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The authors surveyed Canadian editorial opinion on economic relations between Canada and the U.S. in 1972 and 1982 by means of a content analysis of editorials featured in six newspapers.

The years 1971-72 and 1980-82 were critical periods, when pressures on the Canadian-U.S. relationship "reached unusually serious proportions" (Beigie and Stewart, 1983: 18; Dolan, et al., 1982; Clarkson, 1982). In the earlier period, President Richard Nixon responded to U.S. balance of payment problems by imposing a ten percent surcharge on dutiable imports. Although the economic effects of the import surcharge on Canada were limited, the psychological impact was profound because Canada was unable to gain special exemptions from the U.S. as it had during the 1960s (Fox, et al., 1970). Partly as a result of the surcharge, the Department of External Affairs released its "Options for the Future" paper in October 1972 recommending a "Third Option" policy of diversifying relations with other states to "reduce...Canadian vulnerability" to U.S. actions (Sharp, 1972). The creation of the Foreign Investment Review Agency (FIRA) in 1973 to screen investments was also aimed at the U.S. as the largest foreign investor in Canada.

Canadian-U.S. economic relations seemed to improve in the late 1970s, but underlying tensions over trade and investment policy were persistent. With the re-emergence of Pierre Trudeau as Prime Minister in 1980 and the election of President Ronald Reagan, the stage was set for a serious exacerbation of conflicts. In accordance with campaign promises, the Trudeau government announced intentions to strengthen FIRA and introduced the National Energy Program (NEP), which included measures to increase Canadian ownership in the oil and gas industries. These measures drew a sharp reaction from the Reagan administration, which is ideologically committed to the free movement of investment and trade. In response to U.S. pressures, the Trudeau government withdrew its promise to upgrade FIRA in late 1981, and indicated that other industries would not be Canadianized in accordance with the NEP model. Although this eased the crisis in relations to some extent, the U.S. continued to demand further concessions in Canadian foreign investment policies. Tensions in the trade area in the
1980s were largely related to increased protectionism, but there were also counter-
pressures for closer relations as demonstrated by the literature favouring a Canadian-
U.S. free trade area. Indeed, the Department of External Affairs' August 1983
discussion paper supporting new sectoral free trade agreements with the U.S. was a
sharp contrast to its 1972 Third Option paper (External Affairs, 1983).

This paper examines editorial coverage in 6 Canadian newspapers of economic
relations with the U.S. during the crisis periods detailed above. Since there are sig-
nificant differences between the two periods (for example, Canada's economic posi-
tion was stronger in 1972), we would expect editorial views of the bilateral relationship
to be quite different in 1972 and 1982. Editorial perceptions of the following 4 issues
are discussed: Canadian economic conditions (relative to U.S. conditions); the causes
of Canadian economic problems; foreign investment policies toward the U.S.; and
foreign trade policies toward the U.S. We assume that there are close linkages in
editorial perceptions of these issues. For example, Simon Reisman, Canada's chief
negotiator at the bilateral free trade (BFT) talks, has stated that "Canadian interest in
reciprocity [with the U.S.] traditionally has peaked during periods of economic dif-
ficulty" (Reisman, 1984: 43). In addition, Canada usually has been more open to
foreign investment during difficult economic periods, and there is a close relationship
between the trade and investment issues (witness Canada's concessions on investment
in the BFT agreement).

Methodology

The methodology employed is rather unconventional in several respects. First,
we focussed exclusively on editorials to ensure that Canadian press attitudes were
being surveyed. It is well-known that the daily press is replete with material from non-
Canadian sources, and reports often cannot be traced to their origins (Stairs, 1976;
Soderlund, et al., 1983). Newspaper editorials are also the major sources of prescrip-
tions, criticisms and support for official policies, and radio and television generally do
not provide the same opportunities for editorializing. Nevertheless, only a few
analysts have used editorials to assess Canadian press views of economic policies
toward the U.S. (Keenleyside, et al., 1983). Second, we favoured qualitative over
quantitative assessment since editorials are by definition opinion pieces. Their role as
indicators of public opinion and of issues on the public agenda could be analyzed from
a variety of angles including extent of coverage of a topic; reaction to 'trigger events';
issue-extraneous influences such as the personalities involved; and intensity of
editorial views. We felt that this last aspect --intensity of views-- was most suited to
the purpose of this article. We have not undertaken quantitative analysis of either
volume or content of editorials and although we did take into account frequency of
comment on issues, we have not scientifically correlated frequency with intensity of
views.
The study covers the periods 1 January to 30 June 1972 and 1 January to 30 June 1982, and the newspapers selected (5 dailies and 1 weekly) represent Canada’s major regions and official languages: the Vancouver Sun (The Sun or VS); Winnipeg Free Press (the Free Press or WFP); Globe and Mail, Toronto (the Globe or G&M); Le Devoir, Montreal (LD); Chronicle-Herald, Halifax (CH); and Financial Post, Toronto (the Post or FP). Each paper assigns a clearly-identified space to its editorials, and these (about 4500 in all) were screened in a 2-step process. The first screening isolated editorials with a Canada-U.S. focus (591), and the second screening identified editorials (244) with significant discussion of 1 or more of the 4 specific issues: Canadian economic conditions (compared to the U.S.); the causes of Canadian economic problems; foreign investment attitudes toward the U.S.; and trade policy attitudes toward the U.S.. Editorials from the second screening that discussed more than 1 issue were coded under each of the relevant issues. Thus, the number of discussion items (339) is greater than the number of editorials. The unit of analysis in this study is the discussion item.

To assess intensity of views on the 4 issues, each discussion item was assigned a value on a scale (with no intermediate valuations): -10, -5, 0, +5, +10. An across-the-board equation of plus or minus values with, for example, "pro-Canada" or "pro-U.S." would not be appropriate, and the significance of the discrete points on the scale was therefore denoted separately for each issue, as outlined in Table I below. An assignment as "mixed" (0) denotes an equivocal or basically factual editorial; +5 and -5 values were assigned to moderate opinions (e.g., "FIRA is too cumbersome"); and +10 and -10 values were assigned to stronger opinions (e.g., "Abolish FIRA"). The two authors and a graduate student did the screenings of editorials as well as the scoring of discussion items. All three individuals often examined the same editorials to check for accuracy, and there was a very high level of agreement on screening, and on assignment of values. Finally, our findings on the 4 issues were examined further by interviews at the Globe and Post. We conducted interviews in 1984, and Professor John Kirton (University of Toronto) also provided us with material based on his interviews in 1983 and 1984.

**Canadian Economic Conditions**

Editorials frequently used the U.S. as a "benchmark" in assessments of the Canadian economy. While a number of editorials gave Canada an equal or better-than-equal rating in 1972, virtually all judged the Canadian economic performance less favourably than the American in 1982. This shift was particularly marked for the Chronicle-Herald, the Post and the Sun, all of which went from 1972 net positive to 1982 negative ratings (see Figure 1). The Post in the earlier period sounded a distinctly optimistic note, opining that a recovery was well underway and that external influences were conducive to a sustained positive performance. In 1982, its gloom about Canada’s economic conditions matched that of the regional newspapers on the East and West coasts. The negative assessments in 1982 seemed to bear out apprehensions
TABLE 1

SCORING OF DISCUSSION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C'n* Causes of C'n Econ. Problems</td>
<td>For Investm Attits toward U.S.</td>
<td>Trade Attits toward U.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>C* much better than US</td>
<td>US much &gt;* cause than C</td>
<td>quite positive (for*&lt; C'n) control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>C better than US</td>
<td>US &gt; cause than C</td>
<td>somewhat positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>US better than C</td>
<td>C &gt; cause than US</td>
<td>somewhat negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>US much better than C</td>
<td>C much &gt; cause than US</td>
<td>quite negative (for &gt; C'n control)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C'n = Canadian; C= Canada; > = greater; < = less.

occasionally voiced in the earlier period. For example, the Free Press observed in 1972 that "up to now things have been somewhat better than equal for Canada in an economic sense"; but the paper felt that comparative dollar values, labour rates, price rises and industrial productivity demonstrated that U.S. prospects were improving while Canada's were declining (1972: WFP, 7/1, p 19; 13/1, p 19; 20/5, p21; FP, 19/2, p 1; 1 1/3, p 1; 27/5, p 1).

In both periods the Globe was the most negative. In 1972, it alone rated U.S. economic performance as distinctly better than Canadian, citing the same problems that backed assessments unfavourable to Canada in 1982: increases in cost of living, unemployment and interest rates. Ten years later, the Globe was lamenting that "if Canada trails the United States in almost everything else, it is way out ahead in building up federal deficits...[and in] rising inflation" (G&M, p 6: 10/2/82, 15/4/72). In summary, editorial discussion of Canadian economic conditions generally focussed on the same problems in the two periods; but perceptions of Canada's economy clearly were more negative in 1982.

Causes of Canadian Economic Problems

The results (see figures 1 and 2) show that editorials (on average) were more inclined in 1972 to hold the U.S. responsible for Canada's problems, and in 1982 to
Figure 1
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perceive Canada as creating its own difficulties. However, editorials in both periods referred to Canada’s dependence on the U.S., and *Le Devoir* in 1972 considered this to be dangerous for Canada’s future (*LD*, 13/4/72: p 4). All papers had at least some criticism of President Nixon’s August 1971 economic measures; for example, the *Sun* described them as "shaking the world’s currency and trading structures to their foundation", and as one reason why optimism regarding Canada’s economy had proven wrong (*VS*, 27/4/72: p 4). Except for the special case of *Le Devoir* (see below), the *Post* adopted the most extreme position in the earlier period, thundering against the U.S. "cavalier attitude" and "penchant for goods-only things" (*FP*/1972: 1U2, p 1; 114, p 6; 2612, p 1). The *Globe* by contrast had very little to say in this context in 1972 (see Figure 1). Dependence on the U.S. as a factor delimiting Canada’s options was also a theme in 1982. The *Sun*, for example, expressed concern that Canada’s "great resource industries depend vitally on a depressed United States market", and all papers discussed the difficulties in lowering Canadian interest rates while U.S. rates remained high (1982: *VS*, 28/1, p A4; 15/5, p A4; *G&M*, 13/2, p 6; *FP*, 3/4, p 9). Editorials in both periods were also frequently critical of Canadian policies. On topics such as labour rates and wage restraint, most papers concurred that Canada was creating its
own problems by not following the U.S. example of restraint (VS: 9/2/72, p 4; WFP: 21/2/72, p 13; G&M: 15/2/72, p 6; LD: 22/1/82, p 6; FP: 3/4/82, p 9). The frustration of dependence at times led to contradictions; for example, the Free Press first demanded that the federal government stop "slavishly" following U.S. interest rates, but then stated that independent Canadian actions were impossible. (WFP/1982, p 6: 21/1, 10/2, 3/6).

As mentioned, there was a greater tendency in 1972 to hold the U.S. responsible for Canada's problems, and in 1982 to perceive Canada as causing its own problems. Explicit praise for the Trudeau government's economic achievements was occasionally found in 1972, but was virtually absent in 1982 (1972: VS, 6/3, p 4: WFP, 7/4, p 17). Also largely absent--except in the Post--was constructive criticism related to specific economic issues; instead, many editorials reiterated a litany of woes in need of government attention. Where in 1972 the Post and Le Devoir had blazed forth against the U.S. government, in 1982 the Globe (and Le Devoir to a lesser degree) did so against Canada. Globe editorials were particularly extreme and seemed obsessed with the idea that Prime Minister Trudeau and his advisors were the root cause of Canada's problems. The Globe expressed the view that "recovery has no chance if Mr. Trudeau stays", and that the "policies that have caused or exacerbated our problems were developed by...politicians and bureaucrats." (G&M, 26/6/82: p 6). Most of the other papers were not as strident even in 1982 in their attributions of responsibility, and in their advocacy of remedial measures. Across the board, however, such advocacy remained highly generalized: the government, or Canadians, needed to improve this, attend to that or re-examine the other.

**Foreign Investment Attitudes towards the U.S.**

Editorial comment on this issue dealt with several interrelated questions: the amount of foreign investment in Canada; U.S. ownership in Canadian industry, especially the oil and gas industries; and Canadian control or ownership. Although our analysis of editorials combines all these facets into the single issue of foreign investment, differentiation between them can be important in understanding a newspaper's position. For example, support for FIRA did not necessarily signify opposition to U.S. investment in Canada. Significant catalysts of editorial opinion were the Gray Report, the Foreign Takeovers Review Bill, and FIRA in the earlier period, and the NEP in the later period. Figure 1 shows a remarkable reversal of editorial positions between 1972 and 1982. In 1972, most papers (and especially Le Devoir and the Post) were inclined to agree that Canada should do something about the large degree of U.S. investment and ownership in the Canadian economy; but in 1982 all papers felt that Canada was doing too much about it for its own good.

In 1972, most papers shared the Post's view that the "foreign presence in Canada's business affairs...is already too large to be ignored", and approved of moderate control measures, although not necessarily for the same reasons or to the same degree (FP,
Guarded support for Canadian investment controls often went hand-in-hand with criticisms of particular aspects of these controls and with warnings that U.S. investment was vital to Canada. Thus, most papers were opposed to the adoption of strongly nationalist policies and the Post maintained that Canada should encourage Canadian but not discourage foreign investment (1972: FP: 262, p 1; 25/3, p 6; G&M, 2/5, p 6; VS, 3/5, p 4; CH, 16/5, p 6). The only two papers that did not share in the 1972 "yes-but" attitude were the Free Press and Le Devoir, which were at opposite ends of the spectrum. Le Devoir strongly advocated more stringent controls to redress the lack of national economic decision-making, and severely criticized the Globe, for approving of the limitations in the Foreign Takeovers Review Bill (LD, p 4/1972: 18/2; 13/4; 4/5; 5/5). However, this unique editorial position was significantly based on the double-layered meaning of "foreign" control or decision-making in Quebec, which often refers to non-Quebecois as well as to non-Canadian. In marked contrast, the Free Press in 1972 condemned the "nonsense of the nationalists' demand, in Quebec and elsewhere, for a curtailment of foreign capital when obviously it must be increased" (WFP/1972: 21/4, p 17; 6/6, p 33). It was the only paper that did not change direction in 1982, when its favourable attitude towards U.S. investment was merely strengthened. Whereas Le Devoir's extreme position in 1972 is readily understood, the Post's strong support for investment controls in 1972 may be more complex. In the conclusions we suggest some possible explanations and seek to link the Post's positions in 1972 and 1982.

In 1982, attitudes toward the U.S. investment were all favourable, with the Globe and Chronicle-Herald holding equally extreme positions (closely followed by the Free Press) and with the Post having changed the most since 1972. The crucial catalysts of editorial opinion now were FIRA, the NEP, and the poor state of the Canadian economy. The NEP and to a lesser extent FIRA were viewed as harmful to Canadian economic interests, and most papers wanted them to be modified. Le Devoir mirrored the new welcoming stance of Rene Levesque toward U.S. investment, and favourably contrasted Quebec's investment climate with the federal government's. The Post, despite its favourable stand toward U.S. capital, carefully distinguished between the "laudable...goal to increase Canadian ownership" and the timing for measures discouraging foreign investment. The Chronicle-Herald, having seen its hopes for provincial benefits from Canadianization shattered, went beyond most papers in suggesting that FIRA and the NEP should be abolished. All papers were hostile to the government's restrictive investment policies in 1982, and saw them as causally linked to poor economic conditions in Canada (1982: LD, 28/5, p 16; 9/6 p 12; FP/p9, 22/5, 12/6; CH, 1/3, p 6; G&M/p 6, 9/4, 4/6; VS/p A4, 23/1, 8/2, 1/5, 23/6; WFP/p 6, 5/2, 5/4, 3/6, 8/6).

Trade Policy Attitudes towards the U.S.

Figure 1 shows that trade policy is the only issue on which most newspapers were consistent in both periods in the direction of their positions. The notable exception is
the *Post*, which switched from an extreme negative stance in 1972 (shared with *Le Devoir*, the *Chronicle-Herald* and the *Sun*) to a slightly positive one in 1982 (shared with the *Globe* and *Free Press*). One may be tempted to assume that such consistency is indicative of pronounced philosophical persuasions or clearly issue-oriented reasoning. *The Free Press* banner on the editorial page proclaiming 'Freedom of Trade-Equality of Civil Rights-Liberty of Religion' might be further indication of a commitment to a particular position. Editorial content, however, often suggests less logical and more complex processes. Thus, editorials did not call for major changes in Canadian trade policy in either 1972 or 1982, and public statements and policy proposals seemed to be of little interest. For example, External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp's public speeches about trade diversification in 1972 generally failed to stimulate expression of editorial views; and despite threats of rising U.S. protectionism in 1982, the advocacy of Canada-U.S. free trade in a report by Canada's Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs met with similar editorial diffidence (The Standing Senate Committee: 111). Thus, even major policy proposals generally did not shape editorial opinion on this issue.

This is not to say that editorial treatment of the fundamental trade policy questions was completely absent. On diversification, coverage in 1972 was confined to the *Post* and the 2 papers in the West, where Sharp gave a significant speech in January. The *Sun* referred to Canada's "undue dependence" on the U.S., but all 3 papers were skeptical that diversification would be possible or beneficial, and fearful that the U.S. might react negatively (1972: VS, 24/1, 12/4, p 4; WFP, 7/2, p 15, 12/2, p 21; *FP*, 5/2, p 6, 15/4, p 1, 22/4 & 20/5, p 1). It is interesting to view this lack of support in 1972 for weaker Canada-U.S. trade ties in conjunction with the general lack of endorsement in 1982 for bilateral free trade. Four newspapers devoted one editorial each to the Senate Committee report, but none went beyond advocating careful consideration of free trade, and the 2 Western papers raised reservations concerning its viability or benefit to Canada (1982: *G&M*, 12/4, p 6; *FP*, 10/4, p 9; VS, 7/4 p A4; WFP, 5/4, p 6). Also notable was the high degree of factual content in all editorials on this issue, which left little space for opinion on the merits of policies.

In the wake of Nixon's 1971 measures, editorials expressed both hostility toward the U.S. and criticism of the Canadian government for not being more accommodating. The *Post* protest against "the cavalier attitude of the United States towards...its trade partners", and its decisive stance against U.S. demands for Canadian concessions reflected the most hardline position (*FP*/1972: 26/2, p 6; 15/4 & 20/5, p 1). At the opposite end of the spectrum, the *Free Press* took the same staunch pre-U.S. stand as it did on investment. It sharply dismissed Canadian warnings of an impending trade emergency as "strident anti-Americanism" and "the attribution of all sorts of sinister motives to our greatest trading partner", and it argued that U.S. demands for concessions on Canada's auto safeguards were basically justified (*WFP*/1972: 17/4, p 13; 3/1, p 19). On this last point the *Sun* agreed, but on balance its attitude was moderately unfavourable to the U.S.. The *Sun* criticized Treasury Secretary, John Connelly who
implemented the Nixon measures, but it also warned of U.S. retaliation if Canada did not agree to concessions (VS/1972, p 4; 11/2, 28/3). At stake with respect to concessions were central Canadian industrial interests, while retaliation could hurt British Columbia's resource industries. The Globe in an ambivalent manner enjoined Canada both to make peace with "that old friend of ours", and to extract U.S. concessions in exchange for Canadian concessions, if any, on the autopact (G&M/1972, p 6; 12/2; 17/2; 25/2).

Perceptions by the 2 easternmost newspapers were strongly influenced by regional sensitivities. Le Devoir's coverage of Canada-U.S. trade in 1972 was surprisingly sparse (2 editorials) compared to its coverage of foreign investment. The negative position shown in Figure 1 results from one emphatic call for a revival of the Quebec-based Canadian aircraft industry to end U.S. domination in this field, and one critical review (by Claude Ryan) of bilateral trade problems and Nixon's grasp of them. The Chronicle-Herald called upon both the U.S. and Canada to overcome antagonistic attitudes on the larger trade questions, but rushed to the defence of regional interests, such as apple exports, maritime resources and Atlantic port traffic, that seemed endangered by U.S. policies (1972: LD/p 4, 9/2 & 13/4; CH/p 6, 13/1, 5/4, 7/4, 23/5).

The Michelin tire case provided a clear illustration in this period both of the primacy to the Chronicle-Herald of provincial concerns (its editorial page motto is "What have YOU done for Nova Scotia today?") and of the perceptual gulf that can separate editorialists across Canada. With assistance from the federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion, Michelin established tire manufacturing plants in Nova Scotia and was exporting to the U.S. market. Resultant threats of U.S. countervailing duties added to the agenda of bilateral trade disputes in 1972 as well as to the worries of Ontario tire manufacturers. Globe editorials argued that the U.S. was "rightly perturbed" about the "suspect" Michelin deal, but the Chronicle-Herald in turn attacked the Globe for its "biased thinking" in alignment with "Central Canadians" and its "blatant example of insensitive journalism". The Chronicle-Herald also criticized "the big American tire corporations" for their "all-out assault on Michelin" (1972: G&M/p 6, 25/2, 23/5; CH/p 6, 11/5, 22/6). The Michelin case confirms how little the Canadian newspaper scene is conducive to unified editorial positions on Canada-U.S. trade. It also exemplifies how strongly editorials on trade can be shaped by particular events, personalities or extraneous considerations. However, the most important factor shaping opinion on trade in 1972 was the U.S. departure from its previous special consideration for Canada; and the more remarkable editorial reaction was that of hesitation and skepticism regarding significant Canadian policy changes.

In 1982, the dominant problem for all papers discussing the trade issue (Le Devoir did not) was U.S. and Canadian protectionism (G&M, 20/2, p 6; FP, 10/4, p 9; VS/p A4, 25/1, 22/2). However, there was an overall decline of editorial treatment of trade issues and a lack of interest in a free-trade solution. Most editorials confined their comments to concerns about the spread of U.S. protectionism, the dependence of
Canada on the U.S. market, and the need to raise Canadian industrial productivity. In parallel with the frequent laments about Canada’s deteriorating economic conditions (issue 1), the feeling of dependence had intensified; and hopes to counter protectionist Congressional forces were pinned on Reagan’s commitment to trade liberalization rather than on Canadian actions. Despite the perception that U.S. protectionism endangered Canada, editorials were often quite favourable to the United States. In fact, the Post switched, on balance, to a positive attitude consonant with its belief that Canadians were contributing more than the U.S. to their own economic problems. Both the Globe and Free Press looked on Canada’s economically more successful neighbour with greater favour than in 1972. Whereas Nixon’s “shock” measures could prompt critical attitudes in the earlier period, in 1982 the structural problems in Canada’s trade relations stood unobscured and the U.S. President was implicitly arguing Canada’s case with his own legislators.

The East and West coast papers, the Sun and Chronicle-Herald, derived their more negative attitudes from regional concerns: in British Columbia, the lumber trade was threatened by cries for U.S. countervailing duties because of alleged subsidies; and in Nova Scotia, the scallops industry was threatened by pressures for export limits from the New England Fisheries Management Council (1982: VS/p A4, 26/1, 6/2; CH/p 6, 26/1, 24/3). These industries are of such fundamental importance to each province’s economy that their defence often tops the agenda in times of peril. Neither of these two regional problems were given editorial attention in the Globe during the 1982 period, and editorial discussion of regional trade topics generally was found only in the press of the affected region.

Conclusions

Our analysis shows a remarkable similarity in both periods in editorial perceptions of Canada’s economic problems: inflation, unemployment, federal deficits, exchange rates, productivity, research and development, and managerial control. There was considerable satisfaction in 1972 with Canada’s economic conditions, but most papers compared Canada unfavourably with the U.S. in 1982. Responsibility for economic problems was attributed more to the U.S. in 1972 and more to Canada in the later period. In 1972 most papers gave some support to Canada’s foreign investment control policy, but in 1982 all criticized the policy. Editorial interest in trade issues stood out as a discrete problem in 1972 due to U.S. actions, but fell sharply in 1982 when trade questions were subsumed in general and frequent calls for change on the entire economic front; but in neither period did proposals for trade policy changes arouse much editorial interest. Overall, the earlier crisis in bilateral relations was perceived as originating primarily in the U.S., whereas the later crisis was seen as far more serious and as resulting largely from Canadian actions.

As expected, we found that editorials were more favourable to closer linkages with the U.S. during periods of economic difficulty in Canada. When Canada’s
economic situation was perceived more negatively in 1982, there was a greater tendency to view Canada as the cause of its own problems; greater demand for a decrease in foreign investment barriers; and a willingness to support freer trade with the U.S. These linkages were reinforced by the view that the government's NEP and FIRA policies were largely responsible for the 1982 crisis. The same linkages were apparent in the earlier period, when economic conditions were seen more positively. The 1972 crisis struck Canada with little warning and without the expected display of U.S. goodwill. Canadian self-satisfaction combined with the external origin of the crisis caused most papers to support efforts to hold out on Canadian concessions. Editorials also generally supported the implementation of moderate foreign investment controls. However, in the trade area all Canadian regions could identify benefits from close ties with the U.S. and the press was reluctant to endorse the poorly-defined diversification policy.

Our study also has raised a number of questions about the nature of the press in Canada. First, "the press" often speaks neither with a unified nor clear voice on fundamental economic policy issues. In addition, there is a widespread tendency (least in the Post which has a weekly deadline) to offer information and complaint rather than argument and prescription, and to be reactive rather than creative in placing national business before the readership (Keenleyside, et al.: 32-40; Reisman: 43). Furthermore, many editorialists draw mostly on events in their immediate environments for inspiration, and we found reason to question the existence of a truly national, focal press voice acknowledged as such from coast to coast.

In a contest of national agenda and public policy, attention naturally centres on the Globe and the Post. Although each of the other dailies represents a major segment of Canada's national whole, it may safely be assumed that none constitutes regular and essential reading matters for most national policy-makers. Thus, the question arises as to whether the Globe at least mentions the issues that the regional newspapers consider fundamental. This does not always occur: B.C. anxiety over lumber exports, the concern in Manitoba over the Garrison diversion project, and maritime fisheries problems found not a single mention in Globe editorials during the periods examined; and on the Michelin issue the paper's position was not generally accepted as a national view. In the Michelin context, the Chronicle-Herald maintained that the Globe showed no sympathy with the Atlantic region's need for investment, employment and trade opportunities. In the Garrison case, the Free Press in 1982 devoted 8 of its 9 editorials on Canada-U.S. economic relations to this issue; yet this was not reflected in Globe comments on economic questions of importance in Canada. One must ask, then, whether a "national newspaper" does not have a responsibility to present to its readership the major concerns of all of Canada's regions.

Questions also arise with respect to press sourcing for information and judgment, and to editorial process. Many Globe editorials seem to rely to a high degree on in-house staff and data resources. As a result, individual editors' personal beliefs and
interest can have a large impact on what appears as "the editorial line." Concerning editorial process, it is instructive to look at the Globe and the Post. There is a more conscious effort at the former to find and maintain a well-considered stand on a major issue which is not readily altered. At the Post, with the exception of the former front-page editorial "The Nation's Business", there is little such effort; indeed, a respondent referred to "the great myth" of careful editorial deliberations on selection or process (interviews by Kirton and the authors). Coverage of the investment issue clearly illustrates the effect of editorial process on content. As discussed, the Post was more emphatic than the Globe in 1972 that something should be done about the large degree of foreign investment in the Canadian economy. However, an exaggerated impression of the divergences in attitude possibly resulted from the editorial process in each paper. The large impact of former editor Richard Doyle on the Globe's editorial process, and his apparent hostility toward the Trudeau Liberals, probably moderated the paper’s enthusiasm for foreign investment legislation in 1972. An interview concerning the Post indicates that its position on foreign investment was in fact less nationalist than suggested by our analysis, and that differences between its 1972 and 1982 attitudes were actually not major. The lack of careful editorial deliberation, and the disinterest in promoting a consistent viewpoint, may have produced too strong an impression of the divergences. To a Post respondent, the 1982 position on foreign investment was not a reversal of the paper’s earlier stand, but merely reflected the lessons of the intervening decade: while Canadian investment and ownership should be encouraged, U.S. capital should definitely not be discouraged.

The above raises many further questions. For example, was the Post misunderstood in 1972? Is there a risk that it underestimates the impact of its editorials on important segments of Canadian business and on policy-making institutions? If it is accepted that the Post has never sought to discourage U.S. capital, one wonders how to interpret 1972 editorials referring to U.S. "piracy" and "idiocies...in the U.S. penchant for goods-only thinking" (FP: 12/2, p 1; 1/4, p 6). Regarding the Globe, one may wonder whether its self-perception as national guardian of the public interest is adequately served by its editorial process and contents. Many editorial surveyed for all papers do, indeed, draw into question the generally accepted wisdom that the press is a major source of prescription for policy-makers. It should be, but is it?

Endnotes

1. The B.C. lumber lobby and the Manitoba and federal Garrison lobbies in Washington were not yet well developed.

2. A rare exception was a Sun editorial (5/6/82) supporting the Bombardier company of Montreal in its dispute over the export of subsidized Canadian-built subways cars in New York City.
3. This was strongly confirmed in interviews concerning the \textit{Globe} and \textit{Post}. Many respondents pointed to the economic conditions in Canada as the primary influence on editorial positions regarding all four issues.

4. According to one interview, the \textit{Globe} editor and publishers were not interested in fisheries and maritime boundaries. Fulford (1981) has stated that "southern Ontario...not Canada, is the region of which the Globe has been effectively the 'national newspaper'".

5. One wonders how the national interest can be appropriately perceived without due attention to regional issues. On the other hand, it can be argued that a national newspaper must devote substantial attention to Canada's international affairs, and this may detract from space available for regional interests.

6. Interviewees pointed out (September 1984) that Doyle's philosophy on economics tied in with his feelings about the federal government under Trudeau and how it behaved towards the U.S. The \textit{Globe} supported Joe Clark for Prime Minister in both 1979 and 1980.

7. Kirton interview: "The \textit{Globe} views itself, first and foremost, as Canada's national newspaper." Also see Fulford, p. 30.
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