

Canadian Cultural Policy, Maclean's Magazine and the Coverage of the Death of Pierre Trudeau

David Hutchison
Glasgow Caledonian University

Abstract

This paper focuses on the coverage of the death and funeral of Pierre Trudeau in Canada's national Anglophone news magazine, *Maclean's*. In addition to examining the specific nature of that coverage, it seeks to locate it within the discourse of celebration which the magazine frequently deploys in its construction of Canadian-ness. *Maclean's* is one of a number of magazines which have benefited from federal government support policies in the media field, which are described and reflected upon. The paper finally considers whether all of the coverage analysed suggests that *Maclean's*' relatively protected status is being utilised to maximum civic benefit.

Introduction

The paper is intended for an audience which is perhaps wider than the one for journals in the media studies field. However it does draw on ideas and concepts employed in that field, including discourse analysis of news in both print and broadcast form. The work of Allan Bell and Norman Fairclough can be usefully mentioned here.¹ Fairclough (1995) suggests that the language—and imagery—of media texts can be examined to illuminate questions about the way in which events are represented, about the identities set up for reporters, audiences and others and the relationships established between the participants, for example the relationship between the reporter and his readers or auditors. Discourse analysis of print reporting or broadcast news yields many insights, and in what follows some of its basic concepts will be drawn on.

Cultural policy, cultural taste and economics

It is a truism that the Canadian state has long felt the precariousness of its position vis a vis its southern neighbour. The threat of physical annexation may have receded after Confederation, but economic and cultural domination remain central concerns in public discourse. Despite the signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994, and the preceding bilateral agreement with the US in 1988, Canada retains the right under the Invest-

ment Canada Act to review non-indigenous ownership generally, and under the treaties themselves cultural goods were declared to be exempt, although there is some room for doubt as to the exact meaning of the relevant clauses. Likewise, under GATT and its successor World Trade Organisation (WTO), culture comes into a substantially protected category.²

The thinking behind these policies is that the country cannot be truly itself unless it retains control of a substantial segment of its business and commerce, and generates its own cultural artefacts in the arts and the media. It might well be the case that Canada would remain Canada if the United States controlled Canadian business totally, and obliterated Canadian culture; after all, as Seymour Martin Lipset has argued, Canadian society has a number of distinctive characteristics, such as a much stronger emphasis on community and tradition than is to be found south of the border and a greater willingness to defer to authority.³ Nonetheless, Canada's economic and cultural nationalists will insist that these very values would be threatened, should control of economy and culture be lost to the USA.⁴

To the outside observer there is a paradox here: Canada is clearly not the USA, as its social attitudes to such matters as, for example, gun ownership, its level of violent crime, its healthcare provision, and the perennial Quebec/Rest of Canada argument demonstrate all too clearly, yet Canadians do like to consume vast quantities of American mass culture. As Paul Rutherford has commented in a review of the impact of cultural policy to date, "... Canadians generally preferred to watch Hollywood film and TV drama, to listen to imported rock and roll or to read American genre fiction as their chief source of relaxation".⁵

But the attraction of American film, television and popular cinema is not confined to citizens of Canada, it is to be found across the globe. Nor does it exclude the desire for indigenous material. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that Canadians like to watch their own theatrical productions and television, and to read their own novels, newspapers and magazines.⁶ The problem is not one of national disdain for national culture, but the economics of production on a small base: Canada may be one of the largest countries in the world, but it has a population of 30 million. It would be fanciful to imagine that on such a base it would ever be possible to build cultural industries as large and as globally successful as the American ones; it would also be surprising if the reservoirs of talent were as deep as those to be found south of the forty ninth parallel.

Small countries—Scotland and the Scandinavian nations are other examples—have to accept that they cannot expect to be world class in all spheres of activity; if they are lucky, they will achieve distinction in a few spheres, perhaps only briefly, as Norway did in the theatre at the time of Ibsen, or Sweden in cinema for much of the twentieth century. Small countries are also compelled to acknowledge that market forces left to themselves are unlikely to lead to more than modest attainments in the cultural and media spheres. Public subvention is well nigh inevitable. The complications which arise when a country is composed of two or more distinct nations—as is the case in, for example, Canada and Spain—compound the basic problem.

Public support: the Canadian experience

In the inter-war period there were two major public interventions. Responding to the threat of the Americanisation of Canadian radio, the Conservative government, led by R.B. Bennett, in 1932 set up the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission (CRBC), which in 1936 became the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), and was substantially financed by public funds, initially in the form of a licence fee, and latterly a government grant. In 1939 the National Film Board (NFB) was established, not it must be stressed to produce features, but with a documentary remit. After the war interventions continued in the cultural sphere, and on the recommendation of the Massey Commission Report of 1951 the Canada Council came into existence in 1956 as a government financed subsidiser of the arts. When television appeared, policies were gradually developed by the regulatory bodies then in place—the Board of Broadcast Governors (BBG) and its successor the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC)—which were designed to ensure majority Canadian content on the new medium, with radio for its part ultimately being required to have 35% of indigenous music content. In 1967 the Canadian Film Development Corporation (CFDC) was set up to provide financial support for feature films, and, when it became Telefilm Canada in 1983, for television programming. By the late nineties the amount of public money being made available by the federal government to support film and television—excluding CBC's \$840m. Can. grant in aid—was over \$300m. Can per year. Financial help is also offered along with other kinds of support, by several provincial administrations, most obviously those in Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia.⁷

Although book publishing has benefited from a number of public support initiatives for three decades, neither the federal government nor provincial authorities offer direct financial aid to the press, unlike many West European

countries, although there are national postal subsidies. However, a number of measures have been in place for over thirty years which are designed to ensure that Canadian newspapers remain just that, and Canadian magazines are able to compete with their American rivals on reasonable terms.

It is perfectly possible for foreign companies to own Canadian newspapers, but it is not a very sensible business strategy to seek to acquire them, since, under the provisions of legislation passed by the Pearson Liberal government in 1965, advertising placed by Canadian companies in non-Canadian publications—those which were not 75% Canadian owned—was disallowed for tax purposes. This has produced the paradoxical situation in which Canadian press companies, such as Thomson and Hollinger, have been able to acquire large numbers of titles outside of Canada, but are protected from foreign intrusion at home. It can be argued that the remarkably high concentration of ownership in the domestic newspaper market, with Hollinger, for example, owning over 40% of dailies by circulation until it began a process of divestiture in 2000, has been intensified by the inability of foreign companies to establish a presence in the country.

Magazines were also covered by the 1965 measures, and for these publications, while the ownership issue was important, the question of foreign competition was much more critical. It is rather difficult for newspapers to make much headway in foreign markets—that is the principal reason adduced by the EU for not objecting to newspaper subsidy regimes in some members of the Union, since they are not seen as barriers to intra-country competition, other than among internationally oriented elite groups.⁸ Newspapers offer information of all kinds about what is going on in the reader's own part of the world, be it country, region or small town, which no foreign competitor can easily supply. Magazines, however, are less immediate and less rooted in the specifics of what is happening in the reader's home environment. They might well be news oriented, but they are much more likely to target readers as, for example, young people, business people, fishermen or stamp collectors. It is not therefore surprising that English language magazines in Canada have always faced stiff competition from American imports. The language barrier in Quebec has ensured that the competition offered to French language publications, while significant, has been much less fierce.⁹

The government of R.B. Bennett also intervened in the magazine market, and was persuaded by the Magazine Publishers Association of Canada to impose a tariff on foreign imports. As Mary Vipond points out, this had the effect of decreasing the overall circulation of United States magazines in Canada by

62% between 1931 and 1935, and of increasing the circulation of Canadian magazines by 64%.¹⁰ However the Conservative government was replaced by a Liberal one in 1935, and it was not long before the tariffs were abolished, and American magazines were able to make up lost ground. So, when the Liberals acted in 1965, in the eyes of cultural nationalists, they were not only doing the right thing, but also remedying a historic failure.

Under the terms of the post-war legislation, advertising in a magazine in Canada was only tax deductible if the title was 75% Canadian owned, or had 80% Canadian content. The aim here was to make ‘split runs’—editions of American titles with minimal Canadian content, but able to attract Canadian advertising—financially unviable. Initially the Canadian editions of *Time* and *Reader’s Digest* were exempted, but the exemption ended in 1976. Subsequently, *Reader’s Digest* reorganised its Canadian edition to meet the legal requirement, but *Time* did not, and continued to operate its Canadian edition, despite the fact that those companies which advertised in it laboured under the non-tax deductible handicap. In 1965 the government had also introduced a Customs regulation which meant that split run editions printed outside of the country could be seized at the border and destroyed.

The impact of these measures was significant. Canadian magazines continued to face competition from imports, but did not have to contend with the effect of substantial amounts of Canadian advertising being siphoned off by split runs, a serious drain, given that over 60% of gross revenue derives from that source. By the 1990s indigenous magazines accounted for 65% of circulation in Canada; the figure which obtained in the mid-1950s was 25%; in the 1950s 660 titles accounted for 28m copies sold, while in 1990s 1400 titles accounted for 511m copies. However newsstands continue to be dominated by American publications.¹¹

The position might have remained like this, had not technology intervened, or rather had not one of the main players utilised a development in technology, in order to challenge the status quo. In 1993 Time Warner electronically transmitted a split run version of *Sports Illustrated* into Canada. The federal government responded by imposing an 80% excise tax on split runs, and, while Time Warner withdrew the offending title, the US government sought to challenge the Canadian action and the overall direction of federal policy through the World Trade Organisation. As Ted Magder demonstrates in his extremely useful and trenchant analysis of the case put to the WTO panel, the Americans deployed an extraordinary range of arguments, including the contribution of the ‘perfume of the paper’ to the total appeal of a magazine, in its attempt to

demonstrate the injustice of what it claimed was blatant discrimination against US products.¹² The resulting ruling found against the prohibition on the import of split runs, the 80% tax and differential postal rates for domestic and foreign publications. The Canadian government responded by proposing to repeal the relevant legislation as far as split runs were concerned, and to pay a direct subsidy to Canadian magazines, at the same time as it abolished differential postal rates. However, in order to continue the protection of domestic access to advertising revenue, a new piece of legislation was drafted: Bill C-55 proposed to make it illegal for Canadian advertisers to use the services of split run publications, with fines of up to \$250,000 as penalties for miscreants.

Unsurprisingly, the US reacted with fury, and indicated that if the Bill became law it would take action against a range of Canadian exports, including wood products and steel (the relevant government minister represented a steel producing area, and she also found herself subjected to a lewd personal attack by the split run version of *Hustler* magazine, which had been set up in 1997; that led to the threat of legal action).¹³ Negotiations ensued, and in the middle of the Kosovo war, in which Canada was a full partner of the US and Britain in the NATO action, a compromise was reached. The final agreement is a complex one, and the result cannot be regarded as a total victory for either side. Canada agreed to amend Bill C-55, so that a split run magazine can legitimately have a maximum of 18% of advertising aimed at the Canadian market.¹⁴ New magazines established by foreign publishers with over 50% Canadian content will not face advertising space restrictions. Tax deductions will be at 50% for advertising placed in publications with up to 79% Canadian content, and 100% for advertising placed in publications over that figure. Foreign publishers will also be allowed to buy up to 49% of an existing Canadian publication and to start entirely new ones in the country. To deal with the problem of loss of advertising revenue, the Heritage Department announced that it would introduce a new magazine support policy, which has now been developed, in the shape of the Canadian Magazine Fund, which offers financial help on the editorial, business and infrastructure fronts.¹⁵

As might be expected, although Canadian advertisers were happy about this compromise, as were a number of commentators, magazine publishers—outside of Quebec, where little impact was expected—were less than pleased, and some grim predictions were made about the future of indigenous publications.¹⁶ With American companies such as Hearst Magazines—publishers of such titles as *Cosmopolitan* and *Good Housekeeping*—announcing their intentions of producing Canadian editions, it was hardly surprising that Maclean Hunter's president should have gloomily drawn attention to the potential loss

of advertising revenue to Canadian titles in the 'women's service' sector where American titles account for 58% of circulation in that segment of the Canadian market.¹⁷ Yet, although the absolute prohibition on split runs has gone, it is doubtful if it could have been sustained in the current free trade climate. What has been sustained in diluted form is the right of the Canadian government to set some limits on the operations of foreign magazine publishers in Canada, and what has been introduced is the right to subsidise non-arts magazines directly for reasons of national cultural importance.¹⁸ Furthermore, the US has agreed that it will mount no further challenge to the agreement under either WTO or NAFTA procedures, and all future reviews of foreign investment in the cultural industries will be transferred from the Industry to the Heritage Department, a development which the Americans are not at all happy about.¹⁹ However, although the US has not secured a completely open market, it has put down a marker that, when it comes to the 'cultural industries', it will not easily accept that such a collocation is linguistically sound: for the Americans movies, magazines and television are businesses, unlike painting, music and literature, which are culture. For some time the Heritage Department has been trying to find the courage to intervene in the cinematic exhibition and distribution sectors, in order to improve the opportunities for Canadian filmmakers to have their work screened in their own country; after the magazine dispute, caution is likely to be the watchword again.

It must be stressed that not all Canadian commentators are supportive of protection in the media area. Acheson and Maule (2001) for example, showing no relish for "further rounds of the same unproductive engagement" on the magazine front, argue that "the Canadian magazine industry is by all reports in as precarious a state in 1999 as it was 40 years earlier. *Reader's Digest* and *Time* are still extremely successful in the Canadian market.....The horse appears to us to be dead, but the Canadian policymakers refuse to dismount".²⁰

Maclean's Magazine

Maclean's is a weekly news magazine published by Maclean Hunter, which since 1994 has been owned by Rogers Communications, a company with substantial interests in broadcasting and print. Maclean Hunter originally specialised in business publications, but in 1911 launched its national news magazine. This might have seemed a logical and financially sound development in a country which had no national newspapers. Indeed the United States followed its northern neighbour's example with the establishment of three such publications—*Time*, *Newsweek* and *US and World Report*, the first named appearing in 1923 and the other two ten years later. From the start they were

available to the Canadian buyer, and so Maclean Hunter did not depart from its initial judgement that a monthly frequency was all that the market would bear. It was not until 1978, after the introduction of protective legislation, that the publication went weekly. In 1998 it had a circulation of 510,319, which compares with the Canadian edition of *Time's* 318,378.²¹ In that year *Time Canada* had two journalists employed north of the forty ninth parallel compared to *Maclean's* 60. *Maclean's*, it should be noted, competes in the English language market not only with the Canadian edition of *Time*, but also with the US version, which is available in Canada.

A content analysis of the magazine reveals, not surprisingly, that in its news agenda *Maclean's* emphasises home news—political, social, cultural and sporting with a growing emphasis on lifestyle material; its coverage of foreign news has not been strong in recent years, indeed it was in decline during 2001 prior to September 11, and the magazine had begun only to print substantial foreign pieces if a Canadian tag could be used to hang them on, a tendency which reasserted itself in early 2002. The focus on events in Canada is coupled with a constant emphasis on and exploration of what *Maclean's* sees as core Canadian values and beliefs, a process which at times borders on the obsessive. The magazine, for example, commissions an annual end of year poll in which citizens are asked to describe their feelings about living in the country, and to indicate what they consider to be the most important issues facing it, how they would describe the relationship with the US and what their personal priorities are. *Maclean's* also returns frequently to the subject of health care, arguably one of the defining Canada/US areas of distinction. And, crucially, the magazine regularly celebrates Canadians who have made an impression on the world, or even just on their own country. So, for example, on 6 May 2002 the front cover is given over to a picture of “Canada’s David Thomson, the world’s new information king”, and the article inside by Peter C. Newman, a regular chronicler of the activities of the Canadian business elite, celebrates Thomson’s taking on the chairmanship of the country’s largest privately controlled enterprise, which was built up by his grandfather, Roy Thomson. Thomson is described by Newman as a “cerebral energy bunny whose thought process is original and daring”. One year after the death of Mordechai Richler on 24 June 2002 half of the magazine is devoted to lauding the achievements and personality of one of the small group of Canadian writers who achieved international recognition before the Munro/Atwood generation appeared on the literary scene. Richler is described as a “national literary icon” and “Canada’s most famous curmudgeon”. On February 18 of the same year *Maclean's* had presented its readers with a feature on the 50 Most Influential Canadians. The list is split into various categories, *Power Players*, *Money People*,

Local Heroes, Enrichers (artists and performers), and—with grammatical incongruity—*Shaping Society*. The last is a catch-all category which manages to encompass *Maclean's* owner Ted Rogers and the mayor of Montreal. Michael Trebilcock, a University of Toronto lawyer, is described as “the guy they call when an issue needs cracking”. Of Adrienne Clarkson it is said “she embodies the notion that ideas matter”, and there is much emphasis on people being taken seriously beyond the country’s borders. Of Michael Ignatieff it is remarked “doors open to him in the highest circles”, and of Margaret Atwood “She is the Queen of CanLit, her impish cat-smile peeping out of bookstore shelves from Kapuskasing to Copenhagen”. What is striking about several of the phrases quoted above is the uncritical admiration and enthusiasm which they seek to evoke in the reader.

During 2000, the year when Trudeau died, similar kinds of celebratory material appeared. The very first edition of the year on January 1 presents readers with *Faces of the Future: 100 Canadians to watch*. These individuals were apparently nominated by readers and staff of the magazine—“the final list, made up of men and women aged 30 and under demonstrates Canada’s wealth of talented committed young people—and their remarkable promise”. There are business people, social activists, economists, philosophers and sporting figures (though very few politicians), some of whom—we do not yet know which ones—are clearly to be thought of as the heroes of tomorrow. On 1 July, the magazine hosted a round table discussion in which “seven outstanding Canadians discuss the secrets of success and reflect on the secrets of leadership”. The emphasis is on a distinctive Canadian kind of approach—which one of the participants, Beverley McLachlin, claims places “a real emphasis on trying to understand what would be right; looking for the values that constitute doing the right thing”—the importance of consensus, and on the global impact of this approach. On 4 September readers are offered *25 Canadians who Inspired the World*. Chosen by a *panel of experts*, the list includes businessmen like Bombardier and Cunard, the ubiquitous Atwood—though also Lucy Maud Montgomery—and university teachers like McLuhan and Galbraith. Artists, academics and social activists tend to dominate, while scientists and politicians are not very well represented, with only Lester Pearson making the list in the latter category.

The cumulative impact of all of this kind of material may well be different for different audiences. Clearly it is meant to generate pride among Canadian readers in their countrymen and women’s past and present achievements, and to provide the sustenance that the citizens of a nation struggling to maintain their own identity/identities in the shadow of a powerful assimilationist neigh-

bour may be deemed to need. One can only assume that since the magazine very regularly includes such features, reader feedback, formal and informal, suggests that it is appreciated. What its constant inclusion also suggests to the non-Canadian, whether south of the forty ninth parallel or elsewhere, may be something rather different, an issue which will be returned to later.

Pierre Trudeau's death and funeral were clearly major news events for *Maclean's*, to which it was bound to devote much space. But the contention here is that the nature and extent of that coverage can only be fully understood when it is seen in the context of what might be loosely described as *Maclean's* discourses of self-validation and national celebration. The argument here is that not only does *Maclean's* constantly and obsessively seek to celebrate Canadian distinctiveness and achievement but in its approach to news coverage it is constantly asserting its own role as the only Anglophone news magazine which offers adequate coverage of the country.

The coverage of Trudeau's death

For the purposes of this paper the four issues from 9 October 2000 on were considered—those published on 9 and 16 October had a great deal of material; in the succeeding two the material is to be found in the readers' letters pages.

In *Maclean's* edition of 9 October, 39 out of a total of 74 editorial pages are devoted to Trudeau's death, including the front cover and contents pages; half of this material is pictorial, so Trudeau is constructed both visually and in print. As far as the former is concerned, we range from thoughtful Karsh studies through pictures of Trudeau on a camel, in a canoe, pirouetting behind the Queen in Buckingham Palace, watching her sign the repatriation document, clowning, with glamorous women, in pilot's uniform, in a fast car, at public meetings, with his children, in a swimming costume on rocks, and sliding down the banisters in the Chateau Laurier during the Liberal leadership convention in 1968. What we are offered here is the politician as man of many sides—man of action, man of style and sex symbol, man of Canada (though, it might well be argued, very untypical man of Canada).

The epigraph which *Maclean's* offers on its inside front page is significant—

Flamboyant and contradictory, he enchanted and often enraged Canadians with his unique vision and passion for the country. For more than 15 years he was prime minister, leaving a record that included the patriation of the Constitution, the Official Languages Act and

victory for the federalist forces in the 1980 Quebec referendum on sovereignty. Always controversial, he changed the way Canadians viewed themselves, and the way the world looked at Canada.

There are several leitmotifs here, which are pursued in the coverage being considered, in particular national unity, Canadians' sense of who they are and the outside world's perception of Canada. These are continued by Robert Lewis in an editorial, which offers personal reminiscences of the man. It is noticeable that several journalists adopt this 'I knew him too' approach. It seems to serve as a mixture of self-justification and assertion of professional authority, and echoes the behaviour, for example, of some of the journalists who wrote about the very different figure of Princess Diana.²² Lewis does offer some criticism of Trudeau's economic policies, but he comes back to the national unity theme—"he did not produce a traditional autobiography, or even hint at an epitaph. In his heart he must have known what it would be: he spoke for Canada".

Anthony Wilson-Smith (appointed editor of the magazine in 2001) then has two pieces, in the first of which, 'Growing up with Trudeau', he talks of meetings with the former Prime Minister and his stature in the world beyond Canada. In his second piece later in the magazine, entitled 'Canada's champion', Wilson-Smith pursues the theme of national unity, but he also talks about the man's flamboyant—un-Canadian—style and raises the issue of who the real Trudeau actually was. The common sense assumption is that there was of course such an entity, although it might well be argued that much of the coverage considered here is concerned to construct a variety of different Trudeaus, which may or may not cohere satisfactorily. Again there are echoes of the way in which Princess Diana was endlessly constructed and reconstructed, a process recently incisively analysed by Jude Davies (2001). Wilson-Smith also argues that the Trudeau legacy on Quebec is a troubled one and that his foreign policy had very mixed results, although the overall tone of the piece is very positive, as the title implies.

The news report on Trudeau's death and lying in state, which is written by Robert Sheppard, is headed 'Farewell to a Titan', and it takes up one of the themes articulated by Wilson-Smith. Noting that the former prime minister's death was front-page news in London and New York, Sheppard comments—"Trudeau didn't just stride the world stage, he danced upon it, his insatiable curiosity and sophistication carrying the rest of us along in his wake".

The glamour theme is pursued in a piece headed 'The star of his own Movie' written by Jane O'Hara, who lists the movie stars Trudeau dated, and then observes—

Following a generation of dutiful but dour post-war politicians like Lester Pearson, John Diefenbaker and Bob Stanfield, Trudeau arrived like a comet, entering the Canadian atmosphere adorned in black cape and fancy fedoras. Whether playing the role of urban dandy or buckskinned outdoorsman, he was always the star of his own movie, always the remote and rakish sex symbol who made women swoon.

Geoffrey Stevens (also a recent editor of the magazine) hails Trudeau as "the greatest public figure Canada produced in the second half of the twentieth century". Stevens argues that despite policy failures at home and abroad, Trudeau inspired idealism—"single-handedly he increased the public's expectations of political leadership, in the process raising the bar for those who would come after him".

The contemporary comparison theme is very clear in this article, which is followed by other pieces on Trudeau's failures on the economic front, and his successes in the constitutional arena. After a piece on the politician's love of the wilderness, written by a friend who was a companion on some of his trips, there is an essay by Peter Newman which attacks Jean Chrétien explicitly—

While lesser men like Jean Chrétien hang on to high office with no purpose except to perpetuate their power, Trudeau regarded his time as prime minister as a vaguely interesting interlude that allowed him to test and apply his theories and have a little fun.

He reiterates the view already expressed in this coverage that Trudeau changed what it meant to be Canadian and "finally rescued us from the age of Mackenzie King". Hero worship is what we are clearly into here, something emphasised by Newman's reference to Trudeau's "scrap-iron successors". The discourse of celebration then is very apparent in the coverage, at times, it might seem, in super-heated form, and that despite frank acknowledgement that Trudeau failed in a number of important policy areas.

Maclean's inside back page at that point in the magazine's development was usually written by Allan Fotheringham, who is both social/political commentator and wit. He follows Newman's line—and his piece is illustrated by a

line drawing of the former prime minister sitting in a plane as the Canadian landscape unfolds beneath him, which, with its echoes of portraits of Soviet era political leaders, has more than a whiff of socialist realism about it. Again there is personal reminiscence of the 'I was there when' variety, including an account of an incident when Trudeau ran his car over Fotheringham's foot! Fotheringham also argues—as several of his co-writers do—that John Kennedy made Trudeau possible. And, like Newman, Fotheringham uses Trudeau to criticise all his successors. This theme has become rather emphatic and the reader, as he/she closes *Maclean's* edition of 9 October, must be starting to wonder whether Trudeau's death is being used as part of a sustained campaign of denigration directed at contemporary politicians in general, and Chrétien in particular. In the headlines above several of the articles considered here the nouns *Titan*, *Champion*, *Hero* and *Giant* have all been applied to the dead prime minister, substantially emotive terms, which seem designed to evoke awe, respect and regret in the reader, but not to encourage too many critical questions. The journalists—and/or sub-editors—concerned seem happy to assume that this view of Trudeau is one which their readers enthusiastically endorse.

The edition of 16 October, has a total of 49 editorial pages, 17 of which are devoted to Trudeau, eight pages being given over to photographs. The visual emphasis is on the funeral in Montreal, and the train journey made by Trudeau's coffin which preceded the funeral, an event which although part of a Canadian tradition which began with Sir John Macdonald's coffin being taken by train from Ottawa to Kingston in 1891, might also seem to echo the journey made by Lincoln's coffin from Washington to Springfield, Illinois after his assassination in 1865.

On the front cover Trudeau's son, Justin, is shown with a red rose—of the sort often sported in his father's buttonhole—held to his nose, as if to inhale the fragrance, and his father's aura; there is clearly a double symbolism at work, with past and future perhaps united, a symbolism that is made explicit inside the magazine. The caption is 'After the Tears: the legacy of Pierre Elliott Trudeau inspires the nation'. Inside there are photographs of the funeral, which seem designed to emphasise not just the solemnity of the occasion in Montreal's Notre Dame Basilica, but also the range of world figures who attended: in one picture former US President Jimmy Carter is seen behind the cortege, while in another Fidel Castro stands alongside one of Trudeau's sons and his widow, an effective way of signifying pictorially the distinctiveness of Trudeau's and Canada's foreign policy compared to that of the US. A third

shot of the congregation has running alongside it an extract from Justin's eulogy for his father—

We need genuine and deep respect for every human being, regardless of their beliefs, origins or values. That's what my father demanded of his sons and that's what he demanded of his country. He demanded this out of a sense of love -love of his sons, love of his country, and that's why we love him so..... He left politics in '84. But he came back for Meech. He came back for Charlottetown. He came back to remind us of who we are and what we're all capable of. But he won't be coming back anymore. It's all up to us, all of us, now.

The woods are lovely, dark and deep. He has kept his promises and earned his sleep”.

Again and again the allusions to America come flooding in: this time with the adaptation of the last two lines from Robert Frost's *Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening*. There is another echo of the Kennedys, for Frost read a poem at President Kennedy's inauguration in 1961. Trudeau may have established a distinctive Canadian presence in the world, but neither journalists nor his family seem able to talk about him without referring to the United States.

Despite the solemnity and grandeur of the funeral, given the previous week's coverage, there is a journalistic problem for the magazine—what more is there to say about Trudeau and his legacy? But *Maclean's* carries on, and in so doing it is clearly engaging in the self-validation, which it has been argued here, is crucial to understanding its modus operandi. Robert Lewis in his editorial continues the attack on Chrétien. Trudeau, according to Lewis, always spoke directly to the people—

This is why Jean Chrétien's vow last week to carry the Trudeau legacy into an election he doesn't need to call is so ludicrous. This is the man who embraced free trade after denouncing it, who promised to kill the GST but did not, who slashed health spending, who seems bereft of vision. The national funeral last week was a reminder that Canadians knew Pierre Trudeau. And that Jean Chrétien is no Pierre Trudeau.

Peter Newman in his column continues in the same vein—

If anyone has dared to take political advantage of the tragic events, it is Jean Chrétien who has been sounding suspiciously as if he was preparing to ride his predecessor's magic coattails into the election campaign.

Newman is happy to quote a “devastating backhand compliment” which he claims to have heard Trudeau offer about Chrétien—“he knows his limitations”. What is interesting about this piece, apart from the hostility to the current prime minister, is the willingness to concede that, despite Trudeau's commitment to a “strong and confident Canada”, on the fiscal front the record was “dismal”. Credit for dealing with the deficit is, however, given not to Chrétien but to Paul Martin, the Finance Minister. Elsewhere in the magazine as part of its coverage of the funeral there is some discussion as to whether Justin Trudeau might be able to carve out a political career, something which the front cover has hinted at by virtue of the image described above, which inevitably would have reminded readers of the equally pensive Karsh study of Justin's father which was used on the previous week's front cover. The Kennedyesque echoes/dreams are again all too apparent. The distinguished Quebec Liberal politician and journalist, Claude Ryan, is quoted as saying—

It occurred to me that perhaps this was the first manifestation of a dynasty. And, at the least, I was led to believe that the Trudeau family had not said its last word. We may hear a lot more from this young man.

The report however tells us that Justin is quite happy to be a teacher, although he has not completely ruled out some kind of involvement in politics. Jane O'Hara, the journalist concerned, ends her piece—“after his eloquent eulogy last week, some Canadians no doubt wished for a firmer commitment—as the nation struggled with its loss”.

Elsewhere in the magazine another journalist, Barbara Wickens, writes about her personal memories and feelings as she and a colleague journey to the lying in state in Ottawa. She describes standing in line, and the feelings and comments of those present. The piece ends with a touch of bathos. After passing the casket—“we were then ushered down a long hallway with desks along one wall. Each featured two books of condolence—and a box of tissues”.

However in marked contrast to this piece, there is a perceptive article by Charles Gordon, a regular commentator in the magazine on the Canadian media scene. He points up a crucial aspect of Trudeau's persona—

To seek out the ordinary in someone like Trudeau is tricky, because we also admire, as countless tributes have shown, the qualities that made him not ordinary at all—the fierce intellect, the fearlessness, the willingness to lift a certain finger in certain circumstances.

Gordon goes on to note the ‘Trudeau and Me’ tendency among journalists, and is a little dismissive of it—perhaps he says it is really ‘Me and Trudeau’, and it is more vanity than anything of substance which leads his colleagues to recall incidents, remarks or verbal jousts with the former premier. For Gordon, journalists’ reminiscences of this sort “rank far behind the one heard so often during the Ottawa weekend: ‘I am a Canadian because of him’”.

There is then a piece on Trudeau as Montrealer, which is really about Trudeau’s vision of a bilingual country that welcomes new immigrants, and his intense hostility to separatism. In some ways the photograph which illustrates this essay—of an old man in a beret walking down a city street—is the most touching picture in all of the coverage under review.

Only *Maclean’s* desire to emphasise its unique willingness in the magazine field to cover Canadian affairs adequately can explain the inclusion of a very thin human interest piece about the efforts Trudeau and his wife, Margaret, made on behalf of an Ottawa employee who was getting married, and to another about his travels after leaving office. There is however a more substantial piece by Marni Jackson which celebrates national cultural initiatives in film and literature which began under Trudeau, and she too cannot resist having a swipe at contemporary politicians, in this case Stockwell Day, whom she criticises for quoting a Bette Midler song during his parliamentary tribute (one assumes that Justin Trudeau’s borrowing from Robert Frost might meet with her approval, however).

Readers’ letters are an important feature of any magazine or newspaper focused on current events. They provide a forum for commenting on articles and contesting viewpoints articulated in the publication. They can also serve to create a sense of active reader involvement, and to suggest a community, local, regional or, in the case of *Maclean’s*, Anglophone national. The difficulty which faces the analyst of such letters however is that without research on-site in the relevant publication’s offices it is difficult to know on what basis letters are selected and how representative the ones which appear are of those which have been received.

The 16 October edition has seven letters about Trudeau, five of which are very positive about his status and achievements, while two are very critical of his economic policies, and his arrogance. The following week's edition has nine letters, which are concerned with the Trudeau family's political prospects, with Trudeau's achievements in enhancing Canadians' self-image, and the proposal to re-name Mount Logan after him, while two are critical of the former premier on account of his non-enlistment during the Second World War, the growth of the country's debt burden during his time in office and his allegedly divisive impact on the national unity debate.

On 30 October there are a further eight letters, most of them positive, though one is fiercely hostile to everything Trudeau stood for; there is also a letter whose not very subtle wit presents a contrast to the rather elegiac and doleful epistles alongside it—"why the immense resistance to the words Mount Pierre Elliott Trudeau? If memory serves, legions of the world's women appeared to think it was a great idea".

As to geographical origin, in the letters taken as a whole, Ontario and British Columbia are well represented, the prairies less so, and there is only one letter from Quebec, this from a former Ugandan refugee who came to Canada in 1972; the writer suggests that Dorval Airport be re-named in Trudeau's honour, not a suggestion that would be likely to find too much favour in all parts of the province.

Maclean's, it must be remembered, is an Anglophone magazine and as such it will certainly have a readership in Quebec, but the French language market in that province is catered for by its sister Rogers Media publication, the fortnightly *L'Actualité*. *L'Actualité*, which does not suffer the same-language competition from the United States that *Maclean's* does, and has a very healthy 200,000 plus circulation, is rather more of a general interest magazine than a news one, but its 1 October edition does carry a long interview with Stockwell Day. It might therefore be thought rather surprising that its next edition, of 15 October, makes no mention whatsoever of Trudeau's death; however a magazine of this kind usually goes to the printer earlier than does a news magazine. Nonetheless the present writer was surprised that a search of the magazine's on-line archive revealed only two references to the dead prime minister by the end of 2000, one in an article about private schools on 15 November, which noted that Trudeau was among the distinguished former pupils of a particular establishment in Montreal, and one in an article on 1 December about growing voter apathy, where there is a reference to the public outcry which greeted the proposal to re-name Mount Logan. Thus perhaps is emphasised the very

different views held of the man in Quebec and the rest of Canada. The journalists on *L'Actualité*—who, it should be remembered, are employed by the same company as those on *Maclean's*—and, it would appear, on a number of French language newspapers in the province, clearly took the view that this event, which *Maclean's* suggests is of all consuming importance, was very far from being any such thing as far as French speaking Quebec is concerned. Perhaps it was even the case that for *L'Actualité* to tackle the issue at all would have been problematic, given its ownership by Rogers Media. What *Maclean's* journalists have clearly constructed in their coverage is an Anglophone view of Trudeau. In one of the pieces in the edition of 9 October academic Alain Gagnon of McGill University is quoted as observing that for many Quebecers Trudeau's death did not occasion as much emotion as experienced by Anglophones, because the former Prime Minister was perceived as being “antagonistic towards them”. What is striking is that *Maclean's* has clearly decided that it would not be appropriate to commission a piece on Trudeau's death from a fully committed sovereigntist, presumably because to do so might well have unleashed a fury from readers who could have accused the magazine of bad taste and of offering succour to the very forces which sought to destroy Canada, and which Trudeau had devoted his life to fighting. So the *Maclean's* coverage becomes in substantial part a celebration of national unity, but one which proceeds without the participation of the minority of the population who do not support that concept wholeheartedly, or at all.

Within this Anglophone journalistic view, as we have seen, there is an overwhelming desire to relate to the man personally, alongside a willingness to admit his faults, but only within the context of an insistence on star quality—it is left to a few critical letter writers to suggest that Trudeau was no hero. Above all, there is an insistence that things are much grubbier in politics now, and that the current prime minister in particular is third rate.

Time Canada's coverage of Trudeau's death extended across two editions of the magazine, 9 and 16 October. In the first of these editions there were fourteen pages devoted to the subject, of which just over nine were given over to photographs; in addition, the front cover has a rather different Karsh study from the one utilised by *Maclean's*: this one shows a younger man in leather jacket who might easily be mistaken for a Parisian intellectual. The other photographs cover the whole of the former prime minister's career, his private life and the lying in state, and there are a number of pictures also used by *Maclean's*, such as the one of the Buckingham Palace pirouette. Only one journalist, George Russell, appears to be involved in the coverage and he contributes a very brief summary of the man's career and importance. Most of the space occupied by

copy is taken up by a long essay written by Michael Bliss of the University of Toronto. It is a thoughtful historically based piece which considers Trudeau's entire career. For Bliss he is a man who failed to solve many problems, not east the national unity conundrum, and, furthermore, some of his behaviour manifested "assumptions verging on economic illiteracy", while Canada's role in the world was diminished by his attempts to establish an independent foreign policy. But finally Bliss comes down on the side of greatness for two reasons:

More than most other 20th century politicians, he realized that countries are not worth preserving if their governments are not required to respect and advance the rights and freedoms of their people. There was no such commitment in the Canadian constitution before 1982. With the Trudeau Charter, the nation finally had a dedication to individual liberties that no amount of political fumbling or judicial mischief could seriously tarnish.

Despite Trudeau's failure to satisfactorily resolve the constitutional issue, Bliss concludes:

When he was at his best, campaigning in 1968, in the 1980 referendum, in the constitutional struggles, Trudeau glittered and flashed with clarity and conviction and determination. No one in public life came close to being his equal. Such a lucky constitutional monarchy, to have been saved and shaped by a citizen of the republic of free spirits.

In addition to Bliss's piece, there is a brief memoir from the former German Chancellor, Helmut Schmidt, who praises Trudeau's breadth and knowledge and remarks that "Canadians in general did not appear to me to fully understand the complicated, permanent balancing necessary in view of the enormous economic and political push and pull from their gigantic southern neighbor".

On the 16 October Slobodan Milosevic is on the front cover, but there is a little insert showing Justin Trudeau at his father's coffin; of eight pages inside the magazine, over six are devoted to pictures of the funeral service and of the train journey made by the former prime minister's coffin. The copy consists of Justin's funeral elegy and a brief piece by Steven Frank which records the grief and affection shown by ordinary citizens, all of them from the east.

Two weeks later on its correspondence page the magazine carries five letters responding to its coverage, three from the west and two from the east of

Canada. Four are very positive, with one writer accusing Michael Bliss of being niggardly in his praise of Trudeau; the fifth writer, rather like the dissident correspondents in *Maclean's*, sees Trudeau as a man who damaged Canada economically, and mishandled the Quebec situation.

The first and most obvious point to be made about *Time's* coverage is that while superficially it is substantial, journalistically it is very thin indeed. Photographs are very important in this kind of story but there is a balance to be struck and here there are far more photographs than there is copy; where *Maclean's* had seventeen journalists and commentators involved in its coverage, *Time Canada* seems to have had only two and they contribute very little; instead the magazine goes to an academic, a former statesman and Justin Trudeau to obtain its material. However good that material might be, as a strategy it exposes very clearly the nature of *Time Canada's* operation. This is not to denigrate Michael Bliss's long and insightful essay, which is admirable in its scope and in its willingness to tackle the national unity issue from both Anglophone and Quebecois perspectives, and remarkable too for the non-appearance of the word *Chrétien*. But such an essay would only benefit from being placed alongside contributions from a variety of other writers.

Conclusion

It is not the intention in this essay to suggest that any of *Maclean's*' vision or its associated perceptions which have been considered is/are simply untrue; clearly for a magazine to be successful, there has to be some relationship between its world view and the world view of its readers. Anecdotal evidence and the fact of the outpouring of grief which took place in many parts of Canada after Trudeau's death do suggest that the magazine's emphasis on the importance of national unity, the mediocrity and dullness of current political leaders, Chrétien in particular, and the desirability of style and flamboyance in politicians is an emphasis which would strike a chord with many of its readers. But allowance must be made for the possibility that some readers might react rather differently to what is offered, and might indeed reject the version of Trudeau the national leader and statesman which is constructed. The dissident correspondents, whose voices are heard, may be utterly unrepresentative, or they may be more representative than their numbers and the very small space they occupy suggest.

As the reader will have sensed, to an outside observer the coverage examined might seem rather excessive and at times journalistically thin. But that is to miss the point. The discourse of self-validation means that *Maclean's* needs to

offer very extensive coverage—whether justified journalistically or not—as a way of demonstrating to its readers that only it—not its obvious competitor—is willing and able to give Canadian events the attention which they deserve. If this means that on occasion the journalistic barrel is scraped empty, so be it; excess is part of the validation process. The fact that the Canadian edition of *Time*, whatever the quality of some of its coverage, devotes such sparse resources to the task offers an obvious contrast with that excess, and indeed helps to make *Maclean's*' point for it.

The celebration of Trudeau the individual should be seen in a similar light. As was demonstrated earlier, *Maclean's* is constantly looking for Canadian heroes—though finding few among the ranks of the politicians—and the discourse of celebration is employed regularly and explicitly each year; where the individuals chosen for such treatment can be demonstrated to have made an impact beyond Canada, then that gives all the more reason to activate this discourse. Outsiders should be cautions in commenting on the manner in which any particular nation chooses to mark its distinctiveness, particularly those who are citizens of other small nations which are at great pains to emphasise their particularity and achievements. But *Maclean's* is a magazine, not a nation, so it is perhaps legitimate to raise some questions. One need not necessarily go along with the implication of the line from Brecht's Galileo—'Unhappy the land that is in need of heroes'—to have doubts about a constant drive to find individuals to praise to the heights. Indeed, might there be a pathology at work here, does such constant assertion that Canadians matter and are making a major impact on their own society and the wider world suggest that deep down there is considerable doubt about the extent to which they do actually matter? Is there in fact a sense that few Canadians do in reality count for much on the international stage, in effect is a meta-discourse of insecurity at work? Might it be the sign of a more mature and self-confident attitude if *Maclean's* felt no need to behave as it does? On the other hand perhaps the editorial staff believe that the discourses of self-validation and celebration are so entwined with each other that the former would be fatally weakened if the latter were diminished. So, they are locked into journalistic practice which, it can be argued, actually diminishes the ability of the magazine to talk much more often and more extensively than it does about the world beyond Canada from a non-explicit but still discernible and legitimate Canadian perspective.

Maclean's is not relaxed about the relationship between Canada and the United States; it talks about it far too much for that conclusion to be drawn. Whether its rather obsessive approach to the matter is shared by all Anglophone Canadians or all social classes beyond Ontario and the Ontario intelligentsia is open

to question. But it is an approach which continues to inform government policy in the media sphere. What is disturbing about so much space in the magazine being devoted each year to its discourse of celebration is that it is happening at a time when, as Soderlund et al²³ have shown, foreign news coverage in the Canadian press in general may not be continuing to decline as much as it has in the last fifteen years but is not back up to the much higher levels to be found in the mid-1980s. The study in question, which draws its conclusions from views elicited over a twelve year period from newspaper editors across the country, and from quantitative data compiled in the mid-nineties, suggests that international reporting has probably been diminishing throughout North America as a consequence of lack of sufficient reader interest and the cost of providing it. One might wonder whether perceived lack of interest is being used by editors and their owners as an excuse not to spend money, a tendency which, as far as Canada is concerned, has been noted over several decades, not least by the Kent Commission in 1981, which observed that the rate of return in the newspaper business compared very favourably with returns in other sectors of the economy.²⁴ It may well be that with newspaper circulations continuing to decline and intensified competition for advertising from other media, the rate of return is not as high as it once was, but it is difficult to believe that the resources are not available for rather better foreign coverage than is to be found outside the pages of the *Globe and Mail* and the *National Post*.

As far as *Maclean's* is concerned the current approach does call into question the efficacy of and justification for protection policies, which enabled the magazine to become a weekly in 1978. If these cannot secure legitimate civic objectives, one of which must surely be the presentation of a reasonably broad and accurate picture of the world beyond Canada's borders, how can they be argued for and sustained?

Acheson and Maule (2001) contend that Canada's protectionist approach has not succeeded in eroding US dominance and they add that one effect in the audio-visual arena has been the creation of supposedly indigenous material, which, because of the need to recover production costs beyond the small home market, displays an international orientation at the expense of a Canadian one, thus defeating one of the objectives of public subvention.²⁵ That argument could not be sustained easily in the magazine field, since Canadian magazines are not particularly export oriented. As far as *Maclean's* is concerned however the effect may well have been to reinforce, or even encourage, an inward looking approach when an internationally oriented one would have better served its readers and the wider Canadian society. For *Maclean's* to continue on the

path it appears to have now set itself must therefore be a matter of considerable concern.

Notes

- ¹ See for example Allan Bell, *The Language of News Media* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991) and Norman Fairclough, *Media Discourse* (London: Arnold, 1995).
- ² See, for example, K. Acheson and C. Maule, "International Regimes for Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility in the Cultural Industries", *Canadian Journal of Communication* (19, 3/4, 1994) and other articles in the same edition of the CJC.
- ³ S. M. Lipset, *Continental Divide* (London: Routledge, 1990). Some observers are not persuaded by Lipset's explanation for these differences which he locates in distinct Tory and Liberal traditions. See, for example, J.H. Thompson and S.J. Randall, *Canada and the United States, Ambivalent Allies* (Athens: University of Georgia, 1994) where the argument is put that differences in such matters as welfare and medicare owe as much to the US's absorption of its financial and intellectual resources in the Cold War, as to any historical political divergence.
- ⁴ See, for example, M. Dorland (ed) *The Cultural Industries in Canada* (Toronto: Lorimer, 1996); R. Lorimer and J. McNulty, *Mass Communication in Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1996); and M. Vipond, *Mass Media in Canada* (Toronto: Lorimer, 1989). See also P. Newman, "The Year of Living Dangerously", *Maclean's*, 20 December, 1999 for a critical review of the current situation of the Canadian economy in relation to US control.
- ⁵ P. Rutherford, "Made in America: the Problem of Mass Culture in Canada". In D. Flaherty and F. Manning (eds), *The Beaver Bites Back* (Montreal: McGill, 1993), p.275.
- ⁶ The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, for example, after it transmits Canadian drama, will produce figures which purport to demonstrate that, in spite of the range of television channels open to viewers, such productions attract a surprisingly large number of viewers. Furthermore Statistics Canada reports that in 1996-97 over half of domestic revenues in the Canadian book market accrued to indigenous companies. For an extended analysis see R. Lorimer, "Book Publishing", in Dorland, op cit.
- ⁷ See T. Magder, "Film and Video Production", in Dorland, op cit.

- ⁸ For a discussion of EU policy in this area see M. Hirsch and V.G. Petersen, "Regulation of the Media at the European Level". In K. Siune and W. Truetzschler (eds), *Dynamics of Media Politics* (London: Sage, 1992).
- ⁹ For a discussion of the distinctiveness of the Quebec situation see K. Yakabuski, "Quebec Industry expected to fend off US invasion", *Globe and Mail*, 7 June 1999. The fortnightly news magazine, *L'Actualite*, has a circulation of 190,000, compared to *Maclean's* 510,000.
- ¹⁰ Vipond, op cit, p.28
- ¹¹ These figures are taken from a 'Backgrounder' produced by the Heritage Department of the Canadian government in 1997. For an extensive discussion of the market situation see L. Dubinsky, "Periodical Publishing", in Dorland, op cit.
- ¹² See Ted Magder, *Franchising the Candy Store: Split Run Magazines and the New International Regime for Trade and Culture* (Orono, Maine: University of Maine, 1998).
- ¹³ In its February 1999 edition the magazine offered its readers several pictures of female genitals (and asked readers to decide which belonged to Ms Copps; the minister proposed to sue, but after an apology was issued by way of an advertisement in a newspaper in Ms Copps's Hamilton, Ontario constituency, the action was abandoned.
- ¹⁴ Government of Canada 1999 *Bill C-55*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.
- ¹⁵ See the web site of Canadian Heritage for up to date details—www.pch.gc.ca
- ¹⁶ See, for example, H. Scoffield, "Publishers greet split-run deal with dismay", *Globe and Mail*, 27 May 1999; but see, too, the same paper's editorial on 28 May—"A bold new era for Canadian magazines"—which is rather more sanguine about the prospects for magazines and readers, and very critical of Sheila Copps' efforts. For the situation in Quebec see note 9.
- ¹⁷ See B. Milner and G. Fraser, "US magazines poised to pounce", *Globe and Mail*, 27 May 1999; and H. Scoffield, "Women's magazines in peril with new deal", *ibid*, 28 May 1999.
- ¹⁸ The Canada Council, like other such bodies elsewhere in the world, has subsidised arts magazines for many years.
- ¹⁹ See H. Scoffield, "Magazine deal held up; US worried about Copps", *Globe and Mail*, 2 June 1999.
- ²⁰ K. Acheson and C. Maule, *Much Ado about Culture: North American Trade Disputes* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2001), p.205.

- ²¹ These figures are compiled by the Canadian Audit Bureau of Circulation. For a comparison of the two operations, see V. Ross, “Time: the first split-run war”, *Globe and Mail*, 27 May, 1999.
- ²² See Jude Davies, *Diana, a Cultural History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001).
- ²³ W. Soderlund, M. Lee, and P. Gecelovsky, “Trends in Canadian Newspaper Coverage of International News, 1988–2000: Editors’ Assessments”, *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 27, 1, 2002.
- ²⁴ See *Royal Commission on Newspapers*, (Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services, 1981), chap. 10.
- ²⁵ Acheson and Maule, *op cit*, p. 332.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express his thanks to the anonymous reviewer employed by the Journal and to his colleague, Hugh O’Donnell, for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article.

