criticisms of FTA (Frizzell, Pammett, Westell 1989, 22-23).

Thus, at the outset at least two of the three main parties preferred to focus on their leader and past accomplishments, yet FTA still became a central issue of the campaign. This was primarily due to the fervent stance taken by John Turner, as well as the emotions that were incited by any discussions on national sovereignty and possible loss of social programs (Frizzell, Pammett, Westell 1989, 16, 22-23, 34, 48). It was against this backdrop, along with the pressures of conforming to 10-second sound bites, that much of the information on FTA was disseminated to the electorate (Frizzell, Pammett, Westell 1989, 65). A segment of one of Turner's speeches best demonstrates the partisan rhetoric that often characterized the discussions on FTA:

"The Mulroney trade deal will fundamentally alter our way of life. The Mulroney trade deal endangers our social programmes and regional development programmes, and sacrifices our farmers, our industries our fishermen, our miners, our lumber workers, our auto workers and our textile workers to satisfy Brian Mulroney's desire to fulfil the American dream....I will not let Brian Mulroney destroy a 120-year-old dream called Canada, and neither will Canadians. I believe that on election day, Nov. 21, Canadians will understand that a vote for the Liberal Party is a vote for a stronger, fairer, more independent, unique, strong proud Canada. I believe Canadians are not going to vote for Brian Mulroney, a man who would be governor of a 51st state. They are going to vote for John Turner, whose ambition is to be prime minister of a proud Canada (Frizzell, Pammett, Westell 1989, 58-59).

The Tories responded to their opponents' rhetoric against the Agreement with a healthy dose of their own. In their pamphlet, "The Ten Big Lies," they began by challenging the critics of the Agreement to "show the clause in the agreement that takes away your pension or your medicare." This line of reasoning did little to clarify any questions on the future of social programs, and governed much of the information emanating from the political parties (Lee 1989, 224-225; Salutin 1989, 298-299).

On November 21, 1988 the Conservative Party won a 169-seat majority. On December 12, 1988 Prime Minister Brian Mulroney recalled Parliament to reintroduce the free trade legislation, whose passage was delayed by the Liberal-dominated Senate so that an election could be held on the issue. The legislation, Bill C-130, was passed by the 1 January 1989 implementation date (Chapman 1988, 17-18).

SUMMARY

The literature published by various voices in the free trade debate also reflected, for the most part, the manner in which the issue was generally presented in the mass media. A lot of emotional rhetoric and extreme generalities had to be waded through before some of the basis for each position could be established. Once this was done, however, it was easier to comprehend why each side was so firmly committed to its interpretation of the Agreement. While the proponents had complete faith in the economic process outlined by traditional economic theory, the opponents were equally confident of the changes they proposed in the Canadian industrial structure.

The argument, it seemed, boiled down to who would pay the higher price and who would reap the most benefits as the result of a complete

changeover in Canada's economic policy. The absence of well-defined transitional programs, or an adjustment period increased the anxieties of those who would be most adversely affected. Thus, contributing to an environment where calm, rational discussions and frank admissions about both the negative and positive impacts of the Agreement were replaced by the scare tactics of those opposing FTA, and unrealistic optimism of its proponents.

It is hoped that by having focused on some of the basis for the arguments on FTA the ground, to a certain extent, has been prepared for analysing the informational value of the "Journal" on this issue. That is, whether the program provided the substance behind the rhetoric of the free trade debate, in relation to its assumptions about its primary audience.

CHAPTER 3

FREE TRADE AND THE CANADIAN ELECTORATE: THE "JOURNAL'S" NOTION OF AUDIENCE

This chapter represents the initial phase of analyzing the informational value of the "Journal" programs/segments on free trade aired during the 1988 Canadian federal election. As discussed in the introductory chapter, the concept of informational value, in this study, is related to the presentation of issues in keeping with the existing knowledge, or shared codes of the group being addressed (Morley 1980, 149-150). Thus, analysis of the informational value of the "Journal" is anchored in discerning its notion of audience -- the focus of this chapter. It is also based in a recognition that the contexts within which information is presented may enhance or detract from the "Journal's" ability to accommodate this audience -- a focus of the subsequent chapter.

A number of methodologies can be employed to evaluate a program's assumptions of its audience, some more easily applied within specific time frames, others surpassing such restrictions. An example of the former would include an organizational study based on participant observation, as well as

interviews with producers and journalists regarding the decision-making process of what issues on free trade receive coverage, how these issues are covered and why. The strategy of such an inquiry being to isolate those institutional and production factors which influence and thereby reflect the program's perception of its audience. A methodology falling in the latter category would be an examination of some key documented sources offering insight into the "profiles" of the electorate with respect to the primary election issue -- free trade. These sources may include polls, demographic studies, ratings, coverage of free trade by other mass media, as well as the campaign strategies of the three political parties. The purpose of such an examination being to somehow relate the findings of these sources to the "Journal's" assumptions of its audience.

The methodology employed in this study adopts a different strategy. And it does so for three basic reasons. First, overcoming the barrier of time through a retrospective organizational study would be to rely on the memory of key organizational players with respect to the factors influencing their perception of their audience. Second, both a retrospective and a contemporaneous organizational study would shift the emphasis of the analysis to the intentions of the sender rather than the end product of those intentions -- the programs themselves. A point that echoes Morley's criticism of the encoding/decoding model referred to in the introduction (Morley 1981, 4-5). Finally, correlating the "Journal's" notion of audience with the general profiles of the electorate established by other institutional forces would be to speculate on the influence of each on the program.

Thus, as stated in the methodology of this study, this chapter isolates for analysis transcripts of segments aired during the six-week election period that offer the most direct evidence of the "Journal's" notion of audience -- segments

that nominate "ordinary" Canadians to reflect a particular "profile" of the electorate. It can be argued that such a profile may be for the benefit of the politicians and key interpreters of free trade, whom the programs may be addressing, rather than be representative of the voters considered to be the audience. Such an argument is weakened, however, by the improbability of such a selective audience for a publicly financed program on a mass medium. And more importantly, by the narrative and non-linguistic links made between the Canadians watching and those being watched. In identifying these links, the analysis of these segments begins with an examination of the nomination process. This is followed by a review of how the various topics are introduced, substantiated, refuted or elucidated. Such a focus, on how specific issues are appropriated and advanced, also provides an overview of the content of the segments. Further insight into the content is provided during the discussion of the narrative structure.

The central aim in isolating the above structural elements is to analyze the patterns they precipitate. The implication being that recurring structural elements are reflective of the "Journal" production team's assumption of a shared common-sense with its audience. Thus, patterns of nomination indicate a shared common-sense regarding who constitute "ordinary" Canadians. These patterns suggest that the program is *primarily* addressing those, from among the mass audience, who can identify with its image of the electorate. Patterns of appropriating and advancing the issues reflect the "Journal's" assumptions of the information being sought by "ordinary" Canadians, as well as their understanding of the issues related to free trade. The narrative structure indicates attempts of the program to link its primary audience with the Canadians nominated to appear on it.

Analysis of the above patterns cannot be conducted in strict isolation of each other as they are engaged simultaneously. For example, when analyzing the patterns of nomination, references will inevitably be made to how the nomination was appropriated and what were some of the issues discussed as the result of the nomination -- points of analysis more directly related to the appropriation and advancement of issues and the narrative structure. Also, the patterns are examined for their exclusions as much as they are for their inclusions. Such an approach ascribes to absence an integral role in advancing a particular notion of common sense, as well as regard it as an effective tool for maintaining an objective position of the journalist -- points which will be elucidated in the course of the analysis. Although this approach is suggestive of a highly open-ended examination, for the structural elements that are absent can be innumerable, the range is narrowed by identifying the absences within the framework of the individuals nominated.

It should be noted that the labels accorded to the formats in this chapter are basically meant to offer a general description of the segments, which are not necessarily restricted to one specific form of presentation. Rather, these segments offer structural cues related to a variety of formats. For instance, segments introduced as "reports" by the "Journal's" anchor have elements of documentary by way of their serial nature, which enables the coverage of an issue over an extended period; by the settings that are more "natural" in relation to the people nominated, giving the coverage a sense of "actuality" (Medhurst 1989, 184); by a nomination process that often obscures the structural control exercised by the reporter; and by the discrete "absence" of the reporter. Segments introduced as "portraits" or documentary have elements of a news report, for they focus on the current problems facing "ordinary"

Canadians as the result of recent policies put forward by the federal government.

The difficulty in distinctly categorizing the formats of segments focusing on "ordinary" Canadians is made even more apparent when categorizing the formats of segments where Experts and Politicians are nominated. Almost all of the segments of the latter two categories, which will be the focus of the subsequent chapter, are restricted to one or two locations -- usually the "Journal" set or an office or other formal setting such as the St. Lawrence Hall; the people nominated are fewer and identified in the beginning of the segment; and the reporter's role is defined by the spatial and temporal boundaries of the setting. These factors enable an easier identification with such formats as formal debates, in-studio debate/discussion, panel discussions, one-on-one interview etc. Thus, the central aim in this chapter will not be to dwell on the semantics of categorizing the formats, but to analyze the often overlapping techniques involved in advancing a specific notion of common sense, in part, by "obscuring the marks of construction" (Rosteck 1989, 283). The five segments on the Philips employees, which represent the major portion of coverage given to "ordinary" Canadians, will be the starting point of the analysis.

SERIAL REPORTS

The segments on Philips employees can best be described as serial reports, for they provide an on-going coverage of the factors affecting the decisions of a few Canadians in casting their ballot. The analysis of these segments begins with tables that identify some of the basic structural elements of the nomination process in each of the five segments: the choice of location, the names and social status of those nominated, their political stance, and a

summary of the main focus. This is followed by a table that summarizes the relative coverage given to each nominee vis a vis his/her political stance. It lists, by name, the employees nominated; their political stance at the start of the segments and at the end of the segments; the number of segments in which they appeared; and the sequential order of the segments in which they appeared. These tables serve as points of reference when analyzing the patterns of nomination as a whole.

TABLE 3.1 SEGMENT 1

OCTOBER 3, 1988 LOCATION: PHILLIPS ELECTRONICS, ONTARIO

REPORTER: KEVIN TIBBLES

<u>Name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Political Stance</u>
C. Dewar	Assembly line worker	NDP
R. Azerro	Comptroller/Mgr.	Undecided
A. Finestone	Travelling Salesman	Liberal (Wary of leader)

FOCUS:

•The political stance of some of the Philips employees whose opinions will be sought throughout the election.

TABLE 3.2 SEGMENT 2

OCTOBER 14, 1988 LOCATION: PHILLIPS ELECTRONICS, ONTARIO
REPORTER: KEVIN TIBBLES

<u>Name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Political Stance</u>
R. Azerro	Comptroller/Mgr.	Undecided
T. Grunberg	Manager	Conservative
C. Dewar	Assembly line worker	NDP
W. Mitchell	Forklift Driver	NDP
M. Kitt	Assembly line worker	Conservative
A. Finestone	Travelling Salesman	Liberal
L. Ferera	Restaurateur	Dissatisfied with Liberal leadership

FOCUS:

- Fiscal responsibility.
 - Government aid to workers VS. no government handouts. More jobs instead.
 - Misappropriation of taxes -- benefiting the elite rather than the average worker.
 - Reasons behind a worker's support for the Conservatives over the NDP
 - Credibility of Liberal leadership
-

TABLE 3.3 SEGMENT 3

OCTOBER 26, 1988 LOCATION: ONTARIO, ON LOCATION WITH PHILIPS EMPLOYEES
REPORTER: KEVIN TIBBLES

<u>Name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Political Stance</u> <u>Pre Debate</u>	<u>Political Stance</u> <u>Post Debate</u>
R. Azerro	Comptroller/Mgr.	Undecided	Undecided
B. Azerro	Salesperson, wife of B. Azerro	Undecided	Undecided
D. Pitchford	Unidentified	Undecided	Liberal
K. Smith	Salesman	Conservative	Undecided
Y.H. Chung	Unidentified	Undecided	Conservative
B. Wake	Financial Analyst	Conservative	Liberal
A. Finestone	Salesman	Liberal	Liberal

Focus:

- The leadership debate -- expectations regarding a clearer understanding of FTA.
 - The change in the political stance of some undecided voters due to the leadership debate.
 - Reaction to John Turner's performance in the debate.
 - A voter's support for the Liberals over the NDP -- as a means of opposing FTA.
-

TABLE 3.4 SEGMENT 4

NOVEMBER 11, 1988 LOCATION: ONTARIO/QUEBEC, ON LOCATION
WITH PHILIPS EMPLOYEES

REPORTER: KEVIN TIBBLES

<u>Name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Political Stance</u>
D. Pitchford	Communications Supervisor	Liberal
A. Finestone	Salesman	Liberal
S. Finestone	Wife of A. Finestone	Liberal
C. Finestone	Daughter of A. Finestone	Undecided
T. Grunberg	Manager	Conservative
S. Grunberg	Wife of T. Grunberg	Undecided

Focus:

- The effects of FTA on the next generation of Canadians -- jobs, sovereignty, medicare.
 - Choosing between the NDP and the Liberals for opposing FTA.
-

TABLE 3.5 SEGMENT 5

NOVEMBER 16, 1988 LOCATION: ONTARIO, ON VARIOUS LOCATIONS WITH
PHILIPS EMPLOYEES

REPORTER: KEVIN TIBBLES

<u>Name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Political Stance</u> <u>Start</u>	<u>Political Stance</u> <u>End</u>
D. Pitchford	Communications Supervisor	Undecided	Liberal
A. Finestone	Salesman	Liberal	Liberal
C. Dewar	Assembly line Worker	NDP	NDP
T. Grunberg	Manager	Conservative	Conservative
R. Azerro	Comptroller/Mgr.	Undecided	Liberal

Focus:

- The final decisions of Philips employees on casting their ballot.
 - A discussion for and against FTA.
-

TABLE 3.6

SUMMARY OF NOMINATION OF PHILIPS EMPLOYEES

<u>Name</u>	<u>Political Stance</u> <u>Start</u>	<u>Political Stance</u> <u>End</u>	<u>No. of times</u> <u>Included</u>	<u>Order of</u> <u>Segments</u>
A. Finestone	Liberal	Liberal	5	All
R. Azerro	Undecided	Liberal	4	1, 2, 3, 5
D. Pitchford	Undecided	Liberal	3	3, 4, 5
C. Dewar	NDP	NDP	3	1, 2, 5
T. Grunberg	Conservative	Conservative	3	2, 4, 5
W. Mitchell	NDP	Not Stated	1	2
M. Kitt	Conservative	Not Stated	1	2
L. Ferera	Undecided	Not stated	1	2
K. Smith	Conservative	Undecided	1	3
Y. H. Chung	Undecided	Conservative	1	3
B. Wake	Conservative	Liberal	1	3
B. Azerro	Undecided	Not Stated	1	3
S. Finestone	NDP	Liberal	1	4
C. Finestone	Undecided	Not Stated	1	4
S. Grunberg	Undecided	Not Stated	1	4

Patterns of Nomination

The above tables reveal patterns of nomination that can be characterized as a series of absences -- (1) the absence of undecided voters opting to vote either NDP or Conservative, as well as the absence of Liberal supporters shifting their stance in favour of either of these two political parties. Throughout the series, Y.H. Chung is the only undecided voter who decides to cast her ballot for the Conservatives, yet her appearance is restricted to the third segment and is comparatively brief. Out of the fifteen people nominated five end up supporting the Liberals -- two are previously undecided, one is previously a Conservative, another is previously an NDP supporter, and the fifth has his confidence in the Liberal leader restored. In contrast, one of the Conservative supporters ends up undecided about casting his ballot. (2) The absence of different people supporting the Conservatives or the NDP over

more than one segment -- T. Grunberg and C. Dewar are the only two employees consistently nominated to support these two parties, respectively. It is interesting to note that in the second segment M. Kitt, an assembly line worker, is briefly shown supporting the Conservatives, yet the employee consistently nominated to offer support for this party reflects an assumption of the typical supporter -- an executive. (3) The absence of different reporters covering the segments. Unlike other segments, Kevin Tibbles covers these segments exclusively, enhancing the "natural" progression of the issues. And (4) the absence of more formal settings, as those provided for the Experts and Politicians. The last two patterns contribute to making discrete the level of structural control exercised by the reporter in appropriating and advancing the issues, as well as enable a narrative structure that attempts to surpass the limitations of the medium. Both of these points will be elaborated further when analyzing the segments under the respective headings.

The imperceptibility of the above patterns, or the subtlety of their construction is contingent upon two interlocking factors produced by the program's image of its audience: a common-sensical acceptance of the socio-political boundaries within which "ordinary" Canadians are nominated, and a common-sensical recognition of the inability of the reporter to know the final decision of the undecided voters. In other words, objectivity is defined, or the role of the reporter rationalized in the above patterns within the socio-political representation given to "ordinary" Canadians and by the indecisiveness of some of the nominees. Both of these factors offer the most direct evidence of the program's assumptions of a shared common-sense with its viewers regarding who, from among the electorate constitute "ordinary" Canadians. Thereby also offering insight in the profile of the viewers with whom the

program may share this common-sensical view. The analysis below illustrates these points.

In introducing some of the employees of Philips Electronics as "ordinary" Canadians who will be nominated throughout the campaign to offer their views on the election, the reporter asks "Why here?" He immediately narrows the possibility of answers by stating "Because over the next two months these people, along with most other Canadians, are going to have to make a decision: who to vote for in the upcoming federal election." Such an answer precludes the possibility of the questions why only here? Why not also elsewhere? In other words, the opposing views of Canadians employed by a company in Ontario is implicitly equated with the juxtapositioning of views of Canadians from regions or industries diversely affected by FTA.

A more substantive reasoning for why only here? is offered by the serial nature of the segments. The indecisive political support of some of the nominated Canadians, established in the initial segments, detracts from the reporter's role in advancing a particular common-sensical option adopted by those opposing FTA. This option takes the form of a shift in political support for the Liberals, and it starts in the third segment. The employees are introduced in the beginning of this segment as generally undecided, and their decision to support a specific political party is in almost immediate response to the leadership debate. The shift continues when the viewers are introduced, in the fourth segment, to some of the family members of the employees, and a traditional NDP supporter backs the Liberals because of Turner's performance in the debate. The shift is affirmed in the fifth and final segment.

The fifth segment has three Liberal supporters, one NDP, and one Conservative. Out of the five, two of the Liberal supporters were undecided in the earlier segments, and one of them, in the words of the reporter, is "a

conscientious accountant" who reached the decision to vote Liberal after "keeping a report card on all three of the parties ... [and] remained undecided until the bitter end to ensure he makes the right decision." As stated above, discretely absent from the group is Y.H. Chung, the only undecided nominee who backed the Conservatives after the leadership debate in the third segment.

The response of Y.H. Chung to the leadership debate is restricted to, "It's sort of like John Turner struck out. He didn't prove himself, uhm, to be sort of extraordinary. I still find Mulroney a very effective speaker and, uh, he knows what he's saying, so, that sort of confirmed it for me." The significance of this voters comment is greatly reduced not only because it is the only voice that opts not to remain undecided or shift support in favour of the Liberals, but because the reporter probes no further to obtain a more in-depth reasoning characteristic of the responses of those who do. For example, Chung's comments are preceded by the comments of a Conservative supporter, K. Smith, who is undecided after the debate, and followed by the comments of another employee, B. Wake, who shifts his support from the Conservatives to the Liberals.

K. Smith:

I'm skeptical of what Mulroney's been up to now. Any government that spends 10-million dollars to take the message to the masses -- it's such a good deal -- and the United States Senate and the United States Congress pass it in one day a piece, and they're all sitting down there waiting for it, if you're involved in any kind of negotiations in a business, uh, sense, if somebody responds that quickly to you, you'd better watch out 'cause there may be a hook, and you don't know what the hook is, and that's what I'm afraid of. I think there's a hook in there, a bloody big hook, and I don't know what it is, and that bothers me.

B. Wake:

I felt that Mr. Mulroney wasn't answering the questions, uh, fully. He was hedging the answers, uh, he has said that he is not going to allow social programs to, uh, uh, interfere with the free trade; on the other hand, in 1983 he said he was not for free trade. What's changed his mind? Here again, he can change his mind again.

Kevin Tibbles:
So you don't trust him.

B. Wake:
No, I don't.

Kevin Tibbles:
Who're you going to vote for?

B. Wake:
I will vote for Turner, Turner and his party this time around.

The value of Chung's comment is further reduced by the enthusiasm of A. Finestone, who is wary of Turner's leadership in the first and second segments. Finestone is not among those nominated in the introduction of the third segment as he is not an undecided voter. Still, the segment ends by showing Finestone feeling "ecstatic" about the Liberal leader, and taking on the role of the reporter by asking those around him in a delicatessen of how they felt about the debate, and whom they would vote for. Towards the end of the segment one man states "We gotta vote for Turner. He's not such a good leader, but we gotta vote for Turner because he's against free trade." Finestone asks "What about Broadbent? Broadbent's against free trade." The man responds "Broadbent talks a lot, but all his talkin' don't make no sense to me." The segment ends as the reporter makes his closing remarks by suggesting that the debate goes on as voters "try to win a few over to their side...."

The point of casting a ballot for the Liberals as a vote against free trade rather than NDP is repeated in the fourth segment. D. Pitchford, who was an undecided voter until the leadership debate, is introduced by the reporter as someone who has decided that "there's only one real alternative." Pitchford then gives her reason as to why she has opted to vote Liberal rather than NDP: "Philosophically I would agree with the New Democrats, maybe on things like

abortion, but, uh, making a pragmatic decision I have to go with where my vote's gonna count, and vote Liberal." This point is further emphasized by the shift in the allegiance of S. Finestone, introduced by the reporter as a "lifelong New Democrat," as she too decides to vote Liberal along with her husband, A. Finestone, because in her words "Turner stood up and said exactly what I wanted to hear said. I'm glad that one of them said it. It would have been better for me if it had been Broadbent, but Turner did say it." The segment closes with T. Grunberg who is a Conservative. The focus on him, however, is not only relatively brief but included with Grunberg's statements is a question posed by the reporter to Mrs. Grunberg, who is undecided: "Are your worried about being swallowed up by the Americans?" While juxtapositioning opposing views in this manner gives a semblance of balance, this balance is defined by the common-sensical option adopted by undecided voters.

By the fifth and last segment on Philips Electronics, R. Azerro who is most frequently featured as undecided makes up his mind to vote Liberal. The final decision of this employee, along with the decision of D. Pitchford and A. Finestone, who was not confident about Turner's leadership at the outset, is reinforced by on-camera statements made earlier by each regarding their indecisiveness. Similar flashbacks are not accorded to the two employees who remain consistent in their support for the NDP and the Conservative -- C. Dewar and T. Grunberg, respectively -- to reinforce the reasons for their commitment to these two parties.

The nomination of Canadians consisting primarily of undecided voters is attributed by the program to "the sort of people the leaders are chasing." While canvassing undecided voters may be a logical course of action for the three leaders, the same logic would suggest that these leaders would want to have the support of these voters more equitably represented on a mass

medium, if not represented in their favour. However, as stated at the outset, the indecisiveness of the nominees -- established early on in the segments -- provides a buffer for the reporter, for common sense dictates that the final decisions of the nominees cannot possibly be known prior to the end of the six-week coverage. Still, the above patterns give evidence of a structural logic -- primarily through the emphasis on some nominees over others -- that relates a vote against free trade with support for the Liberals over the NDP. In doing so, they offer insight into the programs assumptions of the voters, from the overall viewership, who may concede to its common-sensical view and thus constitute its primary audience -- undecided voters wanting to make their vote "count," in accordance with their final stance on FTA.

Patterns of Appropriating and Advancing the Issues

The manner in which specific issues are appropriated and advanced serves as a general outline, or a blueprint, of both the content and form of the "Journal" segments being analyzed in this chapter. And, in the context of the "ordinary" Canadians nominated, the patterns of appropriation and advancement that emerge reflect the assumptions of the "Journal" regarding the issues of most concern to the electorate and their level of understanding of these issues. Evidence of these patterns is offered by breaking down each segment into the following categories: (1) "Focus," as the term suggests, gives an outline of the main topics covered in each segment. In order to provide a context for the opposing positions on free trade, this category also includes those focuses which deal with issues related to the election in general; (2) "Appropriated Directly" refers to the introduction of specific issues, within a general focus, by the reporter in the form of statements that provide the backdrop for the discussion or in the form of questions posed to the nominees;

(3) "Appropriated Indirectly" refers to the introduction of specific issues, within a general focus, in the form of questions posed by the nominees to each other. Although the journalist may still be involved in the appropriation, by way of selecting the nominees and editing their statements, the involvement would not be as direct; (4) "Advanced Directly" refers to an issue being substantiated, refuted, or elucidated by the reporter as opposed to those nominated by the reporter. The latter belonging to (5) "Advanced Indirectly," and also taking the form of statements confirming a specific stance, statements offering opposing points of view, or statements which seek clarification of the positions on a particular point of discussion.

The last four categories are illustrated numerically, in terms of how frequently specific issues are appropriated and advanced directly or indirectly. Each number represents a complete appropriation or advancement, whether by the journalist or by one of the nominees, it does not necessarily represent the number of times an individual actually spoke. In other words, an interruption and the continuation of the point being voiced by the interrupter is counted as one particular appropriation or advancement of a specific issue, as is the continuation of a point that is interrupted.

The above approach requires that direct and indirect participation be quantified in the context of the overall exchanges taking place among the participants rather than be calculated as isolated incidents. As a result, it restricts the meticulous dissection of the text to serve as evidence of the numbers reflected in each table, a feature characteristic of content analysis. Such a restriction is compensated, however, by the statements which most distinctly appropriate specific issues. A summary of these statements is listed under the first category, "focus," and serves as evidence of the general outline of each segment.

The qualitative nature of the coding also does not guarantee that an advancement of a particular issue cannot be interpreted as an appropriation of another or vice versa. Such discrepancies have nominal impact, however, on the overall ratio of direct to indirect participation and do not significantly change the quantitative representation given to each segment.

An emphasis on the context within which verbal exchanges take place allows for "exceptions" in the coding rules to include instances where a single appropriation or advancement of an issue is initiated by one nominee and completed by another. Such an approach places its primary objective on gauging the discussions on specific issues over the course of the entire segment, rather than be restricted by the order in which these discussions take place.

Statements that neither appropriate nor advance an issue are also categorized according to the context in which they are presented, either as "setting the scene" or "ambience," but are not reflected in the tables. They are not excluded, however, from the analysis. An example of the former would include statements such as "It's the morning coffee break at Philips Electronics, in Scarborough, Ontario. Everyone heads for the coffee cart...." The latter would be characterized by showing the nominees engaging in informal conversation or going about their day-to-day activities, "unaware" of the presence of the camera.

TABLE 3.7 SEGMENT 1

OCTOBER 3, 1988 LOCATION: PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, ONTARIO
REPORTER: KEVIN TIBBLES

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Interjections</u>
1.	3	-	-	3	1:1

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

Focus 1: Introducing the political stance of some of the nominees

- Over the course of the campaign, you'll get to know a handful of these ordinary Canadians, Canadians like Carol Dewar down in the shop floor.
 - Financial Controller, Robert Azerro,.... He'll vote either Tory or Grit....
 - ...Art Finestone ... a dyed-in-the-wool Liberal, but this time out he's is wary of his leader.
-

TABLE 3.8 SEGMENT 2

OCTOBER 14, 1988 LOCATION: PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, ONTARIO
REPORTER: KEVIN TIBBLES

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Intjections</u>
1.	1	-	-	6	1:6
2.	1	-	-	1	1:1
3.	-	1	-	3	0:4
4.	2	-	3	5	1:1
5.	-	1	-	12	0:13

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

Focus 1: Fiscal responsibility of the Government

- What's the government's record, when it comes to fiscal responsibility, especially now in election time when all these promises are being made. Where's the money going to come from?

Focus 2: Government aid to workers

- Do you think the Federal Government should be helping out the working man by helping him get a house?

Focus 4: Probing the reasons behind a worker's support for the Tories over the NDP

- You're going to vote Tory because you think that's the only party that's going to get this country through to the year 2000.
- What is it about the NDP that sort of scares you?

METHOD OF INDIRECT APPROPRIATION

Focus 3: Misappropriation of Taxes

- C. DEWAR: This, it puzzles me, want more, give me more, give me more, ...where's all this money comin' from?

Focus 5: Credibility of Liberal leadership

- L. FERERA: How can you vote for a man [John Turner] that doesn't, you know he's being contested by his own people.

TABLE 3.9 SEGMENT 3

OCTOBER 26, 1988 LOCATION: ONTARIO, ON VARIOUS LOCATIONS WITH PHILIPS
EMPLOYEES

REPORTER: KEVIN TIBBLES

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated</u> <u>Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated</u> <u>Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced</u> <u>Directly</u>	<u>Advanced</u> <u>Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of</u> <u>Direct to</u> <u>Indirect</u> <u>Interjections</u>
1.	1	-	2	3	1:1
2.	4	-	3	7	1:1
3.	1	-	3	4	1:1
4.	-	1	-	6	0.7

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

Focus 1: Info. on FTA anticipated by some undecided voters from the leadership debate

•The hype leading up to the debate makes for high expectations in the Azerro home. They want the nuts and bolts on free trade, and some indication where Canada is going economically. They're looking for answers from this man, who's deal it is.... It doesn't take them long to conclude the facts they're looking for just aren't coming.

Focus 2: The decision of some undecided voters as the result of the leadership debate

•...Diane was at first undecided, but debate night did the trick. Her mind's made up. She'll vote Liberal.

•...Ken Smith was a member of the Conservative Party and he thought he liked the idea of free trade, but all that changed with the debate. Now he's more undecided than ever....

•...Yong Hee Chung's mind was made up before the debate was even over.

•....on debate night, Bruce did some serious thinking. He was a Conservative, now he's not.

Focus 3: Reaction to John Turner's performance in the debate

•Salesman Art Finestone, the Liberal, was definitely undecided about the Liberal leader. Now, after the debate, he's ecstatic....

METHOD OF INDIRECT APPROPRIATION

Focus 4: A voter's support for the Liberals over the NDP- as a means of opposing FTA

•A. FINESTONE: You seen the debate last night?...O.K. So what'd you think of it? What about Broadbent? Broadbent's against free trade.

TABLE 3.10 SEGMENT 4

NOVEMBER 11, 1988 LOCATION: ONTARIO/QUEBEC, ON VARIOUS LOCATIONS
WITH PHILIPS EMPLOYEES

REPORTER: KEVIN TIBBLES

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Interjections</u>
1.	4	-	6	10	1:1
2.	2	-	-	2	1:1

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

Focus 1: FTA & its effects on the future of jobs, sovereignty, medicare

- The big issue of this campaign is free trade. Do you think that's going to affect what's going to be around when your kids grow up?
- Don't you see any benefits in the deal for Canada at all?
- But are there things about the United States that you worry about?
- ...Todd sees it [FTA] as the only way to secure a future for his two sons....Sharon, on the other hand...worries about Canadian sovereignty and remains undecided... Are you afraid of being swallowed up by the Americans?

Focus 2: Choosing between the NDP or the Liberals for opposing FTA

- To vote against free trade Diane could go Liberal or New Democrat. While she likes the NDP, she's decided there's only one real alternative.
 - While Sharon considers herself a traditional New Democrat, something has happened. The big change came during the TV debate.
-

TABLE 3.11 SEGMENT 5

NOVEMBER 16, 1988 LOCATION: ONT., ON LOCATION WITH PHILIP'S EMPLOYEES
REPORTER: KEVIN TIBBLES

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Interjections</u>
1.	5	-	-	5	1:1
2.	2	6	-	12	1:9

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

Focus 1: Decision of casting a ballot by some of the Canadians nominated over the six weeks

- Diane finds that...she's been forced to make up her mind on... a one-issue campaign
- Today,... Art Finestone... standing tall behind the [Liberal] Party and the leader.
- ...Carol Dewar... stands opposed to Free Trade and a hundred percent behind the NDP.
- Todd Grunberg says he is a Conservative and always has been....
- Throughout the campaign this conscientious accountant has been...keeping a report card on all three of the parties....He's remained undecided until the bitter end to ensure he makes the right decision. Today, Robert Azerro has made his choice.

Focus 2: General discussion on FTA -- for and against

- Todd, can Canada survive without the Free Trade Agreement?
- Carol, ... looking back on election '88, what are they going to say about all this?

METHOD OF INDIRECT APPROPRIATION

Focus 2: General discussion on FTA -- for and against

- D. PITCHFORD: If 80% of trade is free already, what's the big deal about this other 20%.
- A. FINESTONE: ...How do you know... what the Free Trade thing says? None of us know.
- R. AZERRO: ... It's our energy and our water and our natural resources...it'll stay in the ground for another ten years...and then they'll come back and maybe we'll get a better deal.
- C. DEWAR: ... perhaps the Conservatives would have explained Free Trade... there wouldn't be the problems there is today... people are... not voting for a Party. They're voting on Free Trade.
- R. AZERRO: ... if you don't vote for Free Trade there's fear that you're going to be an economic ah, wasteland and if you do vote for Free Trade there's fear that... you're going to salute the flag in, in ten years time or something. I mean, we can't win.
- D. PITCHFORD: I've... been disappointed. I had hoped for better from all of the leaders.

TABLE 3.12
SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATING AND ADVANCING THE FOCUS

<u>Summary of Focus</u>	<u>No. of Times Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>No. of Times Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>No. of Times Advanced Directly</u>	<u>No. of Times Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Interjections</u>
1. Casting the ballot in response to FTA	17	2	9	44	1:1.7
2. Issues on FTA	7	6	8	26	1:2.5
3. Economy in General	2	1	-	10	1:5.5

The patterns of appropriating and advancing the issues illustrated by the above tables can be stated as: (1) The most direct control exercised by the reporter is related to the primary focus -- the nominees' decision to vote in response to FTA. (2) In three out of the five segments in which focus no. 1 appears the segments end with a higher ratio of indirect interjections. The relative "absence" of the reporter validates the image of "ordinary" Canadians advanced through the patterns of nomination. (3) When focusing on issues related to FTA the interjections by nominees are more than twice that of the journalist, highlighting the issues of most concern to them and their level of understanding of these issues.

The first set of patterns complements the observation of the previous section as it further substantiates, both quantitatively and qualitatively (through the statements/questions that appropriate the primary focus), the high degree of structural control exercised *through* the nomination process. In other words, the relatively more direct control in appropriating and advancing

the nominees' political stance also sets the trajectory of the discussions on FTA and the economy in general.

The discussions that take place among the "ordinary" Canadians, in the "absence" of the reporter, project a state of confusion and indecisive political support resulting from a lack of understanding of FTA. As such, these discussions serve to substantiate the image of "ordinary" Canadians more directly advanced by the reporter, as well as demonstrate the common-sensical reasoning that guides the final decision of the undecided nominees. The reporter's role is further rationalized by his statement: "We'll be following them ["ordinary" Canadians] throughout the campaign to find out what they're thinking and what issues they want to have addressed." The discussions which ensue are enhanced by the locations in which "ordinary" Canadians are nominated.

The settings for the discussions constitute the personal domain of those nominated rather than the professional domain of the journalist -- the television studio. They include Philips Electronics during coffee break, the homes of some of the employees nominated, restaurants, and routine work schedules and weekend outings (including a visit to the hairdresser as one Philips employee waits for his wife as she has her hair done). These informal settings provide a "natural" backdrop for discussions that are characterized by unfinished sentences as the "ordinary" Canadians cut each other off in heated exchanges, argue from positions which lack conviction, or present their stance on free trade and other election issues by way of emotional rhetoric. In some instances the discussions lead to the "ordinary" Canadians questioning each other's political stance.

The statements or questions which introduce the nominees, both directly and indirectly, relate their political stance to a wide range of concerns

over the economic future of the country, with specific issues related to FTA being at the centre of those concerns -- jobs, sovereignty, social programs. The nominees' level of understanding of these issues is reflected not as much by their position for or against FTA but by their responses to the appropriation of the issues: their need to know what kinds of jobs will be available for the next generation as the result of the Agreement, so that the kids could be advised on what subjects to take in school; their sense of insecurity over Canadian sovereignty due to closer economic ties with such a large trading partner; their concerns over the disparities in the social programs of the two countries, especially medicare; their inability to understand the need to rush into a deal with the United States, instead of continuing with the status quo and, if necessary, renegotiating a deal that Canadians can comprehend.

Through the above points of concern, representation is given to that section of the electorate which seeks clarification on some of the most fundamental aspects of the Agreement, on both a personal and national level. In light of the diverse consequences projected by the pro and anti free trade positions, any clarification of the Agreement thus becomes contingent upon examining some of the basis for these projections.

The Narrative Structure

The serial nature of the segments on Philips employees, filmed in their natural settings, lays the grounds for what can best be described as good storytelling. The informality of the environment and familiarity with the faces allows the narrative structure to transcend the limitations of the medium with such statements directed towards the audience as "... And you'll be shaking hands with this man, he's Art Finestone..." and "This week on Shop Talk we're going to take you away from the Philips Electronics plant, so you can

meet the families of some of the Philips employees we've been talking to." While understanding that these statements are only meant figuratively, for the audience can meet the families in as much as it can shake hands with them, they are reflective of an attempt to implicate the Canadians watching with those being watched. A further attempt to link the audience with those nominated, not only in the segments on Philips employees but also the other two segments on "ordinary" Canadians to be analyzed below, is reflected by an emphasis on widely shared sentiments towards politicians -- disillusionment, mistrust or alienation (Medhurst 1989, 187).

The central "characters" of these segments, or the protagonists, are diverse in their political support, yet unified in their quest for advancing a single plot: unravelling the enigma of free trade. The politicians, or antagonists, are portrayed as a force that makes the resolution of the conflict, or an understanding of the Agreement, increasingly difficult by inundating it with rhetoric. Such a set-up results in a storyline that is deeply immersed in irony, for the "ordinary" Canadians are consistently shown expecting answers from the very people whom they hold in such disdain. Such a storyline also restricts the role of the reporter as one who simply recants the frustrations of the Canadians.

Understandably, the "Journal" does focus on the various issues of FTA throughout its election coverage, as will be evidenced by the programs analyzed in the next chapter. The scheduling of these programs, in the context of the segments on "ordinary" Canadians, should further reflect the "Journal's" contribution to or distancing itself from the responsibility of clarifying the issues.

FEATURE STORY

The first report from British Columbia can best be described as a feature story, for it concentrates solely on the problems particular to the natives of this province. The word native being used here is meant to describe those British Columbians who have come to rely on the traditional industries of the province for their livelihood, and not necessarily those who first inhabited the land.

TABLE 3.13

OCTOBER 24, 1988 LOCATION: BRITISH COLUMBIA
REPORTER: BRUCE GARVEY

<u>Name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Political Stance</u>
T. Oonly	Landscape Artist	
J. Garcia	Fisherman	
M. Hicks	Log Joiner	Disillusioned with
D. Dolick	Grape Grower	Federal Government,
T. Cocar	Semi-retiree	Irrespective of Party
B. Johnson	Developer	
L. Mesai	Italian immigrant of 25 yrs.	
I. Mesai	Daughter of L. Mesai	
M. Marino	Fiance of I. Mesai	
L. Woo	New immigrant	Not stated.
Nina Woo	Mother of L. Woo	Optimistic about future
C. Kwong	President, Citizens' Trust	

FOCUS:

- Alienation of British Columbians as the result of public policy priorities of the Central Government i.e. Fishing, Nuclear Submarines, Day Care, Free Trade.
 - The changes in B.C. -- phasing out the traditional industries in favour of service sectors.
 - Influx of Canadian retirees moving to B.C.
 - Changes in the demographics as the result of increased immigration.
 - Environmental repercussions of changes taking place in B.C.
-

Patterns of Nomination

The nominating process of this feature story is set against the backdrop of old versus new, compressing even further the relatively brief history of the nation by having its resource industry represent the "old" way of life

threatened by change. British Columbians from a variety of traditional occupations are nominated, as evidenced by the table above, to confirm the reporter's understanding of the transition in the local industries, as well as the local sentiments of alienation resulting from federal policies on day care, free trade, and immigration.

A presentation on the effects of change relies on an audience that is able to share the program's notion of the old and new within the confines of the sectors and people nominated. The ability to relate to these factors provides a natural order to and the boundaries for the discussion. Viewers wanting to expand the discussion beyond the boundaries set by the program can at best be considered falling outside the program's assumption of those it is primarily addressing.

Thus, the report assumes a shared common-sense with its audience by focusing on and thereby perpetuating the stereotypical Asian immigrant. For example, working class Canadians of European descent are nominated alongside newly arriving Chinese immigrants from Hong Kong, who are not only optimistic about their future in Canada but are represented by C. Kwong, President of a trust company. Discretely absent are the working class Canadians from the Asian community, the family roots of some of whom may be intertwined with the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The confidence of the new immigrants underscores the uncertainties facing Canadians belonging to the "old stock" of immigrants, for the former bring with them a different language, cultural values, and most significantly, financial resources to materialize a different outlook on economic issues such as FTA.

TABLE 3.14

OCTOBER 24, 1988 LOCATION: BRITISH COLUMBIA
REPORTER: BRUCE GARVEY

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Interjections</u>
1.	3	-	1	4	1:1
2.	1	-		1	1:1
3.	1	.	4	5	1:1
4.	1	-	4	5	1:1
5.	1	-	1	2	1:1

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

Focus 1: Disillusionment and alienation of British Columbians as the result of Fed. policies on fishing, nuclear submarines, day care, free trade

- ...Once centre of the Island's fishery, today small fishermen like Joe Garcia are tied up at the wharf because of regulations from Ottawa even though this is peak of the salmon run.
- Log joiner, Mike Hicks, is carving his future out of the bush. Last election he ran for Parliament...he's got nothing but contempt for politics. Like Joe Garcia, totally disillusioned.
- ... and the impression that government in Ottawa doesn't give a damn....Already hundred of acres are marked to be plowed under if free trade puts the wineries out of business.

Focus 2: Changes in traditional industry -- from resource based to service oriented

-B.C. so long a hewer of wood and a fisher of salmon, now finds that 68% of its economy comes not from resources but from services.

Focus 3: Changes in B.C.'s landscape due to influx of Canadian retirees

- It's not just the threat of free trade. The Okanagan is changing anyway...They're more likely to be retirees or semi retirees from the prairies, like Tom Cocar.

Focus 4: Changes in B.C. due to immigration -- demographically & economically

-This is blue collar Vancouver.... Home to immigrant Italian, tradesmen and labourers. As traditional a Little Italy as you'll find anywhere in the country. But it's changing....

Focus 5: The environmental concerns of British Columbians

- ... Mitsubishi wants to build a plant here to turn forests into disposal chop sticks. Good business or just more loggers wasteland.... British Columbians are asking that question.
-

Patterns of Appropriating and Advancing the Issues

The pattern of appropriation is characterized by the reporter's summation of the changes taking place in British Columbia -- the traditional timber and fishing industries giving way to tourism; the vineyards threatened by free trade; changes in the landscape due to an influx of Canadian retirees moving to B.C.; changes in the demographics due to new immigrants; and environmental concerns of the British Columbians with respect to an increase in the population and new investments in the resource industries. The local sentiment towards these changes is advanced, both directly and indirectly, to reflect resentment towards policies which have prevented fishermen from fishing in "the peak of the salmon run;" prioritized universal day care so that in Toronto "women can go work as a lawyer or something and have their kids taken care out of our taxes," instead of using the tax dollars to build roads in rural areas; placed the future of vineyards and agricultural products in jeopardy through free trade; and favoured immigration, making the lives of those already settled on the land even more difficult.

The significance of this segment, in the context of an election run on a major public policy platform, is twofold: it highlights the regional implications of broad ranging public policies, and it validates the negative effects of these policies by presenting a micro rather than a macro perspective on their causes. Such an approach, by focusing on the difficulties brought on by the restructuring of the nation's economic and social structures, acknowledges that portion of the electorate whose major concerns centre on keeping up with the fast pace of change. Thus this segment produces an image of "ordinary" Canadians requiring more than promises of relief. It projects an electorate that is seeking an understanding of how FTA may affect them.

L. Mesai and members of his family are accorded the most lengthy coverage to give evidence of the hardships brought on by the changes. Frustration rather than tolerance is expressed by the Mesai's towards those entering the country 25 years after they left their own. The point most stressed is on how increasingly difficult it is to make ends meet. Even with two or three jobs. The comments made by the Mesai's in the context of the influx of immigrants, suggest that these new Canadians are somehow responsible for the hardships on those already settled in the country. The following is an excerpt from the segment on the blue collar workers. The blatancy of the segment vis a vis the reporter's methods of appropriating the topic while attempting to maintain a distance warrants its inclusion.

Bruce Garvey:

...Luigi Mesai moved here from Italy 25 years ago. He plays bocci here and talks passionate politics when he's not raking asphalt for the city. They complain about a new generation of Canadians that doesn't seem to work like the way they had to and the high cost of living. Too much welfare, no work ethic.

L. Mesai:

It's hard for me. I pay the rent, I pay the immigration, I pay for six kids. Four kids and me any my wife. It's too hard. I work for \$1.50 and make two jobs, three jobs. It's too hard. Never mind they say people now, I wait for my check...the government take....

Bruce Garvey:

...Daughter Isabel is all set to marry fiance Mike Marino. They've both got two jobs as well.

I. Mesai:

I guess we were brought up differently. We started saving from the first day we went and started working. Yeh.

M. Marino:

I work two jobs as a Isabel's two jobs, too. You know we enjoy working two and a half [sic].

Bruce Garvey:

They're a level headed young couple with all the energy and ideals to make a go of it even though they'll be living in a very different city to the one they grew up in. These days it seems everything's changing.

I. Mesai:

When I was in high school I'd say at least 70% of our high school was Caucasian. Now when I was in grade 12 70% of the people were not, we're no longer Caucasian and they were no longer speaking English in school. You'd walk down the halls and on your lunch hour or during, in between a class and all you'd hear was Chinese or you know their language, their country that they came from.

Bruce Garvey:

....A frustration among these hard working, former immigrants that they may be slipping behind, that once again they may be returning to minority status amid a new wave of immigrants. Just a few blocks from Luigi Mesai's home, Sir Charles Tupper High School, and here's a field hockey class of 26 kids from believe it or not 13 different countries. A tougher 62% of the 1,200 students were born outside Canada. Asian immigration to B.C. has doubled in the past ten years. Chinese immigrants have tripled. For Linda Woo, whether it's the classroom or the playing field the important subject is always English.....

Throughout this section of the report the racial overtones of those nominated are presented without any apologies. In fact, they are substantiated by the reporter through physical and statistical evidence supporting the statements made by the Mesai family. Still, the reporter's role is justified by the manner in which the issue is advanced, emphasizing the notion that the reporter is simply substantiating the state of affairs expressed by hard working Canadians.

The structural control exercised in advancing the sentiments of those nominated is reflected by the failure to disclose other reasons for the hard times facing Canadians like the Mesais'. For example, the beginning of the report points to the difficulties faced by the workers in the resource industries due to a transition towards such service sectors as tourism and housing, yet the reasons for the difficulties facing the working class remain untouched and are indirectly attributed to immigration. There is no mention, for instance, of a

transition towards a labour force that must not only consist of hard working employees but also better educated or at least semi-skilled employees; a transition towards an economy which, in order to assure a standard of living of the first world, is dependent on a labour force whose skills go beyond those found in the third world; and a transition towards a society where post secondary education is a given, rather than one where a high school diploma is celebrated as a milestone

While the regional and sectoral concerns expressed in this segment may be natural, the approach adopted by the "Journal" in addressing them is at the expense of a more symmetrical examination of public policies, as demonstrated by the absence of some of the counter arguments presented above. Such an approach, once again, highlights the socio-political boundaries within which issues are presented. Thereby reflecting the program's image of its audience through assumptions of a shared common-sense with respect to these boundaries.

The Narrative Structure

The narrative structure characterizes the vulnerability of the British Columbians to the changes taking place around them, and a hint of romanticism attached to the past is cause for some contradictions in the latter part of the report. The opening remarks serve as an example of the "tone" maintained throughout the segment.

Bruce Garvey: From the mountains to the valleys of the interior, ocean shores and the bustle of Vancouver, British Columbians find themselves grappling with a common problem. Farmers, fishermen, city dwellers, they're all struggling to cope with traumatic changes that threaten to transform their lives.

In the beginning of the report, figures for industries that are in transformation are stated: "B.C. so long a hewer of wood and a fisher of salmon, now finds that 68% of its economy comes not from resources but from services." Towards the end of the segment, a Hong Kong immigrant, C. Kwong is shown saying: '...I know our resource base, uh, timber.' This is immediately followed by the comments of the reporter, Bruce Garvey: "This is the key to B.C's resource economy, forestry. And here's a sign of the times. The Japanese conglomerate Mitsubishi wants to build a plant here to turn forests into disposal chop sticks. Good business or just more loggers wasteland. More and more British Columbian are asking that question...."

In the context of transformation, the changes in the timber industry are among the causes of uncertainty for log joiners like M. Hicks. In the context of the new immigrants who want to invest in that industry, the issue becomes an environmental one. As does the onslaught of retirees from other provinces, although not as directly. Also, the financial burden of immigration implied by L. Mesai is countered in the latter part of the report with the statement that "Three billion dollars in Asian investment pours in every year. Last year Asian immigrants brought in nearly three quarter of a billion dollars with them." However, as with the coverage of the resource industry, it is the context in which this statement is made that leaves in question its effectiveness as a measure for countering the initial view. The new investors are characterized as those who are more interested in doing business with the Pacific rim, in their *native* language, further isolating a province already alienated by the rest of Canada. No mention is made of the direct benefits to the province as the result of the money being invested -- the number of jobs created, the revenues generated for the provincial and central government, and a financial centre in the West strengthened to match the one in the East.

As stated at the outset of the analysis of this segment, a broader perspective on the changes taking place in British Columbia would require a notion of common sense, with respect to the definition of "old" and "new" way of life, other than that on which the program is based.

EXTENDED NEWS REPORT

The structure of the second segment from B.C. is best described as an extended news report. The qualifier merely added to reflect the relatively longer time allocated (approximately 12 minutes). As a news report it captures the immediacy of events taking place at a local anti free trade coalition, which is organizing a demonstration against a Conservative Party rally to be held in Vancouver; its relevance is precipitated by the results of the latest Gallup Poll indicating "fully fifty percent of Canadians think the Tory's Free Trade deal is a bad idea;" and its central theme -- confusion among the electorate as the result of campaign rhetoric of the politicians -- is substantiated by a reliance on vox pop.

TABLE 3.15

NOVEMBER 8, 1988 LOCATION: BRITISH COLUMBIA

REPORTER: DENISE RUDNICKI

<u>Name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Political Stance</u>
W. Campbell	Grass roots organizer	Anti Free Trade
M. Barlow	Founding Member - COC	Anti Free Trade
B. Mulroney	Prime Minister	Leader, Conservative
G. St. Germain	M.P. Mission, Coquitlam	Conservative
D. Gagle	Shop owner	Undecided
J. Langdon	M.P. Candidate-Mission	NDP
M. Cabbot	M.P. Candidate-Mission	Liberal
Men/Women	Unidentified	Undecided/Confused re FTA

FOCUS:

- Anti free trade organization, at the grass roots level
 - Voters wanting facts on FTA from politicians, but getting campaign rhetoric instead
-

Patterns of Nomination

Unlike the segments on the Philips employees, which give representation to the political parties through the "ordinary" Canadians, this segment basically places its nominees in two distinct categories -- the politicians and the electorate. Such a nomination process provides direct evidence of the disparity between the informational needs of the electorate and the ability of the politicians to accommodate these needs. The inability of the latter to go beyond rhetoric when speaking on FTA is illustrated by juxtapositioning the concerns of "ordinary" Canadians with the comments and responses of the three politicians contesting for a seat in the riding of Mission, Coquitlam, B.C.

The reference to the Gallup Poll, in the introduction to the report, inversely acknowledges that a section of the electorate supports FTA. Yet, representation in this segment is predominantly given to those who are either undecided or opposed to free trade. Such consistency with the patterns of the other six segments is significant in that it affirms the assumption of a shared common sense with the audience regarding who predominantly constitute the electorate. By doing so, it also serves as evidence of attempts to bridge the geographical gap between the voters of the east and west coasts. The only break in the continuum is offered by a segment on Quebec, presented a week before the election, on November 14, 1988. Although the main focus of this segment is on the importance of winning seats in that province -- and not on the responses of "ordinary" Canadians in Quebec to free trade and other election issues -- it is worth mentioning briefly as it demonstrates how a crucial distinction is implied between the electorate of this province and the rest of Canada.

Quebec's support for free trade is linked, by way of a statement of Lucien Bouchard's, to its different "aspirations within Confederation," which can only

be realized once a strong economic base is established in the province through free trade. A more explicit distinction is made by historian, Graeme Decarie, nominated to offer his analysis on the voters of this region in relation to the primary election issue: "I think the big difference in free trade between Quebec and the rest of Canada is that within Francophone Quebec free trade can be perceived as a national project. It's not a threat to the nation. It's a fulfilment of the nation. In English speaking Quebec particularly on the island of Montreal I think that's very much less true...you have a stronger anti free trade feeling among anglophones and to a degree allophones in Montreal." In the context of the segment on Quebec, where endorsement of FTA is associated with national loyalties very different from the rest of Canada, the link between the segments on "ordinary" Canadians from Ontario and British Columbia is strengthened.

TABLE 3.16

NOVEMBER 8, 1988 LOCATION: BRITISH COLUMBIA
REPORTER: DENISE RUDNICKI

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Interjections</u>
1.	1	-	6	4	1.75:1
2.	4	-	7	24	1:2.1

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

Focus 1: Grass roots organization against FTA

- People are confused by the contradictions. They want answers but don't seem to be able to get them in the grandstanding of an election campaign.... The polls show that the opposition parties are launching an effective assault.... They're being backed up by... anti Free Trade groups....

Focus 2: Confusion among the electorate due to campaign rhetoric on FTA

- Tonight is all about grandstanding.... The hoop-la looks great but the Conservative troops have to take the rhetoric and somehow sell it at the door step.... Maple Ridge, B.C. the riding of Mission, Coquitlam. Gerry St. Germain is running for this political life.....St. Germain is discovering the depth of people's uneasePeople want hard facts on Free Trade and a quick bit of politicking to the coffee shop just can't provide them.
- This is Joey Langdon, St. Germain's NDP competition in the riding....she's also taking a lot of heat on the door step. People don't know who to trust and she hears complaints about how confusing the information is.
- ...The Liberal in the riding is May Cabbot. She's here to... deliver a scripted version of John Turner's line on Free Trade....These people are looking for more....At times the demand for answers gets rough. Two weeks to go people are getting desperate to sort this things out.
- They came looking for answers about didn't get much more than the usual political grandstanding. Is it helping you make up your mind about free trade?

Patterns of Appropriating and Advancing the Issues

The high ratio of direct participation, in the beginning of the report, immediately establishes the presence of an organized voice against free trade at the grass roots level. In contrast, the relatively fewer direct interjections in the latter part of the report complement the state of confusion among the generally undecided voters. And the questions posed in the appropriation and advancement of the issues reflect the depth of confusion and frustration among those seeking clarification on FTA.

An understanding of the Agreement is associated with the obtaining of "facts," a point that is repeated by both the reporter and some of the "ordinary" Canadians nominated. Towards the end of the segment, a voter attending an all candidates' meeting challenges the Liberal candidate to show the "paraphrase that says that our medicare is in jeopardy," to which the candidate responds: "I will also ask you to show me where there are 250,000 jobs in the Agreement." To commit both the pro and anti free trade positions to specific phrases, or "facts" contained in the document is to grossly simplify the basis for their projections, which emanate from diverse perspectives on addressing a single problem -- the restructuring of the Canadian economy. In addition, statements meant to accommodate sound bites may require background information if the rhetoric generally associated with them is to be placed within a socio-economic or political context. For example, a statement may propagate an increase in jobs by 120,000 over five years as the result of free trade, while another may forecast massive dislocation of key industries. The confusion caused by the contradictory nature of these projections reflects the need to understand the principles that govern them, thus contributing to a more informed decision regarding their probability.

In view of an extremely confused electorate acknowledged by the "Journal," explaining the basis for the varying projections has to be considered one of the program's priorities during the election period.

The Narrative Structure

The report opens with a series of diametric projections on the Agreement by prominent Canadians and leaders of the three Parties. For example, Ed Broadbent is shown saying: "And when I see the international agreement, that puts in jeopardy our medicare ...", shortly followed by Emmet Hall: "There is nothing in this agreement damaging to medicare in Canada", with Broadbent countering: "Former judge, she said, our social programs are threatened." Such a narrative structure gives direct evidence of the cause of confusion among the voters.

Even those among the electorate, who generally favour the Agreement, are shown as being not too confident about their decision, as one woman states: "And I think in principle that Free Trade does make a lot of sense but we don't know enough about it and we're not able to make a good judgement until we do now so that's really my concern. Not so much that it's a bad deal cause I don't know how good the deal is." Thus, the narrative structure of this segment continues to promote the irony associated with the voters' expectations of obtaining a clearer understanding of the Agreement through the politicians, especially when grandstanding is recognized early on in the report as an inherent feature of election campaigns.

SUMMARY

The patterns of nomination and the narrative structure of the segments, which nominate "ordinary" Canadians, converge to project a profile of an

audience consisting predominantly of undecided voters wanting to make their vote "count," in terms of affecting the outcome of FTA. Such a profile is based on the "Journal's" assumptions of a shared commons sense with those it is primarily addressing, for the latter must common-sensically acknowledge the voters nominated as representative of the electorate. The voters' indecisiveness is largely attributed to the political rhetoric of the three parties, thereby establishing the main source of the confusion on a key election issue.

The indecisiveness of the voters is also attributed to the existing and proposed federal policies, characterized by their insensitivity to the priorities of the working- and middle-class Canadians, as well as those affiliated with the traditional industries -- farming, fishing, and timber. The economic hardships and uncertainties faced by workers in these and other labour intensive occupations in the urban areas, coupled with the inability of the politicians to explain the Agreement, are offered as the basis for the disillusionment, mistrust, and alienation felt towards those running for office, irrespective of the party.

The patterns of appropriating and advancing the issues highlight concerns over the immediate and long term implications of the Agreement, on both a personal and national level. These patterns produce an image of "ordinary" Canadians apprehensive about the future of jobs, national sovereignty, and social programs. These patterns also highlight voters who generally associate any clarification of the Agreement with the obtaining of "facts" on such issues as the number of jobs gained or lost, the strengthening or weakening of the social programs, or the extent of encroachment on Canadian sovereignty.

The Agreement represents but one particular approach to restructuring the Canadian economy, with the positive and negative projections emanating from those advocating different means of obtaining the same end. In view of the

state of confusion among the undecided voters acknowledged by the "Journal," and the complex nature of the Agreement, the informational value of programs on free trade to these voters is contingent upon exploring the basis for the diverse projections of FTA. In other words, these programs must go beyond the point-counter-point formats which are restricted to diametric projections, or "factual" data, to explore the reasoning that affords these projections credibility .

Also, concerns over the future of traditional industries and lifestyles reflect a need to know the past. In other words, an outline of the historical stance taken by these industries, and the groups and regions representing them, is essential in order to place the more contemporary arguments and concerns into perspective.

CHAPTER 4

THE INFORMATIONAL VALUE OF THE "JOURNAL'S" COVERAGE OF FREE TRADE IN THE 1988 CANADIAN FEDERAL ELECTION

This chapter analyzes the informational value of the "Journal's" coverage of FTA during the 1988 Canadian federal election. As stated at the outset, the concept of informational value is linked to the "Journal's" presentation of the issues in relation to its assumptions of the knowledge or expertise of its audience. Thus the previous chapter, which establishes these assumptions through the program's production of a particular image of "ordinary" Canadians serves as the basis for the analysis. The central focus is on the factors that affect the "Journal's" ability to provide a context for the often diametric projections emanating from the national debate over FTA.

The chapter begins with a schedule of all the segments that form the basis of the study by: (1) Listing the date each segment was aired. (2)

Identifying the nominees of each segment either as politicians, experts, or "ordinary" Canadians. Thereby highlighting, as well as serving as an extension of the program's assumption of a shared common-sense regarding these social structures. (3) Summarizing the main focus of each. This list provides a point of reference for the segments, as each is examined in the order that complements the analysis of its informational value.

It should be noted that each segment centres around one specific category of nominee. That is, none of the segments is formatted so as to include a representative from each of the three groups who are accorded a forum. Also, the people identified as politicians are those representing one of the three main federal political parties running in the election -- the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, and the New Democratic Party. The distinction is needed as some of the nominees under the category "experts" may also be considered politicians, as in the case of Peter Lougheed, former premier of Alberta and Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, a senior Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee in the United States.

The segments on politicians include separate interviews with Conservative Party leader, Brian Mulroney, and New Democratic Party leader, Ed Broadbent. The leader of the Liberal Party, John Turner, declined to appear on the "Journal," according to the concluding remarks of the journalist interviewing Brian Mulroney.

Three segments which cover free trade have been excluded from the analysis. The first aired on November 1, 1988, and focuses on a possible Tory defeat and the possibility of scrapping the Agreement. The second aired on November 11, 1988, and focuses on how binding the deal is once it is entered

into. The third aired on November 18, 1988, and is restricted to short statements by twenty prominent Canadians either favouring or opposing free trade as their "last word" on the issue.

The central focus of the first two segments is on the possibility or implications of abrogating the Agreement rather than the Agreement itself. As such, to analyze these segments in terms of how they advance an understanding of issues related to FTA would be to anticipate information for which they were not intended. The third segment represents the "closing remarks" of both sides of the debate rather than a forum for debate for the opposing sides. This observation is substantiated by the close proximity of the segment to the election date, and more significantly by its format, which nominates well-known Canadians to very briefly state their position on FTA rather than respond to opposing views. In other words, the nominees state their position on the Agreement independent of each other. Such a format does not allow the advancement of specific issues, either directly or indirectly. As such, to analyze this segment in terms of how it "explains" certain issues would be to overlook what appears to be its primary function: a concluding segment on the "Journal's" coverage of the federal election campaign.

The analysis of the segments includes an outline of each, articulated both quantitatively and qualitatively. The latter by way of a summary of the coverage accorded to specific issues, the former by way of two distinct yet related tables. The first table illustrates, as in the previous chapter, the patterns of appropriating and advancing the focus(es) of the segment. And, in the context of the politicians and experts nominated, these patterns underscore the role of the reporter in presenting the issues. Implicit in such

an approach is a recognition that some patterns of appropriating and advancing a focus may be more accommodating than others in contributing to the informational value of the segments. And as in the previous chapter, these patterns reflect direct and indirect exchanges on a specific focus over the course of an entire segment, they do not necessarily reflect the order in which a particular focus is appropriated and advanced.

The second table identifies the "Journal's" presentation of specific issues on FTA in the context of: (1) History (2) Market Forces (3) International Precedent (4) Alternatives to FTA (5) The Three Federal Parties (6) Rhetorical Position/Other. The first four categories illustrate the "Journal's" focus on the reasoning behind the opposing positions, as many of the arguments put forward by both sides of the debate are grounded in these contexts. Some of the major arguments within each of these contexts have been outlined in Chapter 2. The last two categories illustrate the "Journal's" failure to go beyond the emotional rhetoric that also characterizes much of the debate on FTA.

The presentation of FTA in the context of "History" infers references to Canada's past debates over freer trade or the effects of Canada's past trade relationship with the United States. "Market Forces" examines the implications of a freer market on Canadian jobs, social programs, sovereignty, etc. Issues presented in the context of "International Precedent" focus on what other countries have done in regards to free trade, as well as the general international trend with respect to trade. While these three contexts are common to the arguments presented by both sides of the debate, "Alternatives to FTA" strictly places the onus on those opposing the

Agreement to offer other options for restructuring the Canadian economy. "The Three Federal Parties" indicates references to the past policies and achievements (or the lack thereof) of the political parties. Opposing arguments within this context are also inundated with challenges to the credibility of each Party's position on FTA, in view of their more recent stance on this or other economic issues. The last category, "Rhetorical Position," overlaps the one that precedes it in that it, too, offers little in terms of outlining the reasoning behind the projected repercussions of FTA. Discussions within this context are characterized by an extreme optimism of those favouring FTA and extreme pessimism of those opposing it.

As stated above, the segments are analyzed not in their chronological order, but the order which best illustrates the factors that contribute to or detract from their informational value. In keeping with this approach, this chapter also includes the segment on Philips employees, which aired on November 16, 1988. This concluding segment on "ordinary" Canadians highlights the significant role of the reporter in structuring a discussion on FTA to project a particular image of "ordinary" Canadians. In doing so, it provides a base for analyzing the "Journal's" adherence to this image in structuring the segments on politicians and experts.

The segment on "ordinary" Canadians is followed by one on experts, which also aired on November 16, 1988, immediately after the report from Philips. This segment can be characterized as a discussion in which the issues are exclusively appropriated by the journalist, while the nominees articulate their positions in a generally substantive manner. The last of the three segments, which initiate the analysis of the

"Journal's" informational value, aired on November 9, 1988, a day after the report on "ordinary" Canadians from British Columbia. This particular segment lacks any semblance of a coherent discussion. The issues are predominantly appropriated and advanced by the politicians, resulting in a debate that at best focuses on issues other than those related to FTA, and at worst projects chaos amongst the politicians with respect to their ability to explain FTA.

These two segments most significantly illustrate how the patterns of appropriating and advancing the issues, engaged by the "Journal," affect the program's informational value. The analysis of the remaining segments on politicians and experts further emphasizes the factors that consistently enhance or inhibit the program's ability to present FTA, in relation to its assumptions of "ordinary" Canadians.

In addition to the two tables outlined above, the first three segments are examined for: 1) the duration of key sections -- introduction, links, focus, closing remarks 2) Average duration of each participant's statement of position and 3) the number of overlapping interjections/statements of position. In the case of the segments on the politicians and experts, such a breakdown offers additional evidence of a presentation that either contributes to or detracts from the "Journal's" informational value.

Table 4.1 Schedule of Segments on Free Trade

<u>Date</u>	<u>Politicians</u>	<u>Experts</u>	<u>Ord. Cdns.</u>	<u>Focus</u>
1. Oct. 3/88	-	-	X	Intro. -Philips employees
2. Oct. 14/88	-	-	X	At Philips--some election issues
3. Oct. 17/88	-	X	-	FTA debate--I
4. Oct. 18/88	-	X	-	FTA debate--II
5. Oct. 20/88	X	-	-	Reps. of Fed. parties on FTA
6. Oct. 24/88	-	-	X	Concerns of Cdns. in B.C.
7. Oct. 26/88	-	-	X	At Philips -- leadership debate
8. Nov. 07/88	X	-	-	Interview -- leader of NDP
9. Nov. 08/88	-	-	X	Report from B.C. --on FTA
10. Nov. 09/88	X	-	-	Fed. Parties on key economic issues
11. Nov. 11/88	-	-	X	Views of three families on FTA
12. Nov. 15/88	-	X	-	Two Americans on FTA
13. Nov. 16/88	-	-	X	Philips -- final report
14. Nov. 16/88	-	X	-	Two historians discuss FTA
15. Nov. 17/88	X	-	-	Interview --PM

Table 4.2 Final Report on Philips Employees, November 16, 1988

Journalist: Kevin Tibbles

Nominees: D. Pitchford, A. Finestone, R. Azerro--Liberal; C. Dewar--NDP; T. Grunberg--Conservative.

PATTERN(S) OF APPROPRIATING AND ADVANCING THE FOCUS(ES)

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Participation</u>
1.	5	-	-	5	1:1
2.	2	6	-	12	1:9

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

FOCUS 1: Decision of casting a ballot by some of the Canadians nominated over the six weeks

- Diane finds that...she's been forced to make up her mind on... a one-issue campaign
- Today... Art Finestone... standing tall behind the [Liberal] Party and the leader.
-Carol Dewar... stands opposed to Free Trade and a hundred percent behind the NDP.
- Todd Grunberg says he is a Conservative and always has been....
- Throughout the campaign this conscientious accountant has been...keeping a report card on all three of the parties....He's remained undecided until the bitter end to ensure he makes the right decision. Today, Robert Azerro has made his choice.

FOCUS 2: General discussion on FTA -- for and against

- Todd, can Canada survive without the Free Trade Agreement?
- Carol, ... looking back on election '88, what are they going to say about all this?

METHOD OF INDIRECT APPROPRIATION

FOCUS 2: General discussion on FTA -- for and against

- D. PITCHFORD: If 80% of trade is free already, what's the big deal about this other 20%.
- A. FINESTONE: ...How do you know... what the Free Trade thing says? None of us know.
- R. AZERRO:... It's our energy and our water and our natural resources...it'll stay in the ground for another ten years...and then they'll come back and maybe we'll get a better deal.
- C. DEWAR: ... perhaps the Conservatives would have explained Free Trade... there wouldn't be the problems there is today... people are... not voting for a Party. They're voting on Free Trade.
- R. AZERRO: ... if you don't vote for Free Trade there's fear that you're going to be an economic ah, wasteland and if you do vote for Free Trade there's fear that... you're going to salute the flag in, in ten years time or something. I mean, we can't win.
- D. PITCHFORD: I've... been disappointed. I had hoped for better from all of the leaders.

Table 4.3 Final Report on Philips Employees, November 16/88

Journalist: Kevin Tibbles

Nominees: D. Pitchford, A.Finestone, R.Azerro--Liberal; C.Dewar--NDP; T.Grunberg--Conservative.

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN THE CONTEXT OF:

<u>History</u>	<u>Market Forces</u>	<u>International Precedent</u>	<u>Alternatives to FTA</u>	<u>The Three Fed. Parties</u>	<u>Rhetorical Position/Other</u>
FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: '88 election from the p.o.v. of future generations/ historians TIME: Journalist-0:09 Dewar----0:08 Finestone-0:09	FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Canada without FTA TIME: Journalist-0:03 Grunberg- 0:13	FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Maintaining Status Quo TIME: Journalist-0:00 Pitchford-0:07 Grunberg-0:10	-	FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Voting to Affect Outcome of FTA TIME: Journalist-0:58 Pitchford-0:17 Finestone-0:08 Dewar----0:10 Azerro----0:15 Grunberg-0:15	FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Renegotiating FTA TIME: Journalist-0:00 Azerro----0:27 Finestone-0:05 Grunberg-0:13
				FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Lack of info. on/ understanding of FTA TIME: Journalist-0:00 Finestone-0:10 Dewar----0:15 Pitchford-0:15 Azerro----0:17 Grunberg-0:32	

Table 4.4 Final Report on Philips Employees, November 16, 1988

Journalist: Kevin Tibbles

Nominees: D. Pitchford, A.Finestone, R.Azerro--Liberal; C.Dewar--NDP; T.Grunberg--Conservative

PACING OF THE SEGMENT:

<u>Temporal Elements</u>	<u>Introduction</u>	<u>Links</u>	<u>Focus</u>	<u>Closing Remarks</u>
Duration of key sections of the segment	1:34secs. 16%	2:12secs. 23%	5:16secs. 55%	:31secs. 5%
	Journalist-- 1:01, 10%	Journalist--1:18, 13%	Journalist--1:10, 13%	Journalist--:31, 5%
	Nominees--0:33, 6%	Nominees--0:54, 10%	Nominees--4:06, 42%	
	Unl.D. Philips employees :21 T.Grunberg :12	D.Pitchford :07 A.Finestone :24 R.Azerro :09 T.Grunberg :14	D.Pitchford :39 A. Finestone :32 C. Dewar :33 T.Grunberg 1:23 R. Azerro :59	
Avg. duration of each participant's statement of position	Journalist :20 Un. I.D. Philips employees :10.5 T.Grunberg :06	Journalist :19.5 D. Pitchford :07 A. Finestone :06 R. Azerro :09 T.Grunberg :14	Journalist :10 D. Pitchford :09.5 A. Finestone :08 C. Dewar :08 T.Grunberg :12 R. Azerro :19.6	Journalist :31
Overlapping Interjections/ Statement of position	None	D.Pitchford--1	T.Grunberg--2	None

The first focus of the segment on Philips employees is a conclusion of the central theme running through some of the previous segments on these "ordinary" Canadians -- the nominees final decision to vote in response to free trade. The ratio of direct to indirect participation during this issue -- one to one -- changes dramatically once the focus turns to free trade. The journalist poses only two questions while the remaining six questions or statements, which initiate the discussion on specific issues related to free trade, come from the "ordinary" Canadians nominated. Such a discrepancy is significant in that it gives evidence of the program's assumptions regarding the discussions on free trade taking place among "ordinary" Canadians in general . The journalist's closing remarks support this observation: "...this discussion hasn't been any different than those that have been taking place from coast to coast throughout this federal campaign, the most exciting campaign Canada has seen for decades. And while this group from Philips is admittedly a small and unscientific sampling of opinion, those opinions have been interesting...."

Although the contexts within which some of the issues are discussed go beyond partisan rhetoric, the discussion itself lacks depth. The first issue -- maintaining of status quo-- is appropriated by Diane Pitchford and its response is restricted to the pro free trade nominee, Todd Grunberg, pointing out that "the eighty percent [of the trade that already exists with the United States] may not be there. Not in a sense of U.S. taking action but the way the world's going economically." The second issue -- lack of information on or understanding of free trade -- appropriated with a challenge to Todd Grunberg by Art Finestone: "How

do you know about what the Free Trade thing says? None of us know" elicits no immediate response. The discussion then moves to the possibility of renegotiating free trade to ensure a better deal than the one being considered. The response to this, again by Grunberg, is anchored in partisan rhetoric that ends with the statement "....And I can guarantee they, the Liberals are not going to do anything different than the way we [the Conservatives] did." This is countered by Finestone "We'll [the Liberals] do it a little better. Like he says, what are we kissing their [the Americans] asses for, we don't have to kiss their ass."

At this point the journalist intervenes to ask Grunberg whether Canada can survive without free trade. Grunberg attempts to explain, from the perspective of the market forces, how Canada will eventually have to enter into a free trade agreement: "But we're going to be slowly less and less competitive and you'll sooner or later be put into a situation where you go to a free trade agreement."

The discussion then picks up on the issue appropriated earlier, which focused on not having information on or lack of understanding of the Agreement. The blame is placed squarely with the Conservative by the NDP supporter, Carol Dewar: "And you think that perhaps the Conservatives would have explained Free Trade in the beginning this, there wouldn't be the problems today...."

The last of the two questions by the journalist is put to Carol Dewar about what future generations might say about the free trade debate. Dewar's response is limited to a wait-and-see approach in terms of letting the ramifications of the deal decide how future generations will view it. The

segment ends with the R. Azerro and D. Pitchford reappropriating the issue of the lack of information on free trade. The discussion which ensues reaffirms the resentment towards the political parties' handling of the key issue of the campaign.

The lack of depth in discussing the issues related to FTA is most significantly reflected by the amount of time spent on each. A little over four minutes (4:17) is spent either on establishing the nominees decision to vote or on the appropriation and advancement of issues that are discussed either in the context of the three federal parties or partisan rhetoric. In contrast, less than a minute (59 seconds) is devoted to the three issues whose discussion is attempted from the perspective of history, market forces, and international precedent. The time allotted to other structural elements of the segment -- introduction, links, and closing remarks -- underscores this disparity even further.

The segment runs for about nine and a half minutes (9:33). Out of which approximately 44% is devoted to structural elements outside the main focus of the program. 16% is spent on the introduction by way of identifying the locale, the people, and the central aim of the segment: "For the past six weeks the swings back and forth on this blackboard have more or less reflected the swings that have gone on in voters' minds across this country.... This week...we'll take a final tally to find out just who these people are planning to support come Monday." 23% of the time is spent on linking previous political stance of the nominees with their final stance or providing a transition from one focus to another. And 5% of the time is allotted to the closing remarks of the journalist.

The higher percentage of air time taken up by the journalist in each of these three structural elements highlights his relative absence when focusing on specific issues related to FTA. The nominees are allotted 42% of the air time during the focus while the journalist only takes up 13%. And out of a little over one minute (1:10) taken up by the journalist, only twelve seconds are spent on directly appropriating and advancing issues related to free trade.

The absence of the journalist initially projects an informal and loosely structured forum in which some nominees take up more time than others in expressing their views on the election and FTA. But the relatively low ratio of direct participation of the journalist, does not necessarily translate into his limited role in structuring the discussion. Two factors support this observation.

First, the dynamics of the discussion, created through the nomination of one Conservative supporter facing off four voters who oppose the Agreement, preserves the continuum of the image of "ordinary" Canadians advanced in the preceding segments. This image is further reinforced by R. Azerro, an undecided voter who opts to vote Liberal as the result of being confused about FTA rather than on the basis of an understanding of the issues related to it. This nominee is not only accorded more air time relative to T. Grunberg who, as stated above, single-handedly defends his position on supporting FTA but on average has the longest uninterrupted time (19.6 seconds) for stating his position.

Second, the setting of the segment, which is over lunch in a Chinese restaurant, has surprisingly few overlapping

interjections/statements of position often characteristic of informal discussions on politics. Thus inferring the reporter's role in structuring the discussion through editing.

Both of these factors demonstrate an emphasis by the "Journal" on articulating a particular image of "ordinary" Canadians over allocating "equal" time to the opposing sides. In doing so they reinforce an analysis of how the program responds to this image when presenting FTA. This approach requires an examination that goes beyond establishing the time allocated to the opposing positions or the level of positive/negative coverage accorded to each. It places an onus on examining the contexts within which issues are presented, reflecting the "Journal's" attempts to address the confusion among "ordinary" Canadians.

Table 4.5 Two Prominent Historians Discuss Free Trade, November 16, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum. Terrance McKenna

Nominees: Kenneth McNaught--Anti-FTA; Michael Bliss--Pro-FTA

PATTERN(S) OF APPROPRIATING AND ADVANCING THE FOCUS(ES)

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Participation</u>
1.	3	-	-	6	1:2
2.	4	-	1	20	1:4
3.	1	-	-	3	1:3
4.	2	-	1	14	1:4.6

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

FOCUS 1: Canadian Elections on free trade

- ... the election of 1891. Liberal opposition leader Wilfred Laurier wrapped himself in the banner of free trade...Sir John A. Macdonald wrapped himself in the flag to fight the last great battle of his career.
- ...two decades later, Laurier had another run on the Free Trade platform...
- In the late 1940's, McKenzie King negotiated a sweeping deal...in secret...In the end King backed down fearing that such a broad ranging agreement with the Americans would strike one of Canada's most sensitive political nerves. The election of 1988 has struck that nerve again....

FOCUS 2: Concerns over U.S. political/social influences on Canada through free trade

- ...Kenneth McNaught...fears the deal will lead to pressure for political integration...Michael Bliss...believes the deal will create wealth that is essential to assure our social programs and our cultural integrity... Gentlemen...Is this the same old debate or have times changed?
- ...has it always been a referendum on the American way of life
- ...Let's spend a little time on that. The notion that we'll stop being Canada, that our sovereignty cannot be preserved.
- ...How do you see us exercising our sovereignty in the next twenty years?

FOCUS 3: Free trade from a global perspective

- ...let me ask you to put our discussion in a global context. What's the rest of the world doing?

FOCUS 4: Safeguarding Canada's economic/social prosperity

- Professor Bliss, what about his point that it's wrong to say Canada can't go it alone, that everybody's in an umbrella of some kind?
- ...I want to hear how you each think our future is best secured. When you weigh the risk against the gain, when you think about what Canada's going to be like and you opt for the deal, why do you do so?

Table 4.6 Two Prominent Historians Discuss Free Trade, November 16, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum, Terrance McKenna

Nominees: Kenneth McNaught--Anti-FTA; Michael Bliss--Pro-FTA

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN THE CONTEXT OF:

<u>History</u>	<u>Market Forces</u>	<u>International Precedent</u>	<u>Alternatives to FTA</u>	<u>The Three Fed. Parties</u>	<u>Rhetorical Position/Other</u>
<p>FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Tories & Liberals on FTA--past & present stance TIME: Journalist-1:26 John A. MacDonald/ J.Turner-0:32 Wilfred Laurier/Brian Mulroney-0:51</p> <p>FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: National Sovereignty/ Identity TIME: Journalist-0:19 McNaught1:43 Bliss -----1:39</p>	<p>FOCUS 4/ ISSUE: Canada with FTA TIME: Journalist-0:16 McNaught1:19 Bliss-----0:41</p> <p>FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: National Sovereignty/ Identity TIME: Journalist-0:23 McNaught2:04 Bliss-----2:27</p>	<p>FOCUS 3/ ISSUE: FTA vis a vis trade policies of other countries TIME: Journalist-0:08 McNaught1:12 Bliss-----1:13</p>	-	-	<p>FOCUS 4/ ISSUE: Canada without FTA TIME: Journalist 0:09 McNaught1:28 Bliss----- 1:40</p>

Table 4.7 Two Prominent Historians Discuss Free Trade, November 16, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum, Terrence McKenna

Nominees: Kenneth McNaught--Anti-FTA; Michael Bliss--Pro-FTA

PACING OF THE SEGMENT:

<u>Temporal Elements</u>	<u>Introduction</u>	<u>Links</u>	<u>Focus</u>	<u>Closing Remarks</u>
Duration of key sections of the segment	:41 secs. 3%	:27 secs. 2%	19:30 secs. 94%	:06secs. 0.5%
	Journalist :41 3%	Journalist :27 2%	Journalist 2:41 13% Nominees 16:49 81%	Journalist :06 0.5%
			K. McNaught 7:46 M. Bliss 7:40 Archival/ docu- drama/news footage: 1:23	
Avg. duration of each participant's statement of position	Journalist :41	Journalist :27	Journalist :16 K. McNaught :39 M. Bliss :26 Archival/docu- drama/news footage :19	Journalist :06
Overlapping Interjections/ Statement of position	None	None	K. McNaught: 4 M. Bliss: 2	None

The opening of this segment examines FTA in a historical context. Its format differs from the remaining segment, as well as all other segments on politicians and experts. The journalist, Terrence McKenna, makes use of archival films, news clips, as well as footage from a previous CBC docu-drama to trace Canada's past elections on free trade -- 1891, 1911-- as well as McKenzie King's secret trade deal with the United States in the 1940's. This documentary style presentation constitutes the most comprehensive examination, by the "Journal," of the historical roots of free trade in Canada. Unfortunately, it is restricted to less than three minutes (2:49).

Once the brief historical background is established, the segment moves on to an in-studio discussion with Barbara Frum as the moderator. The two nominees, Kenneth McNaught and Michael Bliss are quickly introduced as Canada's leading historians, and the second focus of the segment--Concerns over political/social influences of the U.S. on Canada through free trade-- is appropriated twice. The discussion which ensues addresses the issue of national sovereignty/identity from a historical perspective.

As historians, the two nominees disagree little on the similarities of previous elections on free trade with the election of 1988. They state that each election echoes fears of a political union with the United States as the result of a commercial union, or loss of Canadian identity most acutely represented by a different set of social policies. The historians find little agreement, however, on whether present day economic realities permit an appeal to the concept of Canadian identity as a means of opposing free trade.

Michael Bliss, the historian favouring the Agreement, initially suggests that "the alternative [to free trade] has changed dramatically." In the past

"people were able to say turn away from the Yanks because we're British...we have immense transatlantic trade." Kenneth McNaught responds that although there is no longer that external source of security "opponents of the deal can appeal to a Canadian self confidence now which rests upon a kind of continued prosperity which we did not in fact have on our own then." This is countered by Bliss: "...it's a false self confidence. No nation with thirty percent of its GNP [in] foreign trade is ah, is self contained....we've had a few good years in the 1980's but we're a country with three hundred billion dollars of debt and it seems to me that ah, the problem is that with so much of our trade with one trading partner, if we lose the security of the North American market we are going to be out in the cold in a way that we never were in 1911, 1891." This section of the segment lasts a little less than four minutes (3:41) and advances the discussion to the more contemporary arguments on free trade. It also reflects, more directly, the ideological base from which each historian draws his arguments.

In the third focus of the program -- free trade from a global perspective -- both historians cite examples of the European common market to make their case. Bliss suggests that England, for all its initial attempts to stay out of the common market, eventually had to join in. Although the degree of integration has been a point of contention for the British, there is no longer the question of whether they should join in. McNaught points to the inconsistency of the analogy by stating that not only is the trade agreement between Canada and the U.S. the most extensive of its kind, but unlike Canada smaller countries in Europe can band together to unite against their larger partners in the common market to challenge such matters as

agricultural tariffs. He suggests that "Belgium or Holland would never have gone into an economic union with Germany or France alone." This is countered by Bliss with the example of New Zealand and Australia and how the success of free trade between these two countries has resulted in the remaining barriers being taken down ahead of schedule. The exchange lasts a little over two minutes (2:25).

The segment advances to focus on the safeguarding of Canada's economic/social prosperity, and the nominees respond with a healthy dose of emotional rhetoric. Interspersed with remarks that border on personal attacks are failed attempts to address the issue of Canada without FTA from the perspective of market forces and international precedent. The exchange lasts a little over three minutes (3:08) and is initiated by Bliss with Albania as an example of a country that "goes it alone" rather than enter into a trading block. This invites accusations, by McNaught, of engaging in fear tactics. In response, Bliss is obliged to differentiate between hysterical fears and rational fears. The former, being associated with the fears of those opposing the Agreement. The level of exchange goes down further with Bliss stating "I hardly could have dreamed of the day when my radical professor would become the voice of the status quo, self satisfaction and absolutely unshaking conservatism." As this section of the segment ends, with the appropriation of another question by Barbara Frum, it echoes the rhetoric generally associated with the debate on free trade.

The focus remains on safeguarding Canada's economic/social prosperity, but the more specific issue addressed is each historian's view of Canada with Free Trade. The discussion lasts a little over two minutes (2:16).

Bliss presents the case that the Agreement is "the best way to protect what we have achieved in the last thirty years. It is the best way to stabilize relations with a trading partner that has immense power to do us harm...." But McNaught sees the future of Canada's social and political mores influenced by the United States as the result of the Agreement. Both of these positions suggest different interpretations of the influences of the market forces as the result of the Agreement. In fact, McNaught makes this observation with a response to Bliss' position: "you're arguing almost exclusively it seems to me from the basis of economics and the rationalization and, and efficiency and the market place...."

A more direct discussion within the context of market forces takes place as the focus reverts to concerns over United States' political/social influences on Canada through FTA, and more specifically the issue of Canadian Sovereignty/Identity. This last section of the segment is also the longest, lasting almost five minutes (4:54), with the focus being appropriated twice. The first appropriation addresses the immediate infringes to Canadian sovereignty as the result of FTA, the second addresses the Agreement's long-term ramifications. The central argument presented by Bliss is that Canada's sovereignty can best be guarded through its economic prosperity as "sovereignty in a way is a function of wealth because you can afford choices." The central concern of McNaught deals with the extent to which Canadian business and property will be controlled by Americans, and that "American business and the market place will become the chief criterion of social decisions."

Throughout most of this segment the two historians succinctly answer the questions that are exclusively posed by the journalist. This not only ensures a focus on issues of concern to "ordinary" Canadians, but the relatively low ratio of direct advancement allows each historian more air time to state his position. Such a pattern of appropriating and advancing each focus complements the tacit commitment of the nominees to state their position in a generally forthright manner, evidenced by issues that are predominantly discussed in the context of history, market forces, and international precedent/perspective.

The commitment of the nominees to engage in a substantive discussion is also evidenced by the relatively few overlapping interjections, in spite of the differences in nominees' style of speaking. That is, while the opportunity to respond to a question is given fairly equally to both participants, on average McNaught takes more time to state his position. This is mainly due to his calm demeanour that results in a slower pace in expressing his views than Bliss. Such a difference between the two nominees could have easily resulted in the more aggressive speaker dominating the discussion, or constantly cutting the other off. The absence of such a rapport not only enables each participant to concentrate on articulating his position but also to support it by offering specific examples.

The informational value of this segment is further enhanced by a greater allocation of time to the central focus, over the time spent on the introduction, links, and closing remarks. These three structural elements, combined, take a little over one minute (1:14), or 5.5% of the segment. The

rest, nineteen and a half minutes, or 94% of the segment is mainly allotted to the discussion of specific issues.

The central factor that confines the informational value of this segment results from the lack of foresight, on the part of the "Journal," with respect to its presentation of the historical roots of FTA. The documentary style presentation which opens this segment takes away valuable air time that could have otherwise been directed towards an in-studio discussion with the nominees, drawing on their expertise to further examine FTA in a historical context. Also, had this section been presented at the outset of the "Journal's" coverage of FTA it may have offered a broader perspective, earlier on in the election, on the stringent contemporary positions.

The importance of defining the role of the journalist in response to the rapport between the nominees is most acutely reflected by the next segment. While this is also an in-studio discussion, its informational value is inhibited by the attempts of each nominee to monopolize the air time, and to advance the issues in the context of partisan rhetoric.

Table 4.8 Federal Parties on Key Economic Issues, November 9, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum

Nominees: M. Wilson--Conservative; B. Tobin--Liberal; M. Cassidy--NDP

PATTERN(S) OF APPROPRIATING AND ADVANCING THE FOCUS(ES)

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Participation</u>
1.	1	-	-	-	1:0
2.	-	2	3	15	1:5.6
3.	-	1	1	6	1:7
4.	2	3	6	41	1:5.5

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

FOCUS 1: Repercussion of election results on the economy

- ...many voters are frightened by what could happen to the Canadian economy after the federal election...Mr. Wilson, is free trade the economic issue facing Canadians?

FOCUS 4: Financing government services /campaign promises

- ... Each of you have got different ideas about how to raise revenue...Mr. Wilson, your answer is a national sales tax. Why do you say that's the best answer?
- Mr. Tobin, can I ask you this? How would the Liberals generate more revenue?

METHOD OF INDIRECT APPROPRIATION

FOCUS 2: Significance of Tory policies for economic growth

- M. Wilson: ...We have been...at the top of the major industrialized nations...that compares with the previous four years when we were at the bottom...this...stems from the policies that we have brought in November 1984, agenda paper for economic renewal.
- M. Wilson:...any time...the Conservative support in this election campaign is...down, the markets go down...This is the combination of many decisions of people who have had ah, expectations that...the economy is going to improve... as a result of the free trade deal.

FOCUS 3: Declining support for FTA

- M. Cassidy:...support for the... agreement has been dropping...people understand...it's a bad deal....
- M. Wilson:...acceptance of the free trade deal has gone down. Nothing to do with the economic ah, elements of it. A lot of myths, a lot of scare tactics on ... both your sides....

FOCUS 4: Financing government services/campaign promises

- M. Wilson:...another reason why people have ah, expressed these views through the market place. And that is a concern that stems from thirty-five billion dollars worth of spending promises...Brian, how are you going to... finance... spending over...five years?
- M. Wilson: What are you going to do, Michael?
- M. Wilson:...Brian....What is your sales tax? What's the rate going to be, What is going to be taxed?

Table 4.9 Federal Parties on Key Economic Issues, November 9, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum

Nominees: M. Wilson--Conservative; B. Tobin--Liberal; M. Cassidy--NDP

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN THE CONTEXT OF:

<u>History</u>	<u>Market Forces</u>	<u>International Precedent</u>	<u>Alternatives to FTA</u>	<u>The Three Fed. Parties</u>	<u>Rhetorical Position/Outcome</u>
	<p>FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Market response as a valid gauge of strong economic policies TIME: Journalist-0:11 Wilson-1:49 Tobin---1:07 Cassidy0:25</p>			<p>FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Economic growth1984-88 TIME: Journalist-0:00 Wilson-1:15 Tobin---0:50 Cassidy0:00</p>	<p>FOCUS1/ ISSUE: The role of free trade in the Cdn. economy TIME: Journalist-0:05 Wilson---0:00 Tobin----0:00 Cassidy--0:00</p>
				<p>FOCUS 4 ISSUE: Fiscal responsibility--track record TIME: Journalist-0:10 Wilson----1:16 Tobin-----1:39 Cassidy---0:47</p>	<p>FOCUS 3/ ISSUE: Scare tactics of both sides of the free trade debate TIME: Journalist-0:02 Wilson----0:40 Tobin-----1:13 Cassidy---1:01</p>
				<p>FOCUS 4 ISSUE: Nat'l. sales tax/reallocation of resources TIME: Journalist-1:00 Wilson----4:39 Tobin-----3:10 Cassidy---3:19</p>	

Table 4.10 Federal Parties on Key Economic Issues, November 9, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum

Nominees: M.Wilson--Conservative; B. Tobin--Liberal; M. Cassidy--NDP

PACING OF THE SEGMENT:

<u>Temporal Elements</u>	<u>Introduction</u>	<u>Links</u>	<u>Focus</u>	<u>Closing Remarks</u>
Duration of key sections of the segment	1:39secs. 5%	1:50 secs. 6%	24:38 secs. 78%	3:29 secs. 11 %
	Journalist 1:12secs. 3%	Journalist :31secs. 2%	Journalist 1:28secs. 5%	Journalist :10
	Vox Pop :36secs. 2%	Vox Pop 1:19secs. 4%	Nominees 23:10secs 73%	Nominees 3:19secs. 11%
			M.Wilson 9:39secs. B.Tobin 7:59secs. M.Cassidy 5:32secs	M.Wilson 1: 06secs. B.Tobin 1:07secs. M.Cassidy 1:06secs
Avg. duration of each participant's statement of position	Journalist :36 Vox Pop :06	Journalist :08 Vox Pop :08	Journalist :04 M. Wilson :10 B. Tobin :08 M. Cassidy:10	Journalist :10 M. Wilson 1:07 B. Tobin 1:07 M. Cassidy 1:05
Overlapping Interjections/ Statement of position	None	None	Journalist 19 M. Wilson 29 B. Tobin 25 M. Cassidy 24	None

In this segment, the tendency of the nominees to undermine the role of the reporter surfaces almost immediately. For example, the first question by the journalist is directed towards Wilson, but is completely ignored by him as he focuses on the significance of Tory economic policies and the more specific issue of economic growth between 1984-1988. The initial question remains unaddressed as the high ratio of indirect participation continues to marginalize the journalist's role in setting the course of the discussion, which almost totally ignores FTA.

This omission is significant for two reasons. First, the segment is introduced as one that will try to sort out some of the economic issues facing Canadians. Second, it airs the day after the report from British Columbia, which clearly recognizes that "Canadians are asking hard questions about the Deal but instead of answers they're getting campaign rhetoric." The in-studio discussion between the three politicians only serves to confirm this.

The only discussion on free trade is on the scare tactics used by both sides of the debate. Cassidy begins the appropriation with Wilson completing it while Tobin makes several futile attempts to join in the conversation before actually succeeding. The exchange lasts almost three minutes (2:54) out of which the journalist manages to take up two seconds, only to ask Wilson to respond to Tobin's position.

An emphasis by the "Journal" on distributing relatively equal time among the politicians tends to override the significance of eliciting the reasoning behind each participant's stance through follow-up questions, or indirect advancement. This is reflected by the time taken up by the journalist compared with the time allotted to the nominees, the three of whom

combined take up a little over twenty-three minutes (23:10), or seventy-three percent of the segment during the central focus. The journalist only takes about a minute and a half (1:28), or five percent of the segment.

The ineffectiveness of this segment to address the issues in a substantive manner is best illustrated by the average duration of each participant's statement of position. For example, Wilson takes up over nine minutes during the focus (9:39), but only speaks an average of ten seconds at a time. Tobin takes up almost eight minutes (7:59), but speaks an average of eight seconds at a time. Cassidy takes up over five minutes (5:32) and also speaks an average of ten seconds.

The limited time frame within which each politician articulates his stance results from the number of overlapping interjections/statements of position. Wilson interrupts twenty-nine times, followed by Tobin at twenty-five, and Cassidy at twenty-four. In between all this the journalist makes her own attempts, nineteen times, to control the direction of the discussion. At times the discussion becomes incoherent as no less than three people try to talk over each other.

In light of the political grand standing attributed to the politicians by the "journal," the informational value of this particular segment may have been better ensured had the "rules" of the discussion, or the role of the journalist been more clearly defined at the outset. For example, the last section of the segment, or "closing remarks", is initiated by the journalist with: "We've just got enough time for you each to have a closing statement, I believe you drew lots to see the order. Whose first?"

While this statement once again indicates the "Journal's" concerns over being "fair" in allocating time to the nominees, it also demonstrates the ability of the nominees to comply with the rules, as this is the only section of the segment in which each participant speaks without being interrupted by the others. This point is substantiated further by the initial segment on politicians, which is to be analyzed next.

This particular segment opens with the journalist stating "I will try to keep my interventions as few as possible. I will be directing questions at each of you though. But of course after you each have your chance to talk I hope the others will want to join in..." The discussion which ensues demonstrates the general willingness of the politicians to debate the issues appropriated by the journalist on FTA rather than set their own agenda for the discussion. Thereby resulting in a segment that addresses some of the concerns of "ordinary" Canadians.

Table 4.11 Federal Parties on FTA, October 20, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum

Nominees: J. Crosbie--Conservative; L. Axworthy--Liberal; J. Den-Hertog--NDP

PATTERN(S) OF APPROPRIATING AND ADVANCING THE FOCUS(ES)

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Participation</u>
1.	1	-	3	4	1:1
2.	1	-	3	4	1:1
3.	1	-	2	5	1:1.6
4.	1	-	5	8	1:1.3
5.	-	-	-	-	Incomplete

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

FOCUS 1: Responding to the fears of Canadians re FTA

•...I will be putting the first question to you, Mr. Crosbie...how do you answer those Canadians who still feel vulnerable, still feel worried that the government is losing its ability to act for them, to protect them, to defend Canada? What is the case you make for their confidence in this agreement?

FOCUS 2: Canada's loss of control over energy

•...I want to have ah, some little more time on the energy thing because you (L. Axworthy) say over and over, we would lose control. He (J. Crosbie) says we don't lose control.

FOCUS 3: The effect of FTA on Canada's Social Policies

•...As you know the government says there is not one phrase in this deal that threatens medicare. Why do you insist there is?

FOCUS 4: Protectionist approach of the past vs. free trade of the future

•The next subject I put to you, Johanna Den-Hertog first...that's the perennial worry of Canadians about jobs. Your party is accused by the defenders of this deal of being protectionist, of trying to save declining jobs and declining industries and failing to anticipate the future, that you are trying to preserve the path against the inevitable, changes and adjustments we must make anyway. What's, what's your party's response to that?

FOCUS 5: The affects of FTA on Canadian Culture

•...I want to ask each of you to address the concern about the future of Canadian values, Canadian culture, Canadian way of life. This threat that your (Liberal) party keeps insisting they see as you know the opponents say there is not one line that threatens our culture. It's up to us. What do you respond?

Table 4.12 Federal Parties on FTA, October 20, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum

Nominees: J. Crosbie--Conservative; L. Axworthy--Liberal; J. Den-Hertog--NDP

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN THE CONTEXT OF:

<u>History</u>	<u>Market Forces</u>	<u>International Precedent</u>	<u>Alternatives to FTA</u>	<u>The Three Fed. Parties</u>	<u>Rhetorical Position/Other</u>
FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Energy	FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Jobs	FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Dispute- settlement mechanisms	FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Jobs		FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Lower Prices for consumers
	FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Social programs	FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Energy	FOCUS 4/ ISSUE: Jobs		FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Dispute- settlement mechanism
	FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Energy	FOCUS 4/ ISSUE: Jobs			FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Energy
	FOCUS 3/ ISSUE: Medicare				FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Energy
	FOCUS 4/ ISSUE: Jobs				FOCUS 3/ ISSUE: Medicare
					FOCUS 4/ ISSUE: Jobs
					FOCUS 5/ ISSUE: Culture

This segment is the first, in the "Journal's" coverage of the election campaign, in which politicians are nominated to debate FTA. John Crosbie, Lloyd Axworthy, and Johanna Den-Hertog represent the Conservative, Liberal, and the New Democratic parties respectively. The debate airs from the St. Lawrence Hall, a place whose strong historical connection with FTA is firmly established in the two preceding segments.

As with the segment on historians, the questions are exclusively put forward by the journalist, who focuses on issues such as jobs, social programs, energy. Once the issues are introduced, however, the journalist's role is confined to nominating the politicians to respond to each other. As a result, the responsibility of clarifying the opposing positions rests with the nominees rather than the journalist. For example, a statement by Crosbie that nothing in the Agreement prevents "us from selling our energy sources to the U.S. ... at any price that we can get for it" remains unchallenged by the journalist with respect to the fact that this is not the criticism being directed against the Agreement. Rather, the criticism focuses on the inability of the Canadians to receive preferential rates on their own energy sources, that the price charged to them would also be determined by the market forces (Council of Canadians 1988, 10 in Guide to Main Issues; Council of Canadians 1988c, 7). A point countered by the response of Axworthy.

In this particular instance the nomination of opposing views appears to maintain an effective system of clarifying an ambiguous statement. At times, however, a reliance on the nominees to check and balance each other's positions leads to long-winded statements that tend to shift the discussion in the context of partisan rhetoric.

Still, the segment highlights some of the reasoning or basis for the opposing positions. This is most directly reflected by the debate over the future of jobs, which is discussed in the context of the market forces, international precedent, and alternatives to FTA. Crosbie emphasizes the significance of securing continued access to the U.S. market, while Axworthy points to the shortfalls of allowing the market place to take precedence over public and private partnerships in making the changes required in the workforce. The latter associated with addressing the transitional costs through adjustment programs.

In the context of international precedent, Crosbie proposes that FTA is an important prelude to further securing jobs through GATT, while Den-Hertog focuses on the shortfalls of not entering into multi-lateral trade agreements through GATT in lieu of FTA. Alternatives to FTA are also proposed by way of citing the effects of a reduced interest rate, the government's investment in housing, and arrangements similar to the Auto pact that could have a more positive impact on jobs than those projected by the proponents of the Agreement.

The informational value of this segment is mainly enhanced by its position in the "Journal's" overall coverage of FTA, for this discussion serves more as an introduction to each party's stance on the Agreement rather than an in-depth examination of specific issues. The latter is inhibited more from the relative absence of the journalist than from the tendency of the nominees to ground the discussion in partisan rhetoric. The significance of the journalist's role in following-up a specific point is demonstrated by the segment analyzed below.

Table 4.13 Two Prominent Americans on Free Trade, November 15, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum

Nominees: Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan-- Pro-FTA; Ralph Nader--Anti-FTA

PATTERN(S) OF APPROPRIATING AND ADVANCING THE FOCUS(ES)

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Participation</u>
1.	1	-	2	3	1:1
2.	1	-	-	1	1:1
3.	1	-	-	1	1:1
4.	1	-	1	2	1:1
5.	1	-	4	5	1:1
6.	1	-	1	2	1:1

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

FOCUS 1: Possibility of opposition victory and rejection of FTA

• ...Senator Moynihan...were the opposition to be successful next Monday in Canada and were they to refuse to implement the Free Trade Agreement, what would be the likely reaction in Congress do you think?

FOCUS 2: Adding a codicil to the Agreement

•Senator, what about a codicil to have the administration and Congress say for sure your pensions are safe, for sure your social programs are safe, for sure your medicare is safe, we're not going to pursue you as, as saying that's a subsidy. Is that obtainable?

FOCUS 3: Harmonization to the lowest common denominator

•Here's what they say Senator, and Ralph Nader who's going to be up after you says the same, is that the pressure from the low wage states, from the states that don't have good environmental controls...good social services, that the pressure for harmonization on us is going to be so great we're going to lose every time.

FOCUS 4: Areas affected negatively by FTA

•Senator Moynihan, you said that social programs in Canada would be absolutely safe. Would we be vulnerable in other areas?

FOCUS 5: Ralph Nader's reasons for opposing FTA

•Mr. Nader, we've just been speaking to Senator Moynihan, He's very positive about this Free Trade Agreement. Why are you opposed?

FOCUS 6: Canada without FTA

•...You assume there'll be no pressure on us without a Free Trade Agreement. Why won't there be less restraint, that's what Senator Moynihan just said. He thought if anything there'll be more inclination to press Canada, not less.

Table 4.14 Two Prominent Americans on Free Trade, November 15, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum

Nominees: Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan-- Pro-FTA; Ralph Nader--Anti-FTA

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN THE CONTEXT OF:

<u>History</u>	<u>Market Forces</u>	<u>International Precedent</u>	<u>Alternatives to FTA</u>	<u>The Three Fed. Parties</u>	<u>Rhetorical Position/Other</u>
	FOCUS 4/ ISSUE: Subsidies	FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Social programs			FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Economic consequences for Canada without FTA
	FOCUS 5/ ISSUE: Social programs				FOCUS 3/ ISSUE: Social programs/ wages/ environmental control
					FOCUS 6/ ISSUE: National sovereignty

The segment on two prominent Americans is the only one where the nominees are separated by time and space. Each guest appears via satellite, with Senator Moynihan being interviewed first. This eliminates the chances of the two experts marginalizing the role of the reporter, as in the case of the in-studio discussion among the politicians analyzed above. However, as this segment is one of the last before the election, it places a greater onus on the journalist to go beyond the most fundamental reasoning behind the opposing positions. More specifically, it requires a further examination of the arguments prevalent in the national debate over FTA.

For example, in the third focus Moynihan responds to the possibility of social programs, wages, and environment controls being harmonized to the lowest common-denominator. He states that "This is a chairman of the sub committee on social security saying this, it is not so. Now other things. Legitimate concerns and you can talk about them but don't let yourself be side-tracked by that issue." The journalist probes no further.

Instead, with respect to social programs, Moynihan's position is somewhat elaborated in the preceding focus, in which he states that "the GATT, absolutely excludes social insurance from the area of subsidy, and equally our trade laws do." This point is advanced in the fifth focus of the segment, in which Nader is given a chance to counter that it is the pressures from the market forces that would compel businesses and workers to "voluntarily give up rights when they're faced with a choice of jobs or social service, or jobs or workplace safety standards and that has nothing to do with GATT or the...Agreement once the barriers fall between the two countries."

This constitutes one of the central arguments put forward by those opposing FTA (Council of Canadians 1988b, 15-16; Council of Canadians 1988a, Issue Sheet #6). As such, the informational value of this segment may have been better served had Moynihan's position been initially challenged by the journalist. This would have elicited his views on how the pressures from the market forces may override any protection through GATT. It would have also set the grounds for probing deeper into Nader's position. For instance, by focusing on his reasons as to why trade liberalization with the U.S., between 1940 to 1986, did not prevent Canada from pursuing its own national policies with respect to social programs and labour laws (Chapman 1988, 5; Lipsey 1987b, 255; Lynk 1988, 18-20, 36).

The issue of economic consequences for Canada without FTA, in the first focus, further illustrates the lack of depth in covering the central positions in the debate over the Agreement. The initial question is put to Moynihan on the possibility of Tory defeat and Congress' reaction to the rejection of the Agreement by the party in power. It is advanced, once again, in the last focus so that Nader can respond to the possibility of the pressures that may be put on Canada if the Agreement is rejected.

Moynihan answers in extremely general terms by emphasizing that the strong friendship between the two nations will overcome any pressures that may be applied on Canada. As to what those pressures might be is briefly mentioned in this, as well as in the fourth focus on the issue of subsidies -- a re-examination of the auto pact. Nader's response is that Canadians should "get their back up even more..." that if "...Those are the kinds of threats which will be institutionalized with this Free Trade Agreement... Mulroney will have to

start singing a new tune. It won't be O' Canada. It'll be bye bye Canada as you know it." This equally vague statement does little to offer a more substantial view of how Canadian sovereignty may be affected by either rejecting or accepting FTA.

This pattern is extended further in the fourth focus, as Moynihan suggests that perhaps Canada and the U.S. need to re-examine the economic benefits of subsidizing weak industries. While this infers rationalizing the industries according to the principles of economies of scale, the position remains unchallenged in terms of the repercussion, for Canada, of economic ties that run North-South rather than East-West, and the absence of well-defined transitional programs for workers who may not survive increased competition.

This segment illustrates the significance of appropriating an issue by acknowledging the stance adopted by the nominee, and advancing the discussion so that the criticism levied against this stance is addressed. The important role of the journalist in this regard -- elaborating on the processes that are expected to result in the outcomes projected by the two sides -- is demonstrated further by the segments analyzed below.

Table 4.15 Classic Debate on FTA--Part I October 17, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum Nominee: Peter Lougheed, former premier of Alberta--Pro FTA;
Tom D'Aquino, president of the Business Council on National Issues--Pro FTA; Bob White,
president of the Canadian Auto Workers Union--Anti FTA; Maude Barlow, head of the
Council of Canadians--Anti FTA

PATTERN(S) OF APPROPRIATING AND ADVANCING THE FOCUS(ES)

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Participation</u>
1.	-	1	-	-	0:1
2.	-	1	-	3	0:4
3.	-	1	-	3	0:4
4.	-	1	-	3	0:4
5.	-	1	-	2	0:3
6.	-	1	-	1	0:2
7.	-	1	-	-	0:1
8.	-	1	-	1	0:2
9.	-	1	-	-	0:1

METHOD OF INDIRECT APPROPRIATION

FOCUS 1: Creating new opportunities for Canadians

• P. Lougheed:...hopefully...the representatives for the negative will...propose...alternatives to create new jobs..

FOCUS 2: Pressure to harmonize

• P. Lougheed:...we would not support an agreement that jeopardized... social...environmental.... regional development programs...The Agreement is...about goods and services and investment.

FOCUS 3: Securing access to U.S. markets

• P. Lougheed:...there were pressures on American politicians to erect barriers....We saw how well...the Auto Pact had been working for Ontario and we said, why not a broader deal....

FOCUS 4: Regional and sectoral affects of FTA

• P. Lougheed:...It's [FTA] supported by small business....by the manufacturing community, by most farmers, fishermen and oil well operators and lumbermen and... those who have serviced them.

FOCUS 5: Canada's vulnerability in settling disputes

• M. Barlow:... if the American law has been broken... we have no recourse....Agreement is much more binding on... us than it is on them.

FOCUS 6: Natural resources

• M. Barlow:...We now have to share a portion of our energy in perpetuity, even in times of shortages and we cannot establish lower prices for Canadians.

FOCUS 7: National treatment accorded to foreign investors

• M. Barlow:... we're going to have to treat them [American companies] as if they were our own...in the past we could use the subsidies...for our small business to... create a market. We can't do that any more...

FOCUS 8: FTA vis a vis culture and sovereignty

• T. D'Aquino:...I would not support a deal that...impinged upon our sovereignty.

FOCUS 9: Auto Pact vs. Free Trade

• B. White:...The Auto Pact is the opposite to free trade, it is indeed managed trade...

Table 4.16 Classic Debate on FTA-- Part I October 17, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum

Nominee: Peter Lougheed, former premier of Alberta--Pro FTA; Tom D'Aquino, president of the Business Council on National Issues--Pro FTA; Bob White, president of the Canadian Auto Workers Union--Anti FTA; Maude Barlow, head of the Council of Canadians--Anti FTA

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN THE CONTEXT OF:

<u>History</u>	<u>Market Forces</u>	<u>International Precedent</u>	<u>Alternatives to FTA</u>	<u>The Three Fed. Parties</u>	<u>Rhetorical Position/Other</u>
	FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Social programs/ environmental controls				FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Jobs
	FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Definition of subsidy				FOCUS 3/ ISSUE: Jobs
					FOCUS 4/ ISSUE: Jobs
					FOCUS 5/ ISSUE: Dispute settlement mechanism
					FOCUS 6/ ISSUE: Energy
					FOCUS 7/ ISSUE: Jobs
					FOCUS 8/ ISSUE: culture/ sovereignty
					FOCUS 9/ ISSUE: Auto Pact

The introduction to this first of two classic debates leaves little doubt that the viewers are not only about to witness an event immersed in history, but are to witness the making of history itself. Instead of broadcasting from the regular "Journal" set or a conventional auditorium the setting is the St. Lawrence Hall in Toronto, a place introduced as the room where major historical debates have taken place, including the first debate on Free Trade dating back to 1852.

While the choice of location is relevant to a debate on FTA, the choice of format does little to present the issues in relation to the "Journal's" image of "ordinary" Canadians. The journalist serves merely as a time keeper and the officiator of the proceedings with the resolution that "be it resolved, the Free Trade Agreement is good for Canada." This limited role of the journalist, reflected by the patterns of appropriating and advancing the issues, is established in the introduction which states that the participants will be "putting their arguments" directly to each other, to our invited audience here, and to you."

Theoretically, meticulous attention to a balance forum, and minimum interruptions during valuable air time suggest maximum information being conveyed on an issue. As well, a minimal role of the journalist suggests little means available to the program in enforcing its own bias, especially if those invited to speak have relatively equal expertise for debating FTA. Such assumptions are not valid, however, if the journalist can be instrumental in eliciting the reasoning that guides each nominee's position. Thereby, attempting to offer the viewers substance in place of more rhetoric. Unfortunately, as table 4.16 illustrates, the latter is the case with respect to the first classic debate.

The debate appropriates specific issues nine times. But on three occasions the topics that are introduced are not picked up for further clarification by any of

the other participants. And, as stated above, most of the issues that are debated are grounded in the nominees' rhetorical position, as in the case of the future of jobs through FTA. This issue is central to no less than four different focuses -- creating new opportunities for Canadians (focus 1); securing access to U.S. markets (focus 3); regional and sectoral affects of FTA (focus 4); and national treatment accorded to foreign investors (focus 7). It is not advanced during focus 1 and focus 7. And when it is debated during the third focus, the Auto Pact is vaguely referred to by Lougheed, while an equally vague reference is made by Barlow to the American omnibus legislation and the ability of the Americans to countervail "something they consider to be a subsidy."

During the fourth focus, one particular projection regarding the regional and sectoral affects of FTA on jobs is cancelled by another. For instance, Lougheed puts forward the position that "...for the millions of people in this country that are dependent one way or another on selling products or services on trade mainly to the United States, it will make their job more secure...." This is countered by White's argument: "...Surely, the jobs purported by this deal are not credible but there is areas that's very clear that jobs will be lost. The textile industry, the food processing industry, the plastic industry..."

There is a brief reference to the difficulties, as the result of FTA, in subsidizing industries to create jobs in Atlantic Canada. However, the general tone of the debate during the fourth focus is to neutralize one statement with an equally forceful counter statement. That is, if a list of prominent organizations is offered to lend credibility to the support for the Agreement another list is offered to strengthen the position of those who oppose it. Such a point-counter-point format does little to alleviate the confusion surrounding the issues as it offers

little insight into the processes that are expected to generate these diametric projections. This approach is also characteristic of the opposing positions on the dispute settlement mechanism, energy, and culture/sovereignty.

Only two focuses, which deal with the issues of social programs/ environmental controls and definition of subsidy are debated in a somewhat substantive context -- market forces -- but only very briefly. In the case of social programs, the point emphasized is that changes to the health care system will not result from anything written in the Agreement, but from the pressures put on Canadian businesses to lower their expenses in order to compete with their American counterparts. In the case of subsidies, the main point of concern is that a definition of what constitutes a subsidy will not be reached until five to seven years into the Agreement. Thereby risking pressures from American businesses to include such programs as unemployment insurance in that definition.

The lack of substance during this segment is detrimental to the "Journal's" informational value for two reasons. First, the entire program is devoted to it. Second, it is the "Journal's" first coverage of FTA during the election campaign. As such, its importance in outlining the principles that guide the opposing positions is greater, so that they can be examined in more depth in subsequent programs. And more specifically during the second part of this same debate, which airs the next day.

Table 4.17 Classic Debate on FTA--Part II October 18, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum Nominee: Peter Lougheed, former premier of Alberta--Pro FTA; Tom D'Aquino, president of the Business Council on National Issues--Pro FTA; Bob White, president of the Canadian Auto Workers Union--Anti FTA; Maude Barlow, head of the Council of Canadians--Anti FTA

PATTERN(S) OF APPROPRIATING AND ADVANCING THE FOCUS(ES)

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Participation</u>
1.	-	2	-	5	0:7
2.	-	1	-	2	0:3
3.	-	1	-	1	0:2

METHOD OF INDIRECT APPROPRIATION

FOCUS 1: Restrictions placed on Canada through FTA on national development (i.e. energy)/social policies

- B. White:...the deal is...about the direction of Canada...and about Canadian sovereignty....Sovereignty is indeed the ability of a government to use its power, to use resources of a nation...to use social policies to help develop an economy...culture...farming community....And as we analyze this deal, as we look at it, what we believe is that Canada has given up a great deal of its sovereignty and severely limiting our options in the future....
- B. White:...United States in these negotiations wants to establish a level playing field...on tariffs, on energy costs, on labour costs, and social costs....We know their minimum wage laws and their other social issues. And it is to those standards that our nation will be drawn in the future....

FOCUS 2: Negative effects of FTA through the process of exclusion rather than inclusion

- M. Barlow:...The most damaging aspect of this agreement is not what's necessarily in it....But what's not in it and those are the safe guards of our environment and gifts, our social programs....

FOCUS 3: Opportunities created by the energy sector as the result of FTA

- P. Lougheed:...The job opportunity is the second part of the energy issue and I want to use it as a major example of a sector in which the agreement will provide more jobs....

Table 4.18 Classic Debate on FTA--Part II October 18, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum

Nominee: Peter Lougheed, former premier of Alberta--Pro FTA; Tom D'Aquino, president of the Business Council on National Issues--Pro FTA; Bob White, president of the Canadian Auto Workers Union--Anti FTA; Maude Barlow, head of the Council of Canadians--Anti FTA

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN THE CONTEXT OF:

<u>History</u>	<u>Market Forces</u>	<u>International Precedent</u>	<u>Alternatives to FTA</u>	<u>The Three Fed. Parties</u>	<u>Rhetorical Position/Other</u>
FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Sovereignty	FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Sovereignty	FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Sovereignty			
	FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Social programs				
	FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Energy/ Environment				
	FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Social programs				
	FOCUS 3/ ISSUE: Jobs				

The second part of the classic debate is only slightly more substantive as the arguments are advanced within specific contexts. For example, the issue of Canadian sovereignty is debated in the context of market forces, history, and international precedent.

The central argument presented against the Agreement by Bob White is that by allowing the market forces to determine the price of energy rather than government policy that offers lower prices to Canadians, Canada has "given up a great deal of its sovereignty." White further points to the gains made by Canadian labour with respect to minimum wage and quality of work life, both of which, he suggests, are threatened by the market pressures that will result from the Agreement. Thereby affecting Canadian sovereignty in pursuing a different value system.

To counter the arguments against the Agreement, Lougheed emphasizes all the areas, with respect to energy, that will remain intact after the Agreement -- the jurisdiction of the provinces over their energy resources, exploration, rate of production, and conservation measures. In addressing the criticism levelled against the pricing policy of energy under the Agreement, Lougheed's response is confusing: "...but there is an important matter that Mr. White raised and that had to do with the question of protection of consumers in the case of rapid escalation of prices. There's is no change in that. The federal government still has the ability to fiscal measures to take those steps if it wants to or deems it necessary." The confusion results from the fact that Lougheed does not distinguish between American and Canadian consumers, while White's criticism of pricing deals the inability of the latter to receive preferential rates.

The European Common Market is cited as an example of how a trade deal impinges a nation's sovereignty. White begins with "No other nation in the world has entered into such a deal one-on-one, such uneven size, both population and economic power." And ends by listing the extent to which the European Community is moving "towards harmonizing their social programs, harmonizing their economic policies, harmonizing their loves, moving towards a common currency, a common passport, and yes a common European parliament." Certainly, the point about the Europeans harmonizing their loves is extremely vague if not questionable. Still, in comparison to the previous debate, White at least attempts to offer, however briefly, the reasons for his position rather than merely forecast a negative outcome.

In response to White, D'Aquino also cites international precedent: "Seventy-two nations have signed free trade agreements or common market associations. And not a single one of them has lost its independence, or sovereignty and contrary to what Mr. White has just said, there are a lot of little nations like Denmark, like the Netherlands and others who have signed this agreement with vast countries next to them. They haven't lost their identity....They only way that we're going to maintain our independence and our sovereignty is if we are economically strong."

D'Aquino also places any fears over the country's sovereignty into somewhat of a historical perspective, albeit very briefly: "The vast majority of our trade is free and yet is anyone going to suggest that in the last while, the last ten, fifteen or twenty years, we've become less sovereign? Have we lost our culture, do we not have a good sense of our own identity?"

The debate over social programs, in the context of the market forces, is restricted to pointing out that pressure will be put on Canada to bring the health care and unemployment insurance down to the level of the Americans. Again, the point that harmonization is not written in the Agreement is emphasized and the process through which it may take place is briefly explained, especially with respect to health care. This position is challenged by recanting the independent direction taken by Canada, with respect to its social policies, while its trade barriers were being lowered. The point emphasized is that in order to have strong social programs the country needs a strong economy, attainable through freer trade.

The two other issues very briefly included in the debate, in the context of the market forces, are energy/environment and jobs. In the case of the former the argument put forward relates to how pressure from businesses will bring the environmental standards to the lowest common denominator. The point emphasized is that "subsidy exemption for environmental protection and research instead of oil development or oil research" should have been explicitly stated in the Agreement.

On the issue of jobs, the opportunities gained through the energy sector is emphasized. The basis for this position is explained through the principles of economies of scale: "The domestic market for oil and natural gas and hydro electric generation is simply not large enough to take full advantage of the potential of our resources. We need that United States market to attract investment to create good jobs..."

Although there is relatively more substance during this second debate, the extent to which issues are covered is solely dependent on the experts

nominated. That is, the absence of the journalist inhibits the clarification of the opposing stance prior to the appropriation of additional issues. However, the informational value of this segment is preserved mainly due to its placement at the outset of the election, enabling it to serve as a brief introduction to some of the issues central to the debate over FTA.

Table 4.19 Feature Interview--Ed Broadbent, November 7, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum

Nominee: Ed Broadbent, NDP Leader

PATTERN(S) OF APPROPRIATING AND ADVANCING THE FOCUS(ES)

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Participation</u>
1.	2	-	1	3	1:1
2.	1	-	2	3	1:1
3.	1	-	2	3	1:1
4.	2	-	5	7	1:1
5.	2	-	6	8	1:1
6.	1	-	3	4	1:1
7.	1	-	4	3	1:1
8.	1	-	-	1	1:1
9.	1	-	-	1	1:1
10.	1	-	2	3	1:1

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

FOCUS 1: Market response to possible Tory defeat/withholding of FTA

- I want to ask you about...the dollar that... has taken a dive.... Isn't the world trying to tell us something?
- If they're saying that free trade would have been good for our economy, that it's not going to be a good climate for investment, is it going to be a good climate for employment?

FOCUS 2: Influence of election polls on political support

- ...Do you think we've got too many polls in this election? Is it hurting your party...?

FOCUS 3: NDP defining itself against the Liberals

- ...this has become a one subject election... does the NDP have trouble defining itself against the Liberals?

FOCUS 4: Changes to the status quo

- ...the status quo won't hold... what [would you] do to make our economy grow?
- ...you...use Sweden as a model. They're in a free trading arrangement....

FOCUS 5: Opposing stance between provinces on FTA

- ...Those regions like Alberta uh like Quebec that really wanted this deal, are they going to say Ontario with 99 seats, they have deprived us because they're alright Jack and we're not.
- ...Peterson says we're doing very well without FTA....do you think he includes enough Canadians.

FOCUS 6: Foreign investment through FTA

- ... isn't the...investment...foreigners have put into your riding...good for the rest of the country?

FOCUS 7: Possibility of minority government

- ...Are we heading for a minority government?

FOCUS 8: Financing Govt. services/campaign promises

- ...I wonder if the average Canadian doesn't realize that eventually he too is going to have to pay more taxes.

FOCUS 9: NDP stance on NATO

- I want to ask you about the NATO plank in your platform... would you drop that plank?

FOCUS 10: Credibility of concerns over the future of medicare

- ...Has the medicare scare been finally been put to bed by Mr. Justice Emmett Hall?

Table 4.20 Feature Interview--Ed Broadbent, November 7, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum
 Nominee: Ed Broadbent, NDP leader

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN THE CONTEXT OF:

<u>History</u>	<u>Market Forces</u>	<u>International Precedent</u>	<u>Alternatives to FTA</u>	<u>The Three Fed. Parties</u>	<u>Rhetorical Position/Other</u>
	FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Drop in Cdn. Dollar	FOCUS 4/ ISSUE: NDP's plan for economic growth	FOCUS 4/ ISSUE: NDP's plan for economic growth	FOCUS 3/ ISSUE: Difference between the NDP and Liberal Party	FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Low standing of NDP in the polls
	FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: Effects on jobs without FTA		FOCUS 5/ ISSUE: Access to U.S. market	FOCUS 7/ ISSUE: NDP's course of action in case of minority government	FOCUS 9/ ISSUE: Dropping the NATO plank
	FOCUS 5/ ISSUE: Energy-- no preferential rates for local industry		FOCUS 6/ ISSUE: Auto Pact	FOCUS 8/ ISSUE: Accounting the revenue needed for government services	
	FOCUS 10/ ISSUE: Harmonization of medicare				

The interview of Ed Broadbent covers a wide range of issues, yet the focus consistently reverts to the Free Trade Agreement. The patterns of appropriation in this segment thus reinforce the role of the journalist in redirecting the discussion towards issues central to the election campaign. However, the depth of coverage accorded to FTA in this segment also demonstrates the need to define the journalist's role, in advancing the issues, in relation to Broadbent's ability to articulate his initial responses.

The opening questions appropriate two overlapping issues -- the drop in the Canadian dollar as the money market perceives the failure of free trade and the effects of such a failure on jobs. Broadbent explains, from the point of view of the market forces, that the lower dollar would create more jobs by encouraging export sales. And allowing "total mobility of capital" through free trade "in the absence of Canadian restrictions on performance of companies" would result in fewer jobs in the long run. While Frum counters that this is not what the foreign money market is saying, there is no further attempt to expand on how or why there may be fewer "sophisticated manufacturing, service jobs" as Broadbent contends. The future of jobs was projected by the "Journal" as one of the main points of concern for "ordinary" Canadians. As such, elaborating on Broadbent's position would have reflected an attempt by the program of presenting information in relation to its assumptions of its primary audience.

The discussion moves on to examine issues only indirectly related to free trade -- the significance of polls during the election, and the distinction between the NDP and the Liberals as the result of their similar stance on FTA -- before picking up on the fourth focus of the segment. In discussing changes to the status quo, and more specifically NDP's plans for economic growth in lieu of free trade,

Broadbent affirms his support for phasing out tariffs. He points out that Canada was already on this course prior to FTA, and needs to go beyond to a policy that would expand "initiatives with the Pacific rim countries."

The journalist presses further with "What does that mean? What does that mean?" Framing an advancement of the issue, in this manner, overlooks the opportunity to have Broadbent also address the logistical problems of trading with Pacific rim countries instead of a nation with which Canada shares its borders -- a point made by proponents of the Agreement. Thus Broadbent's response is restricted to outlining an alternative to FTA in which the NDP would support small and medium size businesses through an import replacement program. That is, Canada's policy of exporting natural resources in raw form while importing value-added products would be replaced by producing these products locally. Thereby placing Canadian companies in a better position to compete for their market share in the Pacific Rim countries rather than putting "all our eggs...in the American basket."

The mention of Sweden by Broadbent takes the discussion in the direction of how this particular country is dealing with freer trade in the European Economic Community. Broadbent is quick to point out that Sweden has strict foreign control legislation that ensures a high degree of Swedish ownership, while FTA goes beyond the exchange of commodities. It impacts Canada's "social policy, energy pricing policy" and the ability to "put conditions on [foreign] firms...to do so much research and development...reinvest a certain percentage of.... capital."

Broadbent's stance on this point ends as Frum probes further as to how Canada can possibly avoid entering into such an Agreement in light of what

other countries are doing. In response, Broadbent reiterates the position with which he started the discussion on NDP's plan for economic growth: "we already had access and growing access to U.S. markets....we were going to within a decade be virtually at that position without that [FTA] in place, but what we've done is guaranteed the Americans access to our energy at Canadian prices, given them new incredible access....we can't have a preferential price for Canadians."

Broadbent's assumption of continued access to the U.S. market goes unchallenged by the journalist in that the more recent protectionist actions against Canadian cedar shakes and shingles and Canadian softwood lumber are not cited. Instead, this particular point is brought up by Broadbent, in a slightly different context, as the focus moves on to the opposing stance of the provinces on FTA.

The issue of energy and Alberta's inability to offer preferential rates to Canadians is the first point of discussion. Broadbent refers to Quebec as an example of a province that established its aluminium, as well remodernized its pulp and paper industries through preferential rates. An advantage that will no longer be available to Alberta under the Agreement as the rates will be determined according to the market principles rather than as a means of encouraging a particular industry. When probed further by Frum as to why "Alberta approves the deal?" Broadbent points out that "government policy in Alberta" cannot be equated "with what the growing number of people in Alberta actually think." As evidence, Broadbent offers the turnout at the New Democratic Party meeting in Calgary of over a thousand people and the position of the official opposition in Alberta.

As the focus remains on the opposing stance of the provinces on the Agreement the issue of greater access to the U.S. market surfaces as the cause of the division. Broadbent begins by once again confirming his support for lower tariffs and stating that in his view, the Agreement does not ensure greater access as: "...We still have their [U.S.] trade law available to have action taken against [us]." This explanation is vague at best in that it does not explain how similar actions can still be taken under the Agreement. That is, are they to result from the absence of a clear definition of subsidy or some other factor?

Towards the end of the discussion Broadbent refers to a more secure access to the U.S. market through a "a dispute settlement mechanism that could improve...relations and head off some of the disputes but...maintain independence ultimately in both nations...to take countervailing actions." The brief mention of such a plan only adds to the confusion of earlier statements on this issue, especially as it overlooks the dispute settlement mechanism established through the Agreement.

As the segment moves on to the sixth focus -- foreign investment -- the Auto Pact in Broadbent's riding of Oshawa is used as an example of how the rest of Canada is looking for similar advantages through free trade. In the discussion which ensues, Broadbent outlines the differences between the Auto Pact and FTA. The former, he states, is an example of "managed trade" in that it makes it incumbent upon the big three auto makers -- General Motors, Chrysler and Ford -- to reinvest in Canada. Through such an agreement, he states, "General Motors has not only exceeded expectations" but when "Chrysler fell below...they had to...reinvest in a new plant in Windsor." Under FTA, however, Canadians would be "dealing with a multi-nationally owned economy with so much of it

owned in the United States. If you have a southern climate, if you don't have tough environmental laws and you can export directly into the Canadian market, why would you, why would you do otherwise."

At this point, the journalist poses questions that appropriate three consecutive issues not related to free trade -- NDP's course of action in case of a minority government; accounting the revenue needed for the government services promised during the campaign; and NDP's stance on NATO.

The last issue to be discussed is medicare and whether or not the possibility of its harmonization is real or just a scare, in light of the pressures that will be put on any government that tries to tamper with it. Broadbent assures Frum that the scare is real and that any changes to medicare will not be done through legislation but through the pressures on Canadian businesses to compete with their U.S. counterparts. Broadbent is not very articulate, however, in explaining the possibility of a two-tier health service: "...and there's two very specific clauses on medicare we're talking about that say to Canadian hospitals operating at the provincial level if you're going to be operating on business principles American business organizations and management practice for hospitals which are spreading like wild fire across the U.S. have access to Canada and they bring with them their philosophy."

This segment bridges the gap between two relatively more substantive presentations at the outset of the election --FTA debate II and Res of Fed. parties on FTA -- and the segment towards the end of the election in which the two historians discuss FTA. The issues examined underscore the role of the journalist in eliciting responses within specific

contexts. To an extent this is accomplished by having Broadbent address some of the prevailing sentiments of both sides of the FTA debate.

The only deterrent to the segment's informational value results from the absence of more focused follow-up questions. The significance of this is demonstrated further in the subsequent analysis of the interview with Brian Mulroney, due to his tendency to engage in long-winded responses that are predominantly in the contexts of either the "three federal parties," or "rhetorical position/other."

Table 4 21 Feature Interview--Brian Mulroney , November 17, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum

Nominee: Brian Mulroney, Prime Minister

PATTERN(S) OF APPROPRIATING AND ADVANCING THE FOCUS(ES)

<u>Focus</u>	<u>Appropriated Directly</u>	<u>Appropriated Indirectly</u>	<u>Advanced Directly</u>	<u>Advanced Indirectly</u>	<u>Ratio of Direct to Indirect Participation</u>
1.	2	-	1	3	1:1
2.	1	-	-	1	1:1
3.	1	-	1	2	1:1
4.	1	-	-	1	1:1
5.	1	-	7	8	1:1
6.	1	-	2	3	1:1
7.	1	-	1	2	1:1
8.	1	-	1	2	1:1
9.	1	-	2	3	1:1
10.	1	-	1	2	1:1
11.	1	-	2	3	1:1

METHOD OF DIRECT APPROPRIATION

FOCUS 1: Nationalist sentiments aroused by FTA

- ...John Turner drilled right into that nationalist nerve....How is it you were taken by surprise?
- ...on such a divisive issue...do you not have a political problem unless you get 50% of the vote?

FOCUS 2: Voters' desire to renegotiate FTA

- ...Canadians... might like free trade if they could renegotiate it ...Aren't there still some clarifications...that you should have...included in this deal and should have been there by now.

FOCUS 3: Possibility of Mulroney not realizing the fears of the electorate over Cdn. sovereignty

- ...is it possible that you could be out of sync with the...fears of a lot of Canadians?

FOCUS 4: Pressure to harmonize to the lowest common denominator

- ...why won't the pressure be on us to... harmonize...On what basis do we resist?

FOCUS 5: Scare tactics of both sides of the free trade debate

- ... each side's rhetoric has gotten terribly overheated...Canadians...know you don't get something for nothing, they wanted to hear, what did we give, in order to get what we got?

FOCUS 6: Industries benefiting or losing because of FTA

- ...I invite you to be straightforward about who and what industries are in trouble, and wonder why you didn't have a program in place to cushion those people before the deal was passed....

FOCUS 7: PM's admission that FTA not a perfect deal

- ...You say it's not a perfect deal. What's imperfect about it? What's bad about it?

FOCUS 8: Dispute settlement mechanism

-aren't we surrendering our sovereignty to that new decision-making body?

FOCUS 9: Reisman and Crosbie as liabilities to the election campaign

-Should...Reisman and...Crosbie have been retired...before they offended people....?

FOCUS 10: Implication of the sales tax on Canadians

- ... You're going to be [taxing Canadians even further] can you assure them that that's not true?

FOCUS 11: Risk of running an election on free trade

- ...Are you not defying an iron law of Canadian politics by fighting this election on free trade?

Table 4.22 Feature Interview--Brian Mulroney, November 17, 1988

Journalist: Barbara Frum
 Nominee: Brian Mulroney, Prime Minister

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN THE CONTEXT OF:

<u>History</u>	<u>Market Forces</u>	<u>International Precedent</u>	<u>Alternatives to FTA</u>	<u>The Three Fed. Parties</u>	<u>Rhetorical Position/Other</u>
		FOCUS 8/ ISSUE: National sovereignty		FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: PM's reaction to John Turner's arguments against FTA	FOCUS 3/ ISSUE: National sovereignty
				FOCUS 1/ ISSUE: The margin of Tory victory influencing the decision to implement FTA	FOCUS 4/ ISSUE: Social programs
				FOCUS 2/ ISSUE: Reassuring the security of social programs	FOCUS 5/ ISSUE: Trade-offs by Canada & U.S. (i.e. energy)
				FOCUS 9/ ISSUE: Bitter tone of the free trade debate	FOCUS 6/ ISSUE: Jobs
					FOCUS 7/ ISSUE: negative aspects of FTA
					FOCUS 10/ ISSUE: Sales tax
					FOCUS 11/ ISSUE: Campaigning on free trade

The interview with Brian Mulroney illustrates patterns of appropriating and advancing the issues that are not too different from those of the interview with Ed Broadbent. The results, however, are drastically different. Out of the eleven areas the segment focuses on, only one issue is anchored in a specific context -- national sovereignty is discussed from an international perspective when the focus is on the dispute settlement mechanism. The rest of the issues are discussed either in the context of the three political parties or rhetorical position/other.

Ironically, one of the more blatant examples of Mulroney's rhetorical position also surrounds the issue of national sovereignty in the third focus, as the segment focuses on the possibility of Mulroney being out of sync with the fears of Canadians: "...and they [Canadians] don't need anybody to sing O Canada to them. They can sing it themselves. They don't need anybody to define the soul of their Canadianism because they live it every day, and one element of their Canadianism is not anti-Americanism, and it's not weakness. What it is, is sacrifice, and devotion, and the strength and the knowledge that our citizenship is noble enough, and splendid enough on its own, that we don't have to be fearful and timorous in respect of anybody else, even, even somebody as big as the United States."

The issue of sovereignty discussed, as stated above, from an international perspective appears towards the end of the segment. Mulroney puts forward the position that joining any national treaty, to an extent, impinges upon a nation's sovereignty. He cites NATO, NORAD, and most significantly GATT as international alliances that Canada is a member of and through which decisions have been made that have not always been favourable to all Canadians.

Only three issues -- medicare, energy and jobs-- which appear during the interview with Broadbent are also common to this segment. Their discussion, however, takes place in a different context. As such, different interpretations of the same set of dynamics are not clearly outlined. For example, when discussing the security of social programs, in the fourth focus, Mulroney cites the Auto Pact as an example of how little influence international agreements have in harmonizing social programs. Such an argument does little to counter concerns over pressures from within the country to downsize social programs as the result of greater competition with a larger economy. It does not address the distinctions made by the opponents of FTA between the Auto Pact and FTA. And , it fails to put forward the argument made by the proponents of the Agreement that a stronger economy through freer trade is essential for securing the future of social programs.

And with respect to energy, in the fifth focus, Mulroney states that the market for energy is better secured, for both export and import taxes on this resource are removed through the Agreement. Although Frum puts forward the argument of Canadians not being able to receive "a special deal on price and on security of supply," Mulroney responds by referring to an agreement signed by a previous Liberal government: "The agreement that was in 1974 is more detailed....the undertaking was given in respect of, of Canada sharing its resources if it decided to do so, with people who weren't even its customers. The undertaking given in 1974 by the Liberals in respect of the pro-ration of the resources in that event was infinitely more, uh, demanding than what we have done." This particular reference is confusing in that it requires some prior knowledge of the agreement being referred to.

During the discussion on the future of jobs, in the sixth focus, Mulroney makes vague references to retraining programs. These programs turn out to be existing ones, and the loss of jobs expected to be minimal. Restricting information on this issue to the projections by the Economic Council of Canada does little to explain *how* new jobs are expected to be created.

Mulroney's tendency of being generally vague is further kindled by highly open-ended, or broad questions. For example, the seventh focus, is appropriated with: "You say it's not a perfect deal. What's imperfect about it? What's bad about it?" In response, Mulroney not only feels obliged to make a distinction between "imperfect" and "bad" but to emphasize the strengths of the Agreement.

This segment re-emphasizes the significance of appropriating the issues so that the focus is on specific points of criticism being directed towards either side of the debate. Especially when the segment is aired towards the end of the election campaign, as in the case of the interview of Mulroney. It also places an onus on the journalist to advance the discussion through the fundamental question of "*how*" with respect to the processes that are expected to result in the outcomes projected by both the proponents and opponents of FTA.

SUMMARY

The "Journal's" presentation of FTA highlights two distinct yet related factors that consistently appear to contribute, in varying degrees, to the informational value of the program. In other words, these factors enable a presentation of FTA that reflects the "Journal's" assumptions of the knowledge and expertise of "ordinary" Canadians. They include: (1) A role of the journalist

that is defined by the manner in which the experts and politicians articulate their position(s) on FTA. (2) A depth of coverage within a segment that is in relation to its placement in the "Journal's" overall presentation of FTA during the election campaign. The former, evidenced by the patterns of appropriating and advancing the issues, affects the latter in that to a great extent it determines the contexts within which specific issues are discussed. Inversely, the absence of one or both of these elements within a specific segment appears to inhibit the program's informational value.

Relating patterns of appropriating and advancing the issues, or the role of the journalist, to informational value infers some prior knowledge of the nominees' ability or "style" of articulating their positions on FTA. This knowledge can primarily be ascribed to the "Journal's" production team through its projected image of "ordinary" Canadians. It can also be ascribed to the "Journal" through its coverage of FTA earlier on in the election.

For example, throughout the election the "Journal" emphasizes the confusion among "ordinary" Canadians due to the inability of the politicians to go beyond diametric projections regarding the effects of FTA. Such a projected image makes the informational value of the "Journal," for this sector of the electorate, contingent upon a forum that restricts the opposing sides from engaging in their rhetorical positions. The relative success of the program in ensuring such a forum, as the analysis illustrates, is primarily through the ratio of direct to indirect participation that accords the journalist some control over the contexts within which issues are discussed.

Also, one of the key elements that inhibits the informational value of the first classic debate is the almost total absence of the journalist. Thus,

engaging similar patterns of appropriating and advancing the issues in a subsequent segment only serves to highlight the chaos among politicians with respect to their ability to clarify their positions on FTA. This is most directly illustrated by "Fed. parties on key economic issues." The extremely low ratio of direct participation in this segment only confirms the reasons for the confusion among "ordinary" Canadians rather than address the confusion.

The second factor highlights the significance of a continuum to the "Journal's" presentation of FTA, or a progressively in-depth examination of the issues throughout the six-week election coverage. The consistent break in this continuum results in segments that focus on some of the same positions rather than examine their basis in more detail.

For instance, the segments "Two Americans on FTA" and "Interview -- PM" appear towards the end of the election campaign, yet they fail to go beyond the most fundamental arguments in the FTA debate. These segments illustrate the significance of initial and follow-up questions that require the nominees to address the more prevailing criticism levied against their stance. Thereby attempting to restrict the reiteration of the same arguments put forward by both sides of the debate while eliciting the reasoning behind them.

Thus, out of the eight segments on politicians and experts analyzed in this chapter, only four attempt to address the confusion attributed to "ordinary" Canadians by the "Journal." The segments "FTA debate --II" and "Reps. of Fed. parties on FTA" provide a brief introduction to some of the key issues such as sovereignty, social programs, energy, jobs, and the dispute-settlement mechanism. And in the absence of a more in-depth discussion of issues in the two segments preceding it, the segment on "Two historians discuss FTA"

serves as a conclusion. The "Interview--leader of NDP" appears to bridge the gap between the first two segments and the last.

While informational value of the "Journal's" coverage of FTA can be extended to only half of the segments, all of the segments pay relatively equal if not meticulous attention to the representation given to the opposing sides. Thereby reflecting the "Journal's" perception of its own role: A forum for airing opposing views rather than a source for facilitating informed decisions on public policy. In other words the "Journal's" bias precipitates in the form of favouring those from among its mass audience who possess a higher level of shared codes, or cultural competence (for contextualizing the diametric projections presented by the program) than one attributed by the program to "ordinary" Canadians .

CONCLUSION

The concept of *informational value*, which is central to the analysis of the "Journal's" coverage of the Free Trade Agreement during the 1988 Canadian federal election, has a highly subjective connotation. It infers that the value assigned to information may vary among, as well as within the different groups of people constituting the "Journal's" audience. It also implies a strictly audience-based research, which relies on focus groups to establish the value of the information presented.

Both of these points concentrate on how the presentation of issues actually facilitates an understanding of FTA rather than how the program presents the issues in relation to its assumptions of its primary audience. This study examines the latter, as it considers it a significant aspect of the former. This view emanates from Morley's position on the structuralist paradigm and the concept of "cultural competence," presented in Chapter 1. It suggests that information can only have value if its articulated within the shared codes or knowledge of those being addressed. Thus analysis of the informational value of the "Journal's" coverage of FTA is in relation to the program's assumptions of the shared codes, or knowledge/expertise of the people it is primarily addressing on FTA.

Such an approach infers that analysis of the "Journal" be preceded by an examination of the issues central to the national debate over FTA. The central aim being to trace the reasoning behind the opposing positions, or to examine the background of the often diametric projections on the effects of the Agreement.

Thus Chapter 2 of this study focuses on some of the major issues related to the FTA. It highlights the complex nature of the Agreement by presenting the various contexts within which it is generally debated: history, market forces, international precedent, alternatives to FTA, the three federal parties, and rhetorical position. Such an examination illustrates the knowledge/shared codes required to trace the reasoning behind the bare "facts" put forward by the opposing sides .

Analysis of the "Journal's" informational value also infers establishing the program's assumptions of the knowledge/shared codes of its audience. Chapter 3 outlines these assumptions by examining the program's on-going series on "ordinary" Canadians during the election campaign. The central focus is on how the program defines "ordinary." The implication being that the socio-political and cultural boundaries within which "ordinary" is defined also profiles the viewers, from among the mass audience, with whom the program primarily assumes a shared common-sense with respect to its projected image of this sector of the electorate.

The image projected is that of highly confused undecided voters wanting to make their vote "count," in response to their final stance on FTA. The voters' indecisiveness is largely attributed to the inability of the politicians to explain their positions on FTA. Such an image of "ordinary" Canadians, combined with the complex nature of the Agreement, relates the "Journal's"

informational value with the program's ability to present the contexts, or the basis for the opposing positions.

The "Journal's" coverage of FTA, examined in Chapter 4, illustrates the two factors that consistently appear to enhance the program's informational value: A ratio of direct to indirect participation that accords the journalist relative control over the issues discussed. And a progressively in-depth examination of the issues, in keeping with the "Journal's" overall coverage of FTA. The absence of one or both of these factors in half of its segments not only inhibits the "Journal's" informational value, but reflects the program's bias.

Throughout the coverage of FTA the emphasis by the "Journal" appears to be on the relatively equal distribution of time between the opposing sides rather than the contexts within which these positions are presented. This approach appears to favour those who possess a higher level of shared codes/knowledge than one attributed by the program to "ordinary" Canadians. Such a bias is reflective of the "Journal's" perception of its own role: a forum for airing opposing views rather than a source for facilitating informed decisions on public policy. This is most directly illustrated by the two segments formatted as classic debates, which prevent the journalist from seeking clarification on the positions put forward by the nominees.

Soliciting the opinions of "ordinary" Canadians on the effectiveness of the politicians in explaining the Agreement further reflects the "Journal's" perception of its role as a public affairs program. For example, immediately after the leadership debate, the opinions of the "ordinary" Canadians are sought on how effective the leader of each party has been in easing some of their concerns regarding the Agreement. Similar opinions are not sought, however, on how some of the "Journal's" segments help to clarify the issues. The latter point is made

only to emphasize the lack of coherence between the program's image of "ordinary" Canadians and its attempts to present FTA in relation to this image.

While it is understood that a public affairs program such as the "Journal" is bound by established formats, especially during an election campaign, this study illustrates the need to examine these formats in terms of their relative effectiveness in conveying information. In other words, they need to be analyzed beyond the equal distribution of time and focus on the contexts that relate to the audience's knowledge/shared codes of the issues. Especially on a historically divisive national issue such as FTA.

The presentation of equally divisive and recurring national issues, such as Quebec sovereignty and the Constitution, by public affairs programs may call for a redefinition of "ordinary" Canadians to reflect the constantly evolving ethnicity of Canada. That is, the relatively narrow cultural boundaries within which "ordinary" is defined by the "Journal" would have to be broadened.

And the relative closure between a public affairs program's assumptions of its audience and the contexts within which it presents an on-going debate may warrant a further examination. That is, through audience-based research, to further establish the extent of the informational value of the program.

WORKS CITED

- Blumler, J.G. and Gurevitch, M. 1987. The Personal and the Public: Observations on Agendas in Mass Communication Research. In Mass Communication Review Yearbook. eds. M. Gurevitch and M.R. Levy. Vol. 6. pp. 16-21. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Bowker, M. M. 1988. On Guard for Thee. Ottawa: Voyageur Publishing.
- Brunsdon, C. and D. Morley. 1978. Everday Television: "Nationwide." London: British Film Institute.
- Calvert, J.L. 1988. A Smaller Public Sector. In The Facts on Free Trade. eds. Ed Finn et. al. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd.
- Campbell, B. 1988. The Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement Trade Negotiations Office. In Free Trade and Social Policy. ed. G. Drover. Ottawa, Montreal: Canadian Council on Social Development.
- The Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. 1988. Ottawa: External Affairs Canada.
- Chapman, A. 1987. Canada-U.S. Trade Policy Issues: Free Trade Discussions. Ottawa: Library of Parliament, Economics Division Research Branch.
- Chapman, A. 1988. Canada-U.S. Free Trade: The Road to Implementation. Ottawa: Library of Parliament, Economics Division Research Branch.
- The Council of Canadians. 1988a. Issue Sheet No. 1-11. Ottawa: The Council of Canadians.
- , 1988b. A Guide to the Main Issues. Ottawa: The Council of Canadians.
- , 1988c. Free Trade, Energy, and Resources. Ottawa: The Council of Canadians.

-----, 1988d. The Mulroney-Reagan Trade Agreement: A Guide to the Main Issues. Ottawa: The Council of Canadians.

D'Aquino, T. 1988. Truck and Trade with the Yankees. In Free Trade Free Canada: How Free Trade Will Make Canada stronger. ed. Earle Gray. Woodville, Ontario: Canadian Speeches.

Decision CRTC 87-140. 1987. Current Realities, Future Challenges. Renewing CBC Television Network Licences. 23 February 1987.

Devine, G. 1988. Has American Money Ruined Oshawa? In Free Trade Free Canada: How Free Trade Will Make Canada stronger. ed. Earle Gray Woodville, Ontario: Canadian Speeches.

Drover, G. 1988. Social Policy Harmonization: The Canadian Debate, The European and Tasman Experiences. In Free Trade and Social Policy. ed. G. Drover. Ottawa, Montreal: Canadian Council on Social Development.

Ericson, R.V., Patricia M. Baranek and Janet B.L. Chan. 1987. Visualizing Deviance. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Ethical Choices & Political Challenges -- Free Trade: At What Cost? 1987. Ottawa: Mutual Press Ltd.

Frizzell, Alan and John H. Pammett and Anthony Westell. The Canadian General Election of 1988. Ottawa: Carleton Univeristy Press.

Garos, C. 1990. Canada-United States Free Trade: Background, Issues and Impact. Amsterdam: VU University Press.

Gilsdorf, W. 1993. CBC television and the 1988 Canadian federal election. Journalistic practice in a North American context. In Small Nations Big Neighbour Denmark and Quebec/Canada Compare Notes on American Popular Culture. eds R. de la Garde, W. Gilsdorf and I. Wechseltmann. London: John Libbey & Company Ltd.

Gitlin, T. 1980. The Whole World is Watching. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gray, E. 1988. The History, 1846-1986. In Free Trade Free Canada: How Free Trade Will Make Canada Stronger. ed. Earle Gray. Woodville, Ontario: Canadian Speeches.

- Grossberg, L. 1984. Strategies of Marxist Cultural Interpretation. In Critical Studies in Mass Communication pp. 392-421.
- Hall, S., Ian Connell, and Lidia Curti. 1976 The 'Unity' of Current Affairs Television. Working Papers in Cultural Studies (9) pp. 51-93. Birmingham: C.C.C.S., University of Birmingham.
- Hall, S. 1980. Encoding/Decoding. In Culture, Media, Language. eds. Hall et. al. pp. 128-138. London: C.C.C.S. University of Birmingham.
- 1986. Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms. In Media, Culture and Society eds. R. Collins et. al. pp. 33-48. London: Sage Publications.
- Hartley, J. 1982. Understanding News. New York: Routledge.
- Herrick, J.D. 1988. Firmer Cornerstones for our Standard of Living. In Free Trade Free Canada: How Free Trade Will Make Canada Stronger. ed. Earle Gray. Woodville, Ontario: Canadian Speeches.
- Hum, D. 1988. Harmonization of Social Programs Under Free Trade. In Free Trade and Social Policy. ed. G. Drover. Ottawa, Montreal: Canadian Council on Social Development.
- Hyndman, J. 1988. Why Free Trade with the U.S. is not the Answer for Canada. Ottawa: The Council of Canadians.
- Lee, Robert Mason. One Hundred Monkeys. Toronto: Macfarlane Walter & Ross.
- Lemert, J.B. 1989. Criticizing the Media: Empirical Approaches. Vol. 21. The Sage CommText Series. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Lipsey, R.G. 1987a. Canada's Trade Options. In Canadian-American Free Trade: Historical, Political, and Economic Dimensions eds. A.R. Riggs and T. Velk. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- 1987b. Sovereignty and the Canadian American Free Trade Agreement. In Assessing the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. eds. M.G. Smith and F. Stone. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Lynk, M. 1988. The Labour Law Factor. Canadian Labour Congress Newsmagazine, Vol. 33, No. 2, Spring. Ottawa: Mutual Press.

- Medhurst, M.J. 1989. Propaganda Techniques in Documentary Film and Television: AIM vs. PBS. In Television Studies: Textual Analysis, eds. G. Burns and R.J. Thompson. Media and Society Series, New York: Praeger
- Miljan, L. 1988. On Balance Vol. I. No. 1. October. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.
- Morley, D. 1980. The "Nationwide" Audience: Structure and Decoding. London: British Film Institute.
- 1981. The Nationwide Audience. A Postscript. Screen Education. Summer, Number 39. London: Society for Education in Film and Television.
- Mosco, V. 1989. The Pay-Per Society: Computers and Communication in the Information Age -- Essays in Critical Theory and Public Policy. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Norquay, G. 1988. Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. In Free Trade and Social Policy, ed. G. Drover. Ottawa, Montreal: Canadian Council on Social Development.
- Reisman, S. 1988a. A Stronger Canada with More Freedom and More Choices. In Free Trade Free Canada: How Free Trade Will Make Canada Stronger, ed. Earle Gray. Woodville, Ontario: Canadian Speeches.
- 1988b. Let's Get it Straight. The Globe and Mail October 4, p. A7.
- Rosteck, T. 1989. Irony, Argument, and Reportage in Television Documentary: *See It Now* versus Senator McCarthy. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, pp. 277-298 Vol. 75 No. 3 August.
- Samuelson, P.A. and W.D. Nordhaus. 1985. Economics. Twelfth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Schudson, M. 1978. Discovering the News. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Slack, J.D. and Martin Allor. 1983. The Political and Epistemological Constituents of Critical Communication Research. Journal of Communication, pp. 208-219 Vol. 33 No. 3 Summer.

- Smith, A. 1989. The Public Interest: Can Market Forces be a Surer Path to Collective Benefit than Governmental Intervention? InterMedia June-July Vol. 17 No. 2. London: International Institute of Communications.
- Stempel III, G.H. and B.H. Westley. 1981. Research Methods in Mass Communication. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Stevens, P. 1987. Reciprocity 1911: The Canadian Perspective. In Canadian-American Free Trade: Historical, Political, and Economic Dimensions. eds. A.R. Riggs and T. Velk. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Salutin, R. 1988. Free Trade and Television, A Cautionary Tale. This Magazine Vol. 22, No. 3 June-July. Toronto: Red Maple Foundation.
- 1989. Waiting for Democracy, A Citizen's Journal. Markham: Viking.
- Surich, J. 1987. Labour Concerns About Free Trade. In Assessing the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. eds. Murray G. Smith and F. Stone. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Tsalikis, G. 1988. Canada's Health Services. In Free Trade and Social Policy. ed. G. Drover. Ottawa, Montreal: Canadian Council on Social Development.
- Tuchman, G. 1978. Making News. New York: The Free Press.
- Westerstahl, J. 1983. Objective News Reporting: General Premises. Communication Research Vol. 10 No. 3, July. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- White, R. 1989. Fur Trade to Free Trade: Putting the Canada-U.S. Trade Agreement in Historical Perspective. Toronto, Oxford: Dundurn Press.
- Wiggle, R. 1988. The Received Wisdom of Canada-U.S. Free Trade: Qualifications. In Canadian-American Free Trade: Historical, Political and Economic Dimensions. eds. A. R. Riggs and Tom Velk. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.