MASTER'S THESIS

M-1084

ROGERS, Don B.

THE PRESS AND THE POLITICAL PROCESS IN
CANADA--A CASE STUDY OF THE 1965 ELECTION
CAMPAIGN.

Carleton University, M.A., 1966
Political Science, general

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

© DON B. ROGERS 1967

All Rights Reserved

**THE PRESS AND THE POLITICAL PROCESS
IN CANADA — A CASE STUDY OF THE
1965 ELECTION CAMPAIGN**

by

Don B. Rogers, B.A.

**A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in the Institute of Canadian Studies**

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Canada
September, 1966.**

The undersigned hereby recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies acceptance of this thesis, submitted by
Don B. Rogers, B.A., in partial fulfilment of the require-
ments for the degree of Master of Arts.

Robert L. McDougall
.....
Director, Institute of Canadian
Studies.

Wesley Eggleston
.....
Supervisor

.....
External Examiner

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

The purpose of this study is to attempt to determine whether our daily newspapers are fulfilling their role -- as outlined in the social responsibility theory of the press -- of providing the public with full, accurate, and politically unbiased election campaign coverage.

The contents of the three Toronto daily newspapers during the final week of the 1965 federal election campaign are analysed. Information about the press election coverage was punched on I.B.M. cards, and programmed through an I.B.M. 1710 computer, to yield the desired information.

The specific objectives of this inquiry are twofold. The first is to test the following three hypotheses regarding the newspaper's election coverage:

1. The ratio of favourable/unfavourable coverage given each party varies according to a newspaper's editorial approval or disapproval of that party.
2. The amount of favourable coverage given each party varies according to a newspaper's editorial approval or disapproval of that party.
3. The amount of favourable coverage in desirable locations within a newspaper varies according to the newspaper's editorial approval or disapproval of that party.

The second specific objective is to develop a mathematical "index of bias" by which the political bias of a newspaper towards a party can be measured and graphically plotted. The index combines two factors -- the amount of a party's coverage, and its popular vote at the previous election -- together to form a uniform scale by which any newspaper's political bias in election coverage can be measured and compared.

In the case of the two major parties, the statistical results of the content analysis study substantiate the three hypotheses -- but with a few significant exceptions. Regarding the minor parties, it is concluded that the hypotheses are inapplicable to them, because they are totally ignored by the newspapers in their editorials, and thus no official indication of the newspaper's editorial approval or disapproval of them can be obtained.

The index of bias is successfully developed, using the logarithms of the respective amounts of election coverage, and previous popular vote; and is then plotted on a graph. The indices of bias derived from the content analysis of the previous part of this study clearly reinforce its findings. All three Toronto newspapers display marked political biases in their

election coverage. The Globe and Mail is quite favourably biased toward the Conservatives, moderately biased against the Liberals, and very strongly biased against the N.D.P. The Star is moderately biased against the Conservatives, very slightly biased against the Liberals, and slightly biased in favour of the N.D.P. The Telegram displays a strong favourable bias to the Conservatives, is slightly biased against the N.D.P., and strongly biased against the Liberals.

The inquiry concludes that, based on the results of a study of the three Toronto journals, our press still has some distance to cover before it fulfills the social responsibility concept of full, accurate, and politically unbiased coverage of election campaigns.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the course of preparing this thesis, the author has profited from helpful advice and assistance from many sources, to which he is deeply indebted.

More particularly, my acknowledgement and personal thanks goes: -- to my thesis supervisor, Wilfrid Eggleston, of the School of Journalism and the Institute of Canadian Studies of Carleton University, for his time, interest, advice, encouragement, and much-needed criticism. I am fortunate in having had a thesis supervisor who could pass on to me some of his experience gained from both within the journalistic profession, and also from outside of the profession, as a keen observer of it. -- to Professor R. R. March, of Carleton University's Department of Political Science, who first introduced me to the methods of social sciences research, who encouraged and followed the progress of preparing this paper, and who supplied me on occasion with the key to Carleton's Data Processing Centre; -- to Mr. Douglas Fisher, Visiting Fellow of the Institute of Canadian Studies, 1965-66, for many fascinating anecdotes about the operations of our press and our parliament;

-- to Professor T. H. Qualter, Chairman of the Department of Political Science, University of Waterloo, for his observations and suggestions given at a lengthy interview in January 1966, in which he pointed out several potential pitfalls of such a project and thus saved me considerable time and disappointment later;

-- to Mr. Sam Levene of the Public Affairs Department of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, for permitting me to rummage happily through his files, and providing me with photostatic copies of scripts and interviews of "The Public Eye" program which he produces;

-- to Mr. G. W. Rogers, Head of the Mathematics Department of East York Collegiate, Toronto (not to mention my uncle), for his skilled guidance for my flights into the world of higher mathematics;

-- to Mr. Dennis Smith, Computer Laboratory, Faculty of Engineering, University of Toronto, who showed unusually benign tolerance towards an artsman, and was of tremendous assistance to me in the programming and processing of the data for this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Survey of Relevant Literature	10
3.	The Hypotheses	13
	1. Methods	13
	2. Results	25
4.	The Index of Bias	53
	1. Methods	53
	2. Results	65
5.	Discussion	74
	1. General	74
	2. The <u>Globe and Mail</u>	76
	3. The <u>Toronto Star</u>	77
	4. The <u>Toronto Telegram</u>	79
6.	Suggestions for Further Research	81
7.	Conclusion	84

Chapter		Page
8.	List of References.....	90
9.	Appendices.....	94

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1.1 Amount of Election Coverage (absolute).....	26
Table 1.2 Amount of Election Coverage (relative)	28
Table 2.1 Election Coverage -- Editorials	30
Table 3.1 Election Coverage -- Favourable and Unfavourable (I).....	31
Table 3.2 Election Coverage -- Favourable and Unfavourable (II).....	32
Table 4.1 Quantity of Election Coverage.....	37
Table 4.2 Election Coverage -- Party Leaders (I) ...	40
Table 4.3 Election Coverage -- Party Leaders (II) ..	41
Table 5.1 Election Coverage -- Location within Paper.....	43
Table 5.2 Election Coverage -- Desirable and Un- desirable Locations within News- paper (I).....	45
Table 5.3 Election Coverage -- Desirable and Un- desirable Locations within News- paper (II)	46
Table 5.4 Election Coverage -- Page One	51
Table 6.1 Election Coverage -- Indices of Bias	67

TABLE OF CHARTS

	Page
Chart 6.1 Indices of Bias--National(I).....	60
Chart 6.2 Indices of Bias--National(II)	60
Chart 6.3 Indices of Bias--Ontario(I)	68
Chart 6.4 Indices of Bias--Ontario(II)	69
Chart 6.5 Indices of Bias--Local (I)	70
Chart 6.6 Indices of Bias--Local (II)	71

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

One of the fundamental features of modern-democratic societies is the periodic holding of free, universal-suffrage elections. In these elections, the people, singly and collectively, entrust their sovereignty for a limited time to a legislative body and, directly or indirectly, to an executive body. During the brief moment on election day as each individual voter inside a polling booth marks his ballot, sovereignty is actually exercised at the popular level.

Many studies have been conducted in an attempt to gain a clearer understanding of the factors which determine how that voter inside the polling station will vote.¹ Studies in this field are conducted at all levels, from academic research to popular public opinion polls, to "back-room" strategy sessions. Studies of voting behavior are still in an embryonic stage, due in no small part to the fantastically complex interrelationships between the multifarious factors which impinge on the voter and affect, in some degree, his all-important decision of how to vote,

¹ V. O. Key, Public Opinion and American Democracy, New York, Knopf, 1961; also H. A. Bone and Austin Ranney, Politics and Voters, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1963.

or indeed whether to vote at all. To borrow an analogy from the physical sciences, we might consider the voter as continuously in a state of dynamic equilibrium -- the equilibrium resulting from the resolution of the many external forces of diverse direction and intensity, which act on the voter.

One of these external forces or factors which in some way influence the voter's choice is the mass communications media. Indeed it is not an overstatement to assert that in the modern, highly-industrialized liberal-democratic states, election campaigns are no longer fought directly on the hustings, but instead are fought indirectly in the printed and electronic media. The old-time hustings meetings have given way to modern blockbuster extravaganzas, staged primarily for the purpose of corraling press, television, and radio coverage for transmittal to a vast, removed audience.²

Thus the communications media comprise one of the variables which affect voting behavior. Within the communications media, moreover, there are a further set of variable factors which affect the net impact of mass communications as

²In 1959, 90 percent of all Americans read at least part of a daily newspaper, -- H. A. Bone & A. Ranney, Politics and Voters, McGraw Hill, N. Y., 1963; p. 36. In Canada last year, 92% of all households had a television set, which was viewed an average of 6 hrs. 2 min. per day -- "T.V. Basics", pamphlet issued annually by the Television Bureau of Advertising, Toronto, Canada.

a whole on voting behavior. Harold Lasswell defined the process of mass communications as:

Who...

Says What...

To Whom...

In What Channel

Continuing on the same train of thought, Paul J. Deutschmann³ summarized the variables of the communication process as:

1. The communicator or source - - -symbolized as C
2. The message or content - - - - - M
3. The channel or medium - - - - - Ch
4. The receiver or audience - - - - - R

Deutschmann then formalized the effects of the communication process as the function,

$$E = f (C, M, Ch, R)$$

Bearing in mind that E is itself one of the variables which determine voting behavior, Deutschmann's technique may be used to illustrate the complete system of variables which affect voting behavior, (V); and which keep the voter in the state of dynamic equilibrium:

³ Paul J. Deutschmann, "Measurement in Communication Research", in R. W. Nafziger & D. M. White (ed.), Introduction to Mass Communications Research, Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1958; p. 170.

$$V = f (X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots X_n, E)$$

where

$$E = f (C, M, Ch, R)$$

or, when joined into one function:

$$V = f (X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots X_n, C, M, Ch, R)$$

The purpose of this study is to examine the Toronto newspapers' coverage of the 1965 Canadian General Election campaign, by conducting a systematic content analysis of election material contained in these newspapers. Thus, this inquiry shall deal primarily with the "M" factor (i.e. message and content) of Deutschmann's communication process function. This paper will not attempt to examine systematically the effects, (E), of the communication process -- in this case the effects of the election coverage of the three Toronto daily newspapers -- on voting behavior. Such a study could indeed form the basis of a separate thesis entirely. Nonetheless, brief references to this complex question may be made.

The particular objective of this content analysis is to look for political bias in the three Toronto daily newspapers' coverage of the 1965 federal election campaign -- political bias in the form of (a) favourable or unfavourable nature of election coverage, (b) quantity of coverage, and (c) location of election

coverage within a newspaper.

A second major purpose of this study is to attempt to establish, using the results of the content analysis, a mathematical "index of newspaper bias", which can be calculated uniformly for all newspapers, and which would facilitate meaningful comparisons of political bias between various newspapers, based on their election coverage. To the best of the author's knowledge, such an index of newspaper bias has not been developed previously.

In An Introduction to the Social Sciences, Maurice

Duverger noted that:

Sociological laws, structures, types and classifications have no absolute character and are general only within the limits of a historical context. All analyses in the social sciences are relative to a certain moment in a historical period and to a certain geographical area.⁴

Accordingly, the content analysis and the search for political bias, which are the purposes of this paper, gain further significance when viewed in historical perspective of the development of the philosophy of freedom of the press.

For two centuries following the introduction of mechanical printing in Europe by Gutenberg and in England by Caxton, in 1454 and 1476 respectively -- the press went through a

⁴Maurice Duverger, An Introduction to the Social Sciences, New York, Praeger, 1964; p. 33.

period of authoritarian control by the state. This control was consistent with the then-existing doctrine of absolute power of the monarch, his government, or both -- a doctrine implanted both by tradition and by the writings of contemporary political theorists such as Jean Bodin and Thomas Hobbes. A royal patent or license was necessary in order to publish, and publications were subject to censorship. The chief purpose of the authoritarian press was to support and advance the policies of the government; thus, criticism of political machinery and of officials in power was verboten.

Beginning with the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the Bill of Rights of the following year,⁵ there slowly evolved in England and her American Colonies a libertarian doctrine of freedom of the press -- in contrast to the previous authoritarian doctrine. The replacement of authoritarian by the libertarian doctrine of the press was gradual, and not without regressions. It paralleled the widening of the base of political power (and the increasing constitutional checks on the monarchy), culminating with the Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867. This was the era of John Locke, Thomas Paine, and John Stuart Mill; of rationalism

⁵ The 1689 Bill of Rights, however, made no specific reference to the press -- F. Siebert et al., Four Theories of the Press, Urbana, U. of Illinois Press, 1963, 47.

and natural rights. The role of the libertarian press was not to advance the policies of government, but rather to act as a check on government. The press played a vital part as a "market place of ideas", and only from the "self-righting" interplay of conflicting ideas could the truth emerge. Freedom of the press was stretched to its widest meaning; and, indeed, was sometimes interpreted (for example in the early American Press) to mean freedom to distort the news, freedom to slander, freedom to conduct "trial by newspaper", and freedom to indulge in political manipulation, patronage, and "King making".

In the twentieth century, the social responsibility doctrine of the press has gained wide acceptance in Western liberal democracies. A logical consequent of the libertarian doctrine, it has been developed in the twentieth century in response to the excesses of the laissez-faire libertarian press, to the growth in size and corporate complexity of modern newspapers, and to the consolidation of ownership of the mass media.⁶ The social responsibility doctrine, as enunciated in the 1947 Report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, and in the 1949 British Royal Commission on the Press, has as its chief purpose -- like the libertarian doctrine -- the discovery of truth through

⁶See John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1965, Chapt. XV.

conflict of ideas; however, the social responsibility doctrine continues, the press must play indeed a positive role in ensuring that all contending ideas are brought before the public and given a hearing.

Thus for the first time, a "free" press was also assigned an obligation -- that of social responsibility. It is important to note, however, that such social responsibility was to be self-imposed by the press itself -- a self-imposition influenced by professional ethics, community opinion, and consumer action. The social responsibility doctrine has paid lip-service to the right of government intervention to insure social responsibility, but only after the press itself has clearly defaulted on self-regulation. The press has no desire for government regulation, and has accordingly made progress in regulating itself from within the profession. The social responsibility doctrine of the press is a relatively recent and not-yet-fully-defined conception, centred mostly in the United States, Britain, Canada, and the Scandinavian countries.

Thus, the development of our press has been briefly traced -- beginning with the authoritarian doctrine of the press, which gradually gave way to the libertarian doctrine, which in turn evolved into our present social responsibility doctrine of the press. This paper is now ready to examine a particular aspect of this doctrine.

The Commission on Freedom of the Press listed one of the requirements of a socially responsible press as providing the public with "full access to the day's intelligence". But do our newspapers, in their election campaign coverage, really fulfill this requirement of full access to the day's intelligence, in the amount of coverage given each political party? ... or the "favourableness" of each party's coverage? ... or the location within the paper of a party's coverage?

The conducting of a limited content analysis of election press coverage should prove helpful in answering the above questions, and in reaching some tentative conclusions on how well our newspapers are fulfilling this requirement of a socially responsible press, by providing full access to the day's intelligence.

CHAPTER 2

SURVEY OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Comparatively little has been written about election coverage by the mass media, and most of the studies which have been conducted on this topic have been confined to studies of the mass media in the United States.

A good source of individual studies, discussion of methods, and criticisms, is the Journalism Quarterly, published for the Association for Education in Journalism by the University of Minnesota Press, and the Public Opinion Quarterly, published for the American Association for Public Opinion Research by Princeton University Press. Both of these journals are indispensable for up-to-date information on this topic.

Several American books contain sections which are relevant to this study, although none have been found which parallel it. Particularly useful are: R. O. Nafziger and D. M. White (ed.), Introduction to Mass Communications Research, (Louisiana State University, 1958); B. Berelson & M. Janowitz, (ed.) Reader

in Public Opinion and Communication, (Free Press, 2nd edn, 1966); I. S. Pool, Trends in Content Analysis, (University of Illinois Press, 1959); and D. G. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, (McKay Co., Inc., 1964).

In Canada, a few informative articles on press coverage of federal election campaigns have been written. The first of these was in 1949, when an article appeared in Macleans Magazine (Aug. 15, 1949) titled "How Toronto's Evening Papers Slanted the Election News", which conducted a non-statistical comparison of the 1949 election campaign coverage of the Toronto Star and The Telegram. During the 1962 federal campaign, Pierre Berton wrote two columns in the Toronto Star (May 17 and June 14), in which he presented a statistical comparison of the election coverage of the three Toronto dailies. Although presented in a popular newspaper column, and not of great statistical complexity, the data had been thoroughly prepared by a free-lance researcher. An extensive content analysis of the 1962 campaign coverage by eight Ontario newspaper, conducted by Professors T. H. Qualter and K. A. MacKirdy of the University of Waterloo, published in J. Meisel (ed.), Papers on the 1962 Election, (U. of T. Press, 1964), provided many useful ideas for this paper.⁷

⁷I am particularly grateful to Professor Qualter for his time, comments, and suggestions at an interview at the University of Waterloo in January, 1966.

The above works were the most useful of the many consulted, for the preparation of this inquiry. The complete bibliography appears at the end.

CHAPTER 3

THE HYPOTHESES

1. Methods

The focus of the search for political bias on the three Toronto newspapers' coverage of the 1965 federal election campaign, using data obtained from a systematic content analysis of these newspapers, will be the following three hypotheses:

1. The ratio of favourable/unfavourable coverage given each party varies according to a newspaper's editorial approval or disapproval of that party.
2. The amount of favourable coverage given each party varies according to a newspaper's editorial approval or disapproval of that party.
3. The amount of favourable coverage in desirable locations within a newspaper varies according to the newspaper's editorial approval or disapproval of that party.

These three hypotheses are not new. Variations have been used in other studies of the press. However, as suggested

by the historical framework of freedom of the press discussed earlier, and by the present uncertainty in many minds whether the press is fulfilling its social responsibility role in society, a fresh examination of these hypotheses is appropriate.

Hypothesis 1 examines the allotment of favourable and unfavourable coverage between the political parties for each of the Toronto papers. This is particularly significant. Without a qualitative breakdown of favourable and unfavourable coverage, the quantitative breakdown of newspaper space devoted to each party could be deceptive, since no amount of election coverage benefits the reported party if that coverage is unfavourable! In Hypothesis 1, the independent variable is the newspaper's editorial approval or disapproval of a political party, and the dependent variable is the ratio of favourable /unfavourable election coverage given that party by the newspaper.

The practical value of Hypothesis 2 lies in the fact that the data obtained through testing this hypothesis by means of a content analysis provides a good overall "barometer" indicator of a newspaper's political bias in election coverage. It is from the results of testing this hypothesis that the index of newspaper bias will be derived. The editorial support of a

newspaper is again the independent variable, while the amount of favourable election coverage given a party by the paper forms the dependent variable. It should be noted that in this and the following hypothesis, only favourable coverage will be tabulated. Having examined and noted in Hypothesis 1 the breakdown between favourable and unfavourable coverage, this project will proceed to examine further the breakdowns of favourable coverage only.

Hypothesis 3 affords a different perspective by examining the location within a newspaper of the favourable coverage of the various political parties. The practical value of this hypothesis as a measure of a newspaper's political bias is less precise than Hypothesis 2, especially since communication psychologists and social experimenters are still very unclear on the discrepancies in the impact on the reader caused by differences in location of an item within the newspaper. However, Hypothesis 3 provides an interesting, if somewhat rough, check on the results of testing Hypothesis 2. The independent variable in Hypothesis 3 is again the newspaper's editorial approval or disapproval of a political party, while the dependent variable is the amount of favourable election coverage in favourable locations of the newspaper.

The scale upon which the variables (both independent and dependent) are to be measured, is primarily a quantitative one -- quantities of election coverage. The column-centimetre was selected as the unit measure of election coverage, rather than the customary column-inch, both to facilitate mental calculations involving decimals, and to provide a smaller and hence more accurate single unit when "rounding off" measurements to the nearest whole unit. The column-centimetre as the quantitative unit of measurement has proven quite satisfactory, and has not appreciably impeded the analysis of the results of the inquiry, since these results are expressed in relative, rather than absolute terms -- in percentages rather than column -centimetres. Indeed, some future archivist may well be spared the task of converting the numerical portions of this study into metric units when the changeover to the metric system finally overtakes North America, as overtake us it must!

Certain rules for the quantitative measurement of items have been adopted to maintain consistency of measurement. It was decided that printed items would be measured from beginning to end of the text, and that photographs, cartoons, drawings, and maps would be measured from edge to edge, including caption where applicable. In order to introduce an element of emphasis re item

headings and borders, it was decided that headings would be measured along with the appropriate item; thus the measurement of a large heading over an item would be included with that item, increasing its overall length and hence giving it extra "weight" in the statistical summary. Similarly it was felt that a display border around an item gave it extra predominance, and, to reflect this predominance, the quantitative measurement of such an item includes all the space enclosed within the border.

It should be noted, however, that this study does not incorporate any separate "weighting" factor or scale, to lend emphasis to particular items on the basis of location on a page, or location within a paper. An example of "weighting" re location of an item on a page can be found in Sydney Kobre, "How Florida Dailies Handled the 1952 Presidential Campaign", in Journalism Quarterly, 1953, page 163ff; while an example of "weighting" re location of an item within a newspaper is contained in Robert Batlin, "San Francisco Newspapers' Campaign Coverage: 1896, 1952", in Journalism Quarterly, 1954, page 279ff. Again, while this writer acknowledges that the location of an item is a factor in the amount of impact it has on the reader, the lack of an accepted and conclusive "weighting" scale or factor

has led him to avoid introducing such factors into this study. Instead, Hypothesis 3 has been proposed, to facilitate a separate quantitative examination of the location of items within a newspaper.

In this study, the column-centimetre which was used as the quantitative unit of measurement,⁴ ^{was} calculated on the basis of the standard nine-columns-per page newspaper format. Thus in the case of the editorial page, page seven, or whenever a column of a different width was used, the length of the item was multiplied by an appropriate corrective factor to yield an equivalent column-centimetre measurement in terms of the standard-width column. For example, if an item were being measured on a page with seven instead of the standard nine columns, the item length in column-centimetres would be multiplied by a corrective factor of $9/7$. It was found that this operation could be carried out quickly, and with satisfactory accuracy, with the aid of a small slide rule.

Qualitative measurement of a kind is also used, although to a much lesser degree. Qualitative measurement has been taken into account in the classification of the variables by the writer, in the data coding process.

For example, one of the most important qualitative measurements in this study is the classification of newspaper election coverage as either favourable or unfavourable to a political party. As with all the qualitative measurements in this inquiry, no scale of units of measurement was devised or deemed necessary. In this case, all items were simply classified by the coder as either favourable or unfavourable to the political party which the item covered.⁸

This bifurcation of coverage into favourable and unfavourable components did necessitate the coder making a subjective decision for each item of election coverage. Accordingly, a discussion regarding the criteria which were adopted in classifying coverage as favourable or unfavourable, is in order at this point.

Generally, election items in the press were considered to be favourable to the political party covered in that item. Only if the coverage was clearly critical of the party, or placed the party in a bad light beyond a reasonable doubt, was the coverage classified as unfavourable.

⁸Originally, a third classification -- neutral -- was contemplated. However a trial run of coding indicated that so very few of the items coded were neutral, that the neutral classification was statistically insignificant. It was accordingly dropped.

Thus, press coverage of a party's rally, or a candidate's speech, or a party leader's campaign progress were, when reported without comment, accepted at face value as favourable to the political party concerned, inasmuch as the coverage gave the party publicity, or transmitted a candidate's views to the reader, or reminded the reader of a party leader's activities and whereabouts. Further, as Professors McKirdy and Qualter pointed out, the coding of coverage as favourable or unfavourable is necessarily restricted to what actually appears in the press, and does not include the also-important factor of what may have been omitted and did not appear.

An example of unfavourable coverage during the week under consideration was separate press items about the "bomb scare" at the Prime Minister's Montreal rally. Both the Star and The Telegram ran lead stories devoted only to the bomb incident, and both these stories were classified as unfavourable. A second story in each paper, about the rally itself, was coded favourable in the Star, because it dwelt on the Prime Minister's speech, and unfavourable in The Telegram because it concentrated again on details of the disorders at the rally. The classification of election coverage items into favourable and unfavourable, in general, required considerable thought and judgement.

Occasionally, however, the press made the coder's task quite simple. Consider the following short item which appeared on page one of the Toronto Telegram's last issue before the election:

EDDY CAN'T CAST HIS LIBERAL VOTE

OTTAWA (Staff) -- Lucien Rivard's wife Marie, Eddy Lachasseur, and murder suspect Robert Gignac yesterday complained they will not be able to vote Monday.

They must be in Ottawa for former Liberal Government aide Raymond Denis' preliminary hearing.

"I would like to vote Liberal," commented Lechasseur who is free on \$10,000 bail involving fraud charges.

The coder took the liberty of classifying the above item as unfavourable.

Certain themes which appeared in the press during the week were classified as news rather than election coverage, and were not included in this study. Among the topics so treated as news were organized crime in Quebec, the preliminary hearing of ex-government aide Raymond Denis (if no reference made to the election), the proposed Prince Edward Island causeway, and the "Marcoux affair".⁹

⁹Dr. Guy Marcoux, a sitting Social Credit M.P., charged that a clandestine deal had been made between the Liberal government and six Social Credit members, to sustain the minority Liberal government in power. The charge was investigated by the Quebec attorney-general's department and no evidence to confirm the accusation was found.

Certain limitations to this study became necessary, and are all indirectly due to the time factor. Because this research project is a one-man effort, it was necessary to limit severely the scope of the inquiry, or, alternatively, to expand the inquiry into a long-term research undertaking (with generous grants from some benevolent foundation, of course!)

Accordingly, it was necessary to limit the content analysis study of the election coverage of the three Toronto daily newspapers to a one-week period. Rather than selecting six individual days at random, or six consecutive days at random, or some other random sample the last six days of the election campaign, November 1-6, 1965, were selected for study. The main reason for this selection was the twofold assumption that, since all parties attempt to "peak" their campaigns in the week prior to voting, the maximum amount of election coverage would appear during that period; and, that the election coverage would be more widely read and absorbed during this period. By happy coincidence, each of the three largest political parties staged a mammoth election rally in the area during this last week -- the Liberals and Conservatives in Hamilton, and the N.D.P. in Toronto. For each day of the week under study, the same edition of each newspaper was used, to ensure consistency.

Another limitation of this study is that the analysis does not consider multiparty items of newspaper election coverage, i.e. items dealing with two or more parties. The writer is of the opinion that multiparty items do not carry as much impact on the reader as do single party items; and, lacking a "weighting" system to assign weighted values to single and multiparty items, it was decided to consider in the content analysis only the single party items.

Two alternate methods of affixing a party label to election coverage should be mentioned briefly. Had either of these methods been used, there would have arisen no distinction between single and multiparty coverage.

The first method, used by free-lance researcher Marilyn Douglas in preparing both Pierre Berton's election coverage survey¹⁰, and a C. B. C. - T. V. "Public Eye" program¹¹, involves the classification and measurement of

¹⁰ Pierre Berton, "Election Coverage of Three Toronto Papers", in Paul Fox (ed.), Politics: Canada, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962.

¹¹ C.B.C. -T.V. program, "The Public Eye", aired November 2, 1965. Produced by Sam Levene, C.B.C. Public Affairs Dept., who kindly made the programme's script available to the author.

paragraphs rather than complete items. Thus a multiparty item would be examined on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, the length of each paragraph being apportioned to the appropriate political party. However, this method can, I believe, be deceptive, since a few paragraphs about one party sandwiched within a story about another party weakens the impact of the coverage for both parties involved.

The second alternate method is rather novel. The unit of measurement selected is the "statement" rather than the column-inch or column-centimetre. This method is quite complicated, and requires sophisticated interpreting of the wording of newspaper coverage. It was rejected for this study as being unnecessarily cumbersome. The method is developed at length in Chilton R. Bush, "The Analysis of Political Campaign News", in Journalism Quarterly, 1951, page 250ff.

The accepted practice of contemporary social sciences research was followed in the physical operations of gathering and recording information. The information was taken from the newspapers under study and recorded on I.B.M. data punch cards, according to a predetermined code. One card was punched per newspaper election item -- 905 in all. The data

was then processed through an I.B.M. 1710 computer to yield results in useful form, from which the Tables of this study were derived. The complete print-outs of the raw data, code, and computer programs appear as appendices to this inquiry.

2. Results

A few general statistics relating to overall total election coverage by the three Toronto dailies is included to preface the more specific statistical studies. As indicated in Table 1.1, the Star carried the most, and the Globe the fewest election coverage items during the last week of the campaign. However, in terms of aggregate space devoted to the election, the Globe ranked first with 28.6 pages of coverage, the Star came second with 28.3 pages, and the Telegram, with 27.0 pages of coverage, ranked third. Thus in the average length of an item of election coverage, the Globe was the highest of the three papers, a finding perhaps consistent with the Globe's claim to more extensive and thoughtful news coverage.

If the amount of election coverage in a paper is calculated relative to the total number of pages in that paper during

TABLE 1.1

Amount of Election Coverage (absolute)^{*}

	I t e m s		C o l . - - c m .		P a g e s ^{**}
Globe	279	30.8%	14430	34.1%	28.6
Star	331	36.6%	14249	33.7%	28.3
Tely	295	32.6%	13596	32.2%	27.0
	<u>905</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>42275</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>83.9</u>

* single and multiparty items favourable
and unfavourable items

** Pages = $\frac{\text{Col. --cm.}}{504}$

the week under consideration, the findings of Table 1.1 are given emphasis. As shown in Table 1.2, the Globe and Mail, with election coverage accounting for 9.1% of its total space, devoted a significantly larger proportion of its pages to covering the election than did either the Star with 7.7% or the Telegram with 7.2% of its space devoted to election coverage.

The total number of pages, used in calculating the relative amount of a paper's election coverage, is comprised of everything in the paper (Weekend Magazine sections excepted), including advertisements. Since classified and display advertising account for over one half of a newspaper's space, it can be safely estimated that election coverage accounted for approximately one fifth of the non-advertising content of the Toronto dailies.

Before testing the three Hypotheses, a discussion of the independent variable of these hypotheses is in order. In each case, the independent variable is the newspaper's editorial approval or disapproval of a political party. Table 2.1 tabulates the editorials dealing with the election, which appeared in the three Toronto newspapers during the week under consideration. Editorials were classified according to political party, and whether favourable or unfavourable to that party. No surprises were

TABLE 1.2

Amount of Election Coverage (relative)*

	<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
Pages coverage	28.6	28.3	27.0
Total pages	314.0	370.0	374.0
Coverage as % of space**	9.1%	7.7%	7.2%

* single and multiparty items;
favourable and unfavourable items

** Coverage as % of space = $\frac{\text{Pages coverage}}{\text{Total pages}}$

found. The Toronto Telegram supported editorially the Conservative party, as did the Globe and Mail, to a lesser degree; and the Toronto Star supported editorially the Liberal party. It should also be noted that both the Globe and the Telegram actually devoted more editorial space to damning the Liberals than to praising the Conservatives. With the exception of one very short Telegram editorial (unfavourable) about the Creditistes, the other four political parties -- N.D.P., Socred, Creditistes, and "Other" -- were completely ignored by the Toronto newspapers' editorials.

Tables 3.1 and 3.2 facilitate the testing of Hypothesis 1. The first point which emerges from Table 3.1 is that all three papers gave each political party more favourable than unfavourable coverage, regardless of editorial approval or disapproval of the parties. However, when the percentage division between favourable and unfavourable coverage is considered, Hypothesis 1 appears to be confirmed, at least in the case of the two major political parties.

Hypothesis 1 is more clearly illustrated in Table 3.2, which is derived directly from the preceding table. Table 3.2 compares "favour ratios", or the quotient obtained through

TABLE 2.1

Election Coverage -- Editorials*

		(Col. --cm.)		
		<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
<u>Liberal</u>	favourable	0	357	0
	unfavourable	409	20	528
<u>Conservative</u>	favourable	128	0	215
	unfavourable	0	136	0
<u>N.D.P.</u>	favourable	0	0	0
	unfavourable	0	0	0
<u>Socred</u>	favourable	0	0	0
	unfavourable	0	0	0
<u>Creditiste</u>	favourable	0	0	0
	unfavourable	0	0	12
<u>Other</u>	favourable	0	0	0
	unfavourable	0	0	0
Paper's editorial support		CONS.	LIB.	CONS.

* single party items

TABLE 3.1

Election Coverage -- Favourable and Unfavourable (I)*

		<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
<u>Liberal</u>				
	favourable	72.4%	89.1%	59.7%
	unfavourable	27.6%	10.9%	40.3%
	100.0%	(3670)	(3817)	(3719)
<u>Conservative</u>				
	favourable	96.5%	74.6%	97.8%
	unfavourable	3.5%	25.4%	2.2%
	100.0%	(3503)	(3636)	(4428)
<u>N.D.P.</u>				
	favourable	85.5%	98.3%	100.0%
	unfavourable	14.5%	1.7%	0.0%
	100.0%	(635)	(1863)	(1062)
<u>Socred</u>				
	favourable	100.0%	100.0%	96.3%
	unfavourable	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%
	100.0%	(167)	(81)	(184)
<u>Creditiste</u>				
	favourable	100.0%	97.9%	91.3%
	unfavourable	0.0%	2.1%	8.7%
	100.0%	(23)	(287)	(207)
<u>Other</u>				
	favourable	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	unfavourable	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	100.0%	(102)	(149)	(102)

* single party items

TABLE 3.2

Election Coverage -- Favourable and Unfavourable (II)*

Favour ratio**

	<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
Liberal	2.6	8.2	1.5
Conservative	27.3	2.9	45.1
N.D.P.	5.9	59.1	∞
Socred	∞	∞	26.3
Creditiste	∞	46.8	10.5
Other	∞	∞	∞

* single party items only

** Favour ratio = $\frac{\text{favourable coverage}}{\text{unfavourable coverage}}$

dividing the amount of favourable coverage by the amount of unfavourable coverage. Because, as previously mentioned, all parties received more favourable than unfavourable coverage, all the ratios in Table 3.2 are greater than one. The symbol, infinity, in the table is difficult to comprehend, and can be considered as simply meaning that all the coverage in the paper for that particular party was favourable.

The Globe and Mail, which supported the Conservative party editorially, gave that party a 27.3 favour ratio, compared to 2.6 for the Liberals and 5.9 for the N.D.P. The Telegram outdid the Globe in its support of the Conservatives, giving the P.C.'s a favour ratio of 45.1, compared to a slim 1.5 for the Liberals. The Toronto Star, which backed the Liberal party, was somewhat more restrained in its favourable election coverage of that party. The Star's favour ratio for the Liberals was 8.2, moderately higher than its 2.9 ratio for the Conservatives.

Tables 3.1 and 3.2 also revealed a very interesting and unexpected occurrence -- one which was also encountered in other tables of this inquiry. The minor parties, especially the Ralliement Creditiste, the Social Credit party, and "Others", have in most instances very high favour ratios. Of course, these high

favour ratios are greatly nullified by the small amount of coverage on which the favour ratio is calculated. For example, the Creditiste's favour ratio in the Globe is infinity, but a glance at Table 3.1 reveals that this ratio is based on a grand total of 23 column-centimetres' coverage. It can be argued that the press is thus compensating for paucity of coverage of the minor parties with higher favour ratios, but the parties concerned would undoubtedly prefer it the other way round. The New Democratic Party appeared to be caught in a never-never land between the two major parties and the minor parties, so far as favour ratios are concerned (not to mention the voters). The N.D.P. has favour ratios varying from 5.9 in the Globe, to 59.1 in the Star, to infinity in the Telegram.

On the basis of this study, it would appear that Hypothesis 1 is substantiated so far as Liberal and Conservative party coverage is concerned. However, at least on the surface, Hypothesis 1 would appear to be refuted in the case of Social Credit, Creditiste, and Other party coverage. But, as pointed out above, these three minor parties have been handled by the press in a manner entirely different from the two major parties. Further, the independent variable of the hypothesis (a newspaper's editorial approval or

disapproval of a party) is difficult to determine accurately, since these parties are completely ignored in the editorial columns of the press. On this basis, it would seem more appropriate to conclude that rather than being refuted by the results of the coverage of the Social Credit, Creditiste, and Other parties, Hypothesis 1 is inapplicable to the coverage of the three minor parties.

Table 4.1 facilitates the testing of Hypothesis 2, and provides a convenient overall assessment of the Toronto newspapers' coverage of the 1965 federal election campaign. Table 4.1 is indeed the keystone of this inquiry.

Considering first the three larger political parties, there emerge interesting and significant differences in the Toronto papers' campaign coverage. The Liberals fared best in the Toronto Star, with 40.2% of the Star's election coverage, and poorest in the Telegram with 27.5%. The Conservatives received 53.6% of the Telegram's campaign coverage, 49.2% of the Globe's, and 32.1% of the Star's. N.D.P. coverage ranged widely from a low of 7.9% in the Globe and Mail, to 13.1% in the Tely, to a substantial 21.7% in the Star. The Star's coverage

would appear to be the most balanced of the Toronto papers, although still favouring the Liberals. The Telegram's coverage was rather unbalanced, and favoured the Conservatives. The Globe and Mail's coverage also favoured the Conservatives,

was more balanced than the Telegram, but less so than the Star. The Globe, however, maintained its partial balance between the Conservatives and the Liberals, mostly at the expense of N.D.P. coverage, and hence somewhat artificially.

In contrast to the fluctuations in their coverage of the major parties, the three Toronto dailies were remarkably consistent in their coverage of the three minor parties. Creditiste coverage varied the most, from a low of .3% in the Globe, to a high of 3.3% in the Star. Social Credit coverage ranged from a low of 1.0% in the Star, to a high of 2.4% in the Globe. Speculation on the fact that Social Credit coverage was highest in the Globe and lowest in the Star -- and Creditiste coverage just the reverse -- is rather risky. However, this fact may be a remnant of the schism in the Social Credit party which occurred in the interim since the previous federal election, when the Creditistes broke from Social Credit ranks to form a separate party. In addition, the Globe and Mail actively supports free enterprise, as does Social Credit, but this factor should be immaterial since

TABLE 4.1

Quantity of Election Coverage*

	<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
Liberal	38.7%	40.2%	27.5%
Conservative	49.2%	32.1%	53.6%
N.D.P.	7.9%	21.7%	13.1%
Socred	2.4%	1.0%	2.3%
Creditiste	.3%	3.3%	2.3%
Other	1.5%	1.8%	1.3%
<u>± 100.0%</u>	(6870)	(8454)	(8089)

* single party items favourable items.

the Creditistes also support free enterprise.

The results in Table 4.1 agree with Hypothesis 2. The results show clearly that the Globe and the Telegram gave more campaign coverage to the Conservative party, and the Star gave more to the Liberal party. The other statistics in Table 4.1 contain no great surprises, and are reasonably consistent with the papers' unofficial editorial approval or disapproval of the political parties. Again, however, the hypothesis cannot be accurately tested in the case of the minor parties, because the newspaper's editorial support of these parties cannot be statistically determined.

An interesting sidelight to the previous discussion is an examination of the quantity of coverage the Toronto newspapers gave specifically to the leaders of the various political parties. The examination of the amount of coverage each of the party leaders received is particularly relevant, because of the high proportion of newspaper campaign coverage which dealt with the party leaders. As indicated in Table 4.2, each paper's coverage of party leaders ranged between one third and two fifths of that paper's total election coverage; hence, the press treatment of the party leaders could be expected to have an above-normal influence on the reader.

The format of Table 4.3 is identical to that of Table 4.1. However, because Table 4.3 tabulates the election coverage of party leaders only, some interesting statistical differences between the two tables can be observed. The most intriguing fact at once apparent is that both the Globe and the Star gave more coverage to the leader of the party which it did not support editorially, than to the leader of the party it did support. Even the Telegram, which did not execute this turnabout and remained faithful to the Conservatives, did narrow the gap between Conservative and Liberal coverage in the case of the party leaders, as compared with the case of its overall campaign coverage. A possible explanation (and an intriguing one at that) for this phenomenon is offered. It is quite possible that all three newspapers believed that Mr. Diefenbaker had become a political liability to the Conservative party and perhaps to the nation, and that extensive press coverage of the Tory leader's electioneering antics would tend to be harmful to that party's chances of election. Thus, the pro-Conservative Globe and Mail, and Telegram felt it expedient to "play down" Mr. Diefenbaker, while the pro-Liberal Toronto Star deliberately kept him before the public in order to subtly discredit the Conservative party. If this explanation for the surprising inconsistency between the newspapers'

TABLE 4.2

Election Coverage -- Party Leaders (I)*

	<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
Total Coverage	6870	8454	8089
Party Leaders	2391	3319	3221
% Coverage Party Leaders	34.8%	39.3%	39.8%

* single party items favourable items

TABLE 4.3

Election Coverage -- Party Leaders (II)*

	<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
Liberal	43.6%	30.1%	30.0%
Conservative	39.9%	30.7%	38.4%
N.D.P.	11.0%	29.5%	20.2%
Socred	4.5%	1.3%	5.5%
Creditiste	1.0%	8.5%	5.9%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<u>± 100.0%</u>	(2391)	(3319)	(3221)

* single party items
favourable items

coverage of the parties, and their leaders, is correct -- and it seems quite plausible -- then this study has uncovered a perfect example of deliberate press manipulation of election coverage in the interests of political expediency.

Tables 5.1 to 5.4 are constructed to test Hypothesis 3, concerning the positioning of election coverage items within the newspaper. This question is of direct relevance to this study, since a newspaper's political bias can easily be reflected by where in the paper the editors decide to locate the many diverse election campaign items which daily flow across their desks.

Table 5.1 provides an extensive breakdown of the Toronto dailies' election coverage, by party and by categories of locations within the papers. The table is somewhat complex, and is presented without discussion; however, if a little time is spent studying Table 5.1, many interesting and striking contrasts in coverage by location within the newspaper will be discerned.

A more workable version of Table 5.1 emerges in Table 5.2 and Table 5.3. In Table 5.2, the location within the

TABLE 5.1

Election Coverage -- Location within Paper*

	<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
<u>Liberal</u>			
page one	19.3%	18.3%	23.6%
other front page	.8%	16.4%	9.8%
editorial & opposite page	16.5%	20.7%	11.8%
election news page	47.6%	21.5%	15.4%
other main news page	.8%	0.0%	12.8%
any other page	15.0%	23.3%	26.6%
<u>± 100.0%</u>	(2656)	(3400)	(2220)
<u>Conservative</u>			
page one	9.4%	16.2%	13.6%
other front page	1.9%	18.7%	12.6%
editorial & opposite page	11.7%	8.2%	13.4%
election news page	64.0%	29.6%	17.3%
other main news page	11.7%	0.0%	14.8%
any other page	1.3%	27.3%	28.2%
<u>± 100.0%</u>	(3379)	(2711)	(4332)
<u>N.D.P.</u>			
page one	9.2%	14.8%	27.9%
other front page	0.0%	9.9%	32.1%
editorial & opposite page	7.7%	18.3%	16.1%
election news page	77.0%	44.6%	4.3%
other main news page	6.1%	0.0%	6.4%
any other page	0.0%	12.5%	13.2%
<u>± 100.0%</u>	(543)	(1832)	(1062)
<u>Socred</u>			
page one	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
other front page	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%
editorial & opposite page	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
election news page	97.6%	91.4%	29.9%
other main news page	0.0%	0.0%	39.7%
any other page	0.0%	8.6%	30.4%
<u>± 100.0%</u>	(167)	(81)	(184)

Table 5.1 (continued)

	<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
<u>Creditiste</u>			
page one	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
other front page	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
editorial & opposite page	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%
election news page	100.0%	85.4%	27.5%
other main news page	0.0%	0.0%	55.0%
any other page	0.0%	8.5%	17.5%
<u>± 100.0%</u>	(23)	(281)	(189)
<u>Other</u>			
page one	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
other front page	4.9%	5.4%	0.0%
editorial & opposite page	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%
election news page	33.3%	59.1%	55.9%
other main news page	34.3%	0.0%	0.0%
any other page	27.5%	22.8%	44.1%
<u>± 100.0%</u>	(102)	(149)	(102)
* single party items favourable items			

TABLE 5.2

Election Coverage -- Desirable and Undesirable
Locations within Newspapers(I)*

		<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
<u>Liberal</u>				
	desirable	85.0%	76.7%	73.4%
	undesirable	15.0%	23.3%	26.6%
	100.0%	(2656)	(3400)	(2220)
<u>Conservative</u>				
	desirable	98.7%	72.7%	71.8%
	undesirable	1.3%	27.3%	28.2%
	100.0%	(3379)	(2711)	(4332)
<u>N.D.P.</u>				
	desirable	100.0%	87.5%	86.8%
	undesirable	0.0%	12.5%	13.2%
	100.0%	(543)	(1832)	(1062)
<u>Socred</u>				
	desirable	100.0%	91.4%	69.6%
	undesirable	0.0%	8.6%	30.4%
	100.0%	(167)	(81)	(184)
<u>Creditiste</u>				
	desirable	100.0%	91.5%	82.5%
	undesirable	0.0%	8.5%	17.5%
	100.0%	(23)	(281)	(189)
<u>Other</u>				
	desirable	72.5%	77.2%	55.9%
	undesirable	27.5%	22.8%	44.1%
	100.0%	(102)	(149)	(102)

* single party items;
favourable items

TABLE 5.3

Election Coverage -- Desirable and Undesirable

Locations within Newspaper (II)*

	Desirable location ratio **		
	<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
Liberal	5.7	3.3	2.8
Conservative	75.9	2.7	2.6
N.D.P.	∞	7.0	6.6
Socred	∞	10.6	2.3
Creditiste	∞	10.8	4.7
Other	2.6	3.4	1.3

* single party items
favourable items

** Desirable location ratio

$$= \frac{\text{coverage in desirable locations}}{\text{coverage in undesirable locations}}$$

paper of each party's coverage is classified simply as either desirable or undesirable. By an arbitrary, though reasoned decision, the first five location categories in Table 5.1 (i.e. page one, other front page, editorial and opposite page, election news page, and other main news page)¹² were designated as desirable locations, while the remaining location category in Table 5.1 (any other page) was designated as an undesirable location.¹³ Table 5.3 is derived directly from the preceding table, and expresses ratios of desirable/undesirable positions within a paper.

In the Globe and Mail, which supported the Conservative party editorially, the Tories had an unusually large desirable location ratio of 75.9, compared with 5.7 for the Liberals. In the Star, the Liberals, with a desirable location

¹²For the purposes of this study, a main news page was defined as a page containing news copy in more than 50% of its area. Similarly, an election news page was defined as a page containing election copy in more than 50% of its area.

¹³A similar designation is made in T. H. Qualter and K. S. McKirdy, "The Press of Ontario and the Election", in John Meisel (ed.), Papers on the 1962 Election, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1964.

ratio of 3.3, came out ahead of the Conservatives whose ratio was 2.7. Thus although both the Globe and the Star gave their editorially-supported political party a greater ratio than it did to the major opposing party, the difference between the two ratios was considerably less in the Star than in the Globe. The Toronto Telegram was a slight exception to Hypothesis 3, since it favoured the Liberals by a very narrow margin in its positioning of election items. The Tely gave the Liberal party a desirable location ratio of 2.8, while the Conservatives were close behind with a 2.6 ratio.

The Globe and Mail was the most generous of the Toronto papers in its positioning of N.D.P., Socred, and Creditiste coverage. Each of these parties had all of its Globe and Mail coverage in desirable locations. The Telegram was the least generous in this respect, while the Star ranked in the middle.

As was the case in Tables 3.1 and 3.2, the minor parties -- Social Credit, Creditiste, and Others, are treated quite differently from the two major political parties. In this instance, the three minor parties received a surprisingly high percentage of their press coverage in desirable locations within the papers. Again, the explanation is readily available. Be -

cause of the smallness of the press coverage of the minor parties, on which the percentages of Table 5.2 and the ratios of Table 5.3 are based, these statistics are not a fully reliable measure of the newspapers' political bias in their positioning of the minor parties' election coverage, and must be read with a certain amount of skepticism. The N.D.P., as usual, found itself in the limbo between the major parties and the splinter groups.

Thus, with one minor exception, Tables 5.1 to 5.3 substantiate Hypothesis 3 so far as the Liberal and Conservative party coverage is concerned. Further, for the reasons discussed previously, it can be concluded that Hypothesis 3 is inapplicable to the press coverage of the three minor parties.

In Table 5.2 the location of election coverage within a newspaper was classified as either desirable or undesirable. The desirable classification was made up of five different types of locations. However, some of these five locations within a paper are certainly more desirable than others, especially the page one location. Indeed, it has been estimated that about 98% of all newspaper readers read something on the first page, compared with about only 58% who read some item on any other given

page.¹⁴ The special importance of page one makes it a super-desirable location, and makes appropriate a separate examination of press election coverage on page one of the Toronto newspapers. In Table 5.4 it can be seen that the Telegram allotted more of its page one election campaign coverage to the Conservative party than to the Liberals, giving 41.8% of its page one coverage to the Tories, and 37.2% to the Grits. In the Star, the Liberals fared better, with 46.7% of the Star's page one coverage compared with 33.0% for the Conservatives. In this instance, the absolute difference in percent coverage between the two major parties was narrower in the Telegram. The biggest surprise was the Globe and Mail, in which the Liberal party received a substantial 58.3% of the front page election coverage, considerably more than the Conservatives' 36.1%. The N.D.P. did poorly on the Globe's front page, with only 5.7% of the page one election coverage, but fared considerably better on the front pages of the other two papers, with 21.0% of the Telegram's page one election coverage, and 20.4% of the Star's. The three minor parties were completely ignored on the front page of the Toronto papers. Thus, the splinter parties,

¹⁴Theodore Peterson et al., The Mass Media and Modern Society, New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston Inc., 1965, 126.

TABLE 5.4

Election Coverage -- Page One*

	<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
Liberal	58.3%	46.7%	37.2%
Conservative	36.1%	33.0%	41.8%
N.D.P.	5.7%	20.4%	21.0%
Socred	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Creditiste	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<u>± 100.0%</u>	(879)	(1331)	(1410)

* single party items;
favourable items

as well as receiving very little overall press coverage, were further hindered by not receiving any of their limited coverage on page one, where the greatest readership is concentrated.

Table 5.4 provides a further test of Hypothesis 3.

Regarding the two major political parties, Hypothesis 3 appears to be confirmed by the data obtained from the content analysis in the case of the Star and Telegram. However, the Globe and Mail, in this particular instance of page one coverage, appears to have contradicted the Hypothesis. The Liberal's margin of page one coverage over the Conservative in the Globe and Mail is too large to be explained away by the "breaking government news" theory, and, hence, remains an enigma.

CHAPTER 4

THE INDEX OF BIAS

1. Methods

Mathematical techniques are improved versions of the comparative method. The expression of phenomena by figures and symbols allows a large number to be compared simultaneously, their respective characteristics can be set against one another with great accuracy, and their analysis taken much further. In striving to introduce 'quantification' and mathematics into their disciplines as far as possible, specialists in the social sciences, contrary to what many laymen think, are not merely deferring to a fashion, but are recognizing that mathematics provides analytical tools incomparably more effective than classical comparative methods.

-- Maurice Duverger¹⁵

Time and resources placed severe limitations on the scope of the content analysis conducted in the previous sections of this paper. Accordingly, it soon became apparent that the value of this research study of political bias in the Toronto dailies' election coverage would be increased if some common yardstick or uniform mathematical measuring scale of political bias could be devised which would facilitate comparisons. The

¹⁵ M. Duverger, Social Sciences, 277.

measure of political bias envisioned would permit the comparison both of diverse Canadian newspapers coast-to-coast, and also of particular papers over the period of several federal elections. Thus, the results of many limited studies such as that conducted in the previous chapter of this paper could be pooled in a meaningful way, leading to a better overall understanding of the role of the press in Canadian politics, and perhaps to some general theories of political bias in newspaper election coverage.

It was decided that an index of bias could be developed by comparing the direction and the magnitude of the difference between the amount of election coverage a given party did receive in a given newspaper, and the amount of press coverage a political party should be entitled to, in the democratic political process. This raised the question of a criterion to determine how much press campaign coverage a political party should receive.

The suggestion that all parties -- large and small, national and sectional, established and new, sincere and insincere -- should be entitled to equal election coverage was rejected without extended consideration. If such were the case, the messages of the bona-fide and responsible political parties would be lost in the newspapers amidst the cacaphony of

insignificant parties. In the case of the United States, for example, the mind boggles at the thought of the chaos-in-print which would result if equal press coverage were given the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the Tax Cut Party, the Prohibition Party, the American Vegetarian Party, the States Rights Party, the Industrial Government Party, the Afro-American Unity Party, the American Third Party, the Greenback Party, and the American Beat Consensus Party!¹⁶ Certainly, some criterion other than "equal coverage for all" was required.

It seemed that a more equitable (and realistic) criterion for determining how much press coverage a party was entitled to receive, would be the standing of that party in the previous election. Accordingly, it was decided that an index of bias could be developed by comparing the relative amount of coverage a given political party received in a given newspaper, with the relative strength of that party at the previous federal election.

Two new problems arose from this decision to take into account the previous showing of the political parties. First,

¹⁶ Theodore H. White, The Making of the President 1960, Montreal, Pocket Books (Canada), 1961, 338.

should a party's strength at the previous election be determined by the number of parliamentary seats it won, or by its share of the popular vote? Second, should a party's strength at the previous election be calculated on a national, provincial, or local basis?

The first decision was relatively simple, and based mostly on common sense. The popular vote for a particular party was considered to be a fairer measure of that party's strength, so far as the voting public was concerned. The actual number of seats that the party received in the House of Commons was an indirect and rather artificial representation of the peoples' choice of parties, due primarily to our single constituency, "first-past-the-post" electoral system. The political strengths and weaknesses of this system of voting have been warmly debated ever since John Stuart Mill's "Essay on Representative Government", and it is beyond the scope of this study to enter the debate. However, the fact is that at present, the electoral system does not accurately reflect the popular support of a party, and tends to exaggerate the strength of the large parties at the expense of the smaller ones. Since, however, the press in our society of specialization is expected to be the eyes and ears of the public -- indeed the public's proxy -- it

should, in the opinion of the author, base the amount of coverage it devotes to a political party on the amount of support which the public itself, and not the political institutions, gave that party at the previous election.

The second problem was not so easily resolved. Sound arguments could be offered for calculating a party's strength at the last election on either a national, a provincial, or a local basis. In support of using the national standings, it was felt that since press coverage of a federal election for representation in the federal legislature was being studied, therefore party standings on a federal, coast-to-coast basis should be used to determine the index of bias. Further, using national results would smooth out some of the excesses of party support in particular regions. For example, the Liberal's popular vote in 1963 for all of Canada was 41.7%, compared with 46.7% for Ontario, and 47.8% for Metropolitan Toronto and vicinity. The obvious drawback to this method is that some of the small parties are very localized. Should, for example, a British Columbia newspaper be expected to carry election coverage of the Creditiste party, which did not contest any constituencies outside the province of Quebec? The reply which could be offered to this point is that the Creditiste members sit in the same House of Commons in which British Columbia M.P.'s sit, and hence the Western

Canadians should be informed of the activities of the Creditiste party back in Eastern Canada.

It can be argued, alternatively, that only the election returns from Metropolitan Toronto and vicinity should be used in calculating the index of bias, because the bulk of the three Toronto daily newspapers are distributed and read locally.¹⁷ This argument, however, would seem to be based on the assumption that federal election campaigns are fought more at the local than at the national level. Such may have been the case in the early elections following Confederation, but political scientists are largely in agreement that the local candidates and local campaigns are of secondary importance in present-day election campaigning.

Still another alternative is to consider the parties' popular support on a provincial basis -- in this instance Ontario. Such a method, it can be argued, would strike a happy medium between national and local. The problem of small regional

¹⁷The Audit Bureau of Circulation gave the distribution breakdown of the three Toronto dailies as:

	<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Telegram</u>
City zone	113,608	236,190	151,067
Retail trade zone	29,652	53,807	36,614
All other	86,896	54,466	37,940

Betty W. Gay (ed.), Canadian Advertising, XXXVIII, 2, (March-April 1965), Toronto, Maclean-Hunter, 1965, 42-45.

political parties would be lessened, for only those newspapers in such a party's province would be expected to give it press coverage. This approach would also have some advantages similar to the national case, since tabulating election returns on a provincial basis could be expected to smooth out local pockets of abnormally high or low support for a particular party. However, this method too has a drawback; while it would likely prove satisfactory in the case of Ontario or Quebec, each of which contains over one quarter of the country's population, it would probably be unsatisfactory for the smaller provinces such as Prince Edward Island, with a population of slightly over 100,000.¹⁸

It was felt by the author that, due to the current trends in electioneering, and the national character of our parliament, the most satisfactory of the three alternatives discussed would be to consider the results of the previous federal election on a national basis. Accordingly, the national returns for the 1963 election will be used first in calculating the index of bias. However, since plausible arguments can be made for the other two methods, the index of bias will also be calculated both on provincial and local 1963 election returns, for the purposes of comparison.

¹⁸ A complete breakdown of population by provinces is available in Canada, Bureau of Statistics, Canada Year Book, Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1965, 160.

CHART 6.1

% Coverage

Indices of Bias—National(I)

CHART 6.2

Indices of Bias—National (II)

The index of bias is developed in Chart 6.1. The percentage national popular vote is plotted for each political party on the horizontal axis, and the percentage election coverage of the parties in the Toronto newspapers is plotted on the vertical axis. The source of the 1963 election statistics is the Report of the Chief Electoral Officer, as summarized in Appendix II of this study, while the election coverage data is taken from Table 4.1 above. Since it was decided that each political party was entitled to a percentage of the election coverage equal to its percentage of the national popular vote at the previous election, a line of neutral bias in Chart 6.1 would pass through each pair of equal co-ordinates. In this case the line of neutral bias is the diagonal which bisects the upper cycle of the graph. The actual percentage of the national popular vote for each political party was plotted along the horizontal axis. Next, for each party, the percentage of the election coverage received by that party in each of the three Toronto dailies was plotted on the vertical axis already determined by that party's national popular vote. This procedure was used for the Liberal, Conservative, and N.D.P. parties. In this particular study, it was not possible to plot accurately the Social Credit or Creditiste parties,

since the Creditiste party had broken away from the Social Credit party following the previous federal election, and hence separate election statistics were not available for this study.

The index of bias for each party in each newspaper is represented in Chart 6.1 by the vertical distances between the coordinates. The magnitude of the newspaper's political bias for or against a party is represented by the vertical distance between the appropriate coordinate and the line of neutral bias. The direction of the paper's bias, i.e. whether the bias is favourable or unfavourable to the party, is represented by the position of the coordinates above or below the line of neutral bias. If the coordinates are located above the line of neutral bias, the paper's bias toward the party is favourable; if below the line of neutral bias, unfavourable.

After careful consideration, logarithmic graph paper was selected for plotting the index of bias. It was felt that newspaper bias for or against political parties should be shown as proportions (as logarithmic graph paper does), rather than as absolute values (as standard graph paper would do). To take a simple hypothetical example, two parties which had obtained 50% and 10% of the popular vote respectively, received 48% and 8% of a paper's election coverage respectively. In absolute

terms, each party got 2% less coverage than it was entitled to, and the newspaper displayed the same amount of unfavourable bias against each party. In proportionate terms, however, the first party got 4% less coverage, and the second party 20% less coverage than it was entitled to, and the newspaper displayed five times as much bias against the second party as against the first. Thus in practice, the same absolute amount of press bias for or against a small party affects that party to a much greater degree than it would a large party. This fact is graphically illustrated on logarithmic paper, which measures proportions. In mathematical terms, the absolute distances along the axes represent the logarithms of the numbers marked on the axes.

The index of bias, as shown in Chart 6.1, can, if desired, be calculated mathematically without the use of graphs. The index of bias of a given paper for a given party is equal in each case to the numerical difference obtained by subtracting the value of the logarithm of the party's percentage popular vote at the previous election, from the logarithm of the percentage election coverage which that party received in the newspaper. If the difference in the values of the logarithms is positive, the newspaper's bias is favourable; if the difference is negative,

the bias is unfavourable.

Comparisons between the treatment of various political parties by the three Toronto newspapers can be further facilitated by plotting on a standard graph the indices of bias as calculated by the mathematical and/or the logarithmic graph method. In Chart 6.2, a bar-type graph, the indices of bias are plotted along the vertical axis. When examining this graph, it should be borne in mind that the index of bias as plotted along the vertical axis is a mathematical abstraction. The scale numbers on this axis represent amounts of an intangible commodity called political bias. The chief value of this graph is not the scale marked along the axis, but the visual comparisons of political biases which it facilitates. In Chart 6.2, the area above the zero horizontal axis indicates favourable bias; the area below it indicates unfavourable bias.

It might at this point be asked why the index of bias was developed by the logarithmic method instead of by the more common technique of ratios -- ie. simply dividing the election coverage obtained, by the previous popular vote. However, this method would have two disadvantages. First, only a bar graph similar to Chart 6.2 could be drawn to illustrate the bias ratio, and no graph similar to Chart 6.1 could be formulated.

This is an important factor because Chart 6.1 provides a valuable overall illustration of how the index of bias is derived from its component factors of percent election coverage, and percent popular vote. Second, in the bar graph, which would plot the bias ratios, there would be no negative values; the neutral bias line would not be zero, as it would with the logarithmic method, but would be one (unity) instead. All bars, representing favourable and unfavourable ratios alike, would point upwards, and the favourable or unfavourable bias would have to be determined by whether or not the bars extended up beyond unity.

2. Results

Having developed an index of bias as a common measurement of press bias in the covering of election campaigns, this inquiry now proceeds to consider the indices of bias for the three Toronto daily newspapers' coverage of the 1965 federal election campaign. The findings in this section will add increased meaning to the results of Table 4.1, by taking into account the parties' strength at the previous election. Table 6.1 tabulates the indices of bias for each of the three Toronto news-

paper's election coverage towards the Liberal, Conservative, and New Democratic parties. Although, as discussed earlier, this study of indices of bias is based primarily on consideration of the national popular vote, Table 6.1 also contains the indices of bias calculated on the basis of the Ontario popular vote, and the Metropolitan Toronto and vicinity popular vote. Further, the indices of bias are plotted graphically in Charts 6.3 and 6.4 on the provincial vote basis, and in Charts 6.5 and 6.6 on the Metro Toronto and vicinity popular vote basis.

Considering first Charts 6.1 and 6.2 -- in which the indices of bias are calculated nationally -- it is readily apparent that all three Toronto dailies displayed significant political bias towards at least some of the political parties which they covered. The largest indices of bias in the Globe and the Star were directed at the N.D.P. -- unfavourable in the Globe, and favourable in the Star. The Telegram was meticulously neutral toward the N.D.P. in its coverage, if not exactly so toward the other two parties. If only the Liberals and Conservatives are considered, the Telegram displayed the greatest political bias -- for the Conservative party, and against the Liberals. The Star's coverage re both the Liberal and Conservative parties was the nearest of the three papers to neutral bias, being in fact slightly unfavourable to both.

TABLE 6.1

Election Coverage -- Indices of Bias*

	<u>Globe</u>	<u>Star</u>	<u>Tely</u>
<u>National</u>			
Liberal	-.032	-.016	-.181
Conservative	+.176	-.009	+.213
N.D.P.	-.223	+.216	-.003
<u>Provincial</u>			
Liberal	-.078	-.061	-.226
Conservative	+.144	-.041	+.181
N.D.P.	-.304	+.135	-.084
<u>Local</u>			
Liberal	-.092	-.075	-.240
Conservative	+.237	+.052	+.274
N.D.P.	-.464	-.025	-.244

* single party items
favourable items

CHART 6.3

CHART 6.4

Indices of Bias—Ontario(II)

CHART 6.5

% Coverage

Indices of Bias—Local(I)

CHART 6.6

Indices of Bias—Local(II)

If Charts 6.3 to 6.6 are considered along with Charts 6.1 and 6.2, certain trends in the papers' indices of bias appear, when the basis of calculating the indices of bias is narrowed from national, to provincial, to local. The bias towards the N.D.P. became dramatically more unfavourable as the voting base narrowed, as did the bias towards the Liberals, though to a much lesser degree. On the other hand, the bias towards the Conservative party became moderately more favourable as the voting base was narrowed. For Toronto and vicinity, the Star was without doubt the fairest of the three journals in its election coverage. Indeed, if all three cases -- local, provincial -- are considered, the Star was the fairest of the three newspapers in each instance. The Telegram and the Globe each had a significant bias. Both the Globe and the Tely were strongly biased in favour of the Conservative party. At the same time, the Globe was strongly biased against the N. D. P., and the Telegram against the Liberals. The most important finding which must be borne in mind, however, is that, so far as this study can determine, none of the three Toronto newspapers can be credited with fully neutral bias in the amount of election coverage given the three largest political parties.

Although no specific hypothesis was proposed at the beginning of this inquiry suggesting a consistent relationship between the index of bias and a newspaper's editorial approval or disapproval of a political party, such a test can readily be made using Charts 6.1 to 6.6. Such a hypothesis would be clearly substantiated in the case of the Globe and Tely, both of which supported the Conservative party editorially, and showed favourable bias toward that party. The Star, however, would seem to contradict such a hypothesis, showing toward the Liberals the most unfavourable bias in all three cases -- national, provincial, and local.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

1. General

All three Toronto daily newspapers carried a substantial amount of election coverage during the week under study immediately preceding the 1965 Canadian general election, and offered their readers a large assortment of campaign articles, photographs, constituency studies, editorials, letters-to-the-editor, etc. During this period, election coverage in the press accounted for roughly one fifth of all non-advertising material in the newspapers. Certainly, it cannot be said that the Toronto press failed to provide the public with an adequate quantity of election coverage.

The quality of this vast amount of overall coverage, however, was a different matter entirely. This study revealed widespread fluctuations in the quality of our newspapers' election campaign coverage, particularly in the realm of allocation of press coverage between political parties, of division between favourable and unfavourable coverage, and

of distribution between desirable and undesirable locations within the papers. The fluctuations, as noted in the various tables and charts of this study, have been found to be consistent enough to conclude, in the author's opinion, that they were the product of design rather than of chance.

Each of the three Toronto newspapers had a clear editorial political preference, and expressed this preference quite unequivocally in its editorial columns. All papers ignored the N.D.P., Social Credit, Creditiste, and Other parties, in their editorials.

The campaign coverage of all three dailies contained both favourable and unfavourable items about each party. In all cases, the amount of favourable coverage for any party in a paper exceeded the amount of unfavourable coverage for that party.

All three newspapers concentrated their election coverage heavily on the party leaders. Indeed, the coverage of the party chiefs accounted for approximately two-fifths of each paper's election campaign coverage.

In the positioning of election coverage within the newspaper, each of the three Toronto dailies had its own distinct approach. All, however, were consistent in ignoring the three

splinter groups -- Socred, Creditiste, and Others, on their front pages.

When an index of bias was calculated to correlate election coverage with popular vote at the previous election, each of the Toronto papers exhibited definite biases for or against the various political parties. None gave what could be labelled as overall neutral bias coverage.

2. The Toronto Globe and Mail

The Globe contained the fewest items of campaign coverage, but had the largest aggregate election coverage of the Toronto newspapers. Thus the average length of Globe items was the longest of the local dailies, a fact perhaps consistent with that paper's claim to more extensive and penetrating news coverage. In addition, the Globe devoted a larger percentage of its total space to the election than did its competitors. The Globe and Mail offered a large proportion of its campaign coverage on special election news pages, and very little of its coverage on "any other page". Very little of the Globe's election material was consigned to undesirable locations. In its division of coverage between desirable and undesirable locations, the Globe was

consistent with its editorial policy and favoured the Conservatives over the Liberals, with one astonishing exception. On the all-important page one, the Globe gave the Liberals substantially more coverage than the Conservatives; and, as was mentioned previously, no plausible explanation for this phenomenon is offered.

When the Globe and Mail's indices of bias were considered, the most striking observation was a consistent and extremely unfavourable bias against the New Democratic Party. It would appear that the journal's traditional pro-business and anti-socialist orientation was thus reflected in its reporting of the election campaign. The Globe was moderately biased against the Liberal party, and was favourably biased toward the Conservatives -- but to a lesser degree than was the Telegram.

3. The Toronto Star

In many respects, the Star was the happy medium of this study. Its aggregate election coverage, for example, was less than the Globe's, but more than the Tely's. The Star supported the Liberals editorially, and gave that party more coverage than the Conservatives. In addition, the Star gave the

Liberals a higher favour ratio than it did the Conservatives, but the difference in each case was the smallest of the three dailies.

In its coverage of the party leaders, the Star apparently deviated from its editorial policy and gave the Conservative leader more coverage than it gave the Liberal leader. As was discussed earlier, one suspects that there was method in the Star's madness, and that it deliberately "played up" Mr. Diefenbaker in order to discredit the Tories.

In positioning its campaign material, the Star made more use of the "any other page" location than the Globe, and slightly less than the Tely. Accordingly, the Star ranked in the middle between the Globe (lower) and Tely (higher) in the percentage of its coverage in undesirable locations within the paper.

Of the three Toronto journals, the Star was undoubtably the New Democratic Party's best friend, both in terms of aggregate coverage, and bias index. Indeed, the Star was the only Toronto newspaper to give the N.D.P. a fair break. This is not surprising, since the Star has from time to time shown C.C.F. / N.D.P. leanings. The Star's favourable bias towards the N.D.P. despite its editorial support of the Liberals, is explained in a statement which the Star's Editor-in-Chief, Belard Honderick made in a C.B.C. television interview shortly before the election:

This is the point...as you know, by going over our editorials. We agree with the NDP on many of their major policies, no question about that, yet we stop short of supporting them and... I'm sure we must confuse a great many people...

There's no question that this influence our decision...you've got to have a government after November the 8th and...from where we sit I... I think we're all pretty much agreed that they just don't have a chance.¹⁹

The Star also displayed moderately unfavourable bias against the Conservatives, and a very slight unfavourable bias against the Liberal party. The Star was the only Toronto newspaper to display an unfavourable bias in its coverage of the party it supported editorially.

4. The Toronto Telegram

The "Tely" as it is fondly called by its faithful, has, ever since its founding by John Ross Robertson, been actively associated with the Conservative party, as its election coverage amply demonstrated. Indeed, a former Editor-in-Chief of the Telegram, B. T. Richardson (who resigned his post to become Special Assistant to then-Prime Minister Diefenbaker), was the Conservative candidate for Toronto Spadina in this election. It

¹⁹C.B.C. Television, "The Public Eye", aired Nov. 2, 1965. From the script of the programme, as provided by the producer.

is not surprising, therefore, that the Tely supported the Tories editorially; nor that it was, overall, the most biased of the Toronto papers in its coverage of the election campaign. The Tely displayed a strong political bias both in favour of the Conservatives, and against the Liberals. It was, only moderately unfavourable to the N.D.P., compared with the Globe.

The Telegram had the least aggregate election coverage of the Toronto press, and tended to locate much of it on "other main news pages" and "any other page", rather than on special election news pages as the Globe and Star did. Although very strongly pro-Conservative and anti-Liberal in overall coverage, the Telegram was slightly more balanced in its coverage of the party leaders, and in its page one coverage. In both instances the Conservatives received better coverage than did the Liberals, but the discrepancies between the coverages were less blatant than in the case of overall coverage.

CHAPTER 6

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Mass communications research is a relatively recent field of study, particularly in Canada, which has lagged seriously behind the United States in this area. Thus, there exist many exciting and rewarding research projects, related to the press in Canada. It will, however, be some time before a sufficient pool of research study findings can be amassed to facilitate general theories relating to our press.

The findings of this inquiry, hopefully, have made some small contribution to this pool of knowledge. It did, however raise more questions than it answered, by bringing to light many other possible research undertakings. Other variables of the election coverage of the three Toronto newspapers could be considered and then related to the findings of this study. Among the other factors which could profitably be considered are the geographical origin of campaign items (How much election news originated in British Columbia?), and their geographical subject area (How much election coverage dealt with Quebec?).

Such an approach could be used to discover whether Arnold Edinborough's assertion that "In sum...the press in Canada is local in character",²⁰ applies to press coverage of elections. Another factor which could be explored is the various means used by the newspapers to gather their election news -- local, reporters, correspondents, commentators, wire service, syndicated material, etc.

This study was limited to consideration of the election coverage of the three Toronto daily journals for one week preceding the 1965 federal election. Similar studies could examine other Canadian newspapers during the same period. Or a project could be made to examine the coverage of a given newspaper week-by-week for the full eight weeks of the campaign, to discover if the paper's coverage was consistent throughout, or varied as the campaign progressed. Still another inquiry could be conducted to consider the fluctuations in a newspaper's coverage over a period of two or more election campaigns.

Useful comparisons between newspapers could be made, using the index of bias developed in this study. The indices of bias of various Canadian newspapers could be calculated and

²⁰Arnold Edinborough, "The Press", in J. A. Irving (ed.), Mass Media in Canada, Toronto, Ryerson, 1962, 18.

compared. An indication of the overall political bias of Canadian newspapers could be obtained by calculating the mean average or the median average of the indices of bias of a representative cross section of our journals. Such a national average of several newspaper's indices of bias in their respective coverage of an election campaign could likely be used to settle Conservative leader Diefenbaker's fervent contention that the press of Canada (and television also) is dominantly partisan to the Liberals.²¹ The index of bias is probably the most satisfactory means of making comparisons -- between different newspapers, between different stages of a particular campaign, and between different election campaigns, because it takes into consideration not only the amount of election coverage, but also the popular vote of the parties at the previous election.

²¹ See Peter C. Newman, Renegade in Power: The Diefenbaker Years, Toronto, McLelland and Stewart, 1963, Chapt. 18.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

A newspaper that pleases everybody never
fought for anything.

-- William Allen White

There is no crime committed in the field of
journalism, not even super-lurid sensationalism,
not even inaccuracy, that is more subversive of
the principle of a free press, more indefensible,
than the crime of slanting the news to meet a
publisher's policy.

-- Grove Patterson,
Editor-in-Chief,
Toledo Blade

As was pointed out in the Introduction to this study,
the social responsibility theory of the press -- the dominant
theory in Canada today -- is equally comprised of a freedom
and a corresponding responsibility. It is accepted that our
press be free of any and all forms of control by the state,
without fear of reprisals and free to speak its minds. How-
ever, this freedom from government control is tempered by
the corresponding responsibility of the press to society to

present the public with full, accurate, and unbiased information. Transposed in terms of newspaper coverage of election campaigns, the social responsibility of freedom of the press would mean that our newspapers are free to support any political party and/or oppose any party without fear of controls or reprisals by the government, in their editorial pages. This freedom carries with it the corresponding responsibility of our newspapers to present the voting public with full, accurate, and politically unbiased coverage of the election campaign on their non-editorial pages. This importance of clearly deliniating between campaign news and editorials was brought out in an interview with Eric Wells, Editor of the pro-Conservative Winnipeg Tribune:

Wells:...I believe most papers today have abandoned any partisan passages in news. At least they've attempted to. They may not have succeeded. I believe our paper has...

Interviewer: ...Why do you think there has been a change in the attitude of some newspapers, away from partisanship in news reporting and towards... more neutral news reporting?

Wells: Well I think most papers from time to time have made surveys and certainly the public at large does...not want...a paper to be partisan. This doesn't mean that it won't necessarily support a party on its editorial page, but it wants a paper it can rely on for impartial news and I think most papers...have...attempted to do this...

Interviewer: How influential then...is the paper on the public...you have just told me that the public influences the paper...does the paper influence the public?

Wells: Very little, I would say...the role of the paper, as I see it is to provide the public with...all the pertinent information on various issues...we do not necessarily have any...influence on the public as to the conclusions they will reach, other than to judge, in themselves, the facts, as we present them, to the best of our ability.²²

Where, then, did the three Toronto daily newspapers stand in relation to the social responsibility conception of press election coverage, as described by Mr. Wells?

All three Toronto newspapers took full advantage of their freedom to support and/or oppose any political party in the editorial pages. The Telegram and the Globe and Mail unequivocally endorsed the Conservative party editorially, and presented their readers with reasoned arguments to support this choice. Similarly, the Star clearly supported the Liberal party editorially.

However, the findings of this study would seem to indicate that the three Toronto newspapers did not exercise their corresponding responsibility of full, accurate, and

²²C.B.C.-T.V. -- interview on "The Public Eye"; taken from the unedited transcript of the interview, as supplied by the producer.

politically unbiased non-editorial coverage of the election campaign. First, they gave the political party they were supporting editorially a higher proportion of favourable/unfavourable election coverage. Second, they gave the political party they were supporting higher proportions of election coverage in desirable positions within the paper. Third, their indices of bias, based on amounts of election coverage, compared with previous popular vote, indicated political bias in favour of the editorially-supported party.

The argument is occasionally proposed that the spilling over of editorial opinions into the non-editorial coverage of election campaigns can be defended on the grounds that the newspaper reader, especially in the larger cities such as Toronto, has ready access to different treatments of non-editorial news in different newspapers. This does not, however, work out in practice. Most people, even in a multi-paper city, read only one daily newspaper. Further, one would suspect that most individuals choose their newspaper not on the basis of its political leanings, but rather on the basis of its features, comics, sports news, and syndicated items, and hence are not sensitive to political bias in the paper.

Another important rebuttal to the suggestion that the public has ready access to different treatments of election news is the fact that the number of multi-newspaper cities is rapidly dwindling, and that independent ownership of our newspapers is being steadily reduced as more and more journals are purchased by the major newspaper chains. This is a sobering, though economically logical, trend. The many technological advances in publishing and distributing newspapers have greatly raised the amount of capital and organization required to own and operate a newspaper. The owner-reporter-editor-publisher of yesteryear is mostly a faded memory, having been replaced by the mammoth newspaper corporations and chains.

The mass communications revolution of the twentieth century has had a profound influence on the political process in this country, and indeed in virtually every country, regardless of its political system. The mass media -- particularly the press -- in our country have played an increasingly important role in election campaigns, and have profoundly altered the basis on which political parties organize and conduct election campaigns. Now, more than ever, the communications media are the eyes and ears -- the proxy -- of the electorate. As such, they bear

a special social responsibility present to the public full, accurate, and politically unbiased election campaign coverage -- to fulfill the role of providing the public with the "full access to the day's intelligence", which the Commission on Freedom of the Press envisaged.

Pronouncements such as that made by Eric Wells of the Winnipeg Tribune, as well as many other respected editors and publishers, indicate that the press in Canada is aware of its social responsibility to present balanced, unbiased election coverage to the public, and are actively working toward this end. The results of this study, however, suggest that there remains much to be done before this ultimate goal is achieved -- if indeed it ever can be.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Principal references

- Robert Butler, "San Francisco Newspapers' Campaign Coverage: 1896, 1952", Journalism Quarterly, 1954.
- Norman Berelson and M. Janowitz, Speeder in Public Opinion and Communication, New York, Free Press, revised edition, 1966.
- Edilton A. Bush, "The Analysis of Political Campaign News", Journalism Quarterly, 1951.
- James, Report of the Chief Electoral Officer, 1963, Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1963.
- Commission on Freedom of the Press, A Free and Responsible Press, Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1947.
- Marilee Sawyer, An Introduction to the Social Sciences, New York, Praeger, 1964.
- J.A. Field, et al., Kingston Ontario II Language Specifications, Toronto, University of Toronto, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, revised edition (Keron), 1965.
- Paul Fox (ed.), Politics Canada, New York, Holt-Rinehart, 1963.
- J.L.B. Hamlin (ed.), The Press and the Public, Toronto, Canadian Institute on Public Affairs, 1965.
- Charles E. Hignie, "Wise or Foolies in the 1952 Campaign: Space vs. Display", Journalism Quarterly, 1954.
- H. Janin, Data Processing, Northwestern University Press, 1965.
- M.B. Rosterton, "A History of Canadian Journalism, 1752-1900", Canada Year Book 1957-58, Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1958.
- Sydney Sobro, "How Florida Foolies Handled the 1952 Presidential Campaign", Journalism Quarterly, 1953.

Daniel McCracken, A Guide to FORTRAN Programming, New York, Wiley Co., 1962.

John Meisel (ed.), Papers on the 1962 Election, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1964.

R. McFisger and D.M. White, Introduction to Mass Communications Research, Baton Rouge, La., Louisiana State University Press, 1958.

T. Peterson et al., Mass Media and Modern Society, New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.

Granville Rice, "A Method For Analysing Newspaper Campaign Coverage", Journalism Quarterly, 1954.

Fred S. Siebert et al., Four Theories of the Press, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1963.

2. Secondary References

Hugh A. Bone and Austin Arnoy, Politics and Voters, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Canada Year Book, Ottawa, Queen's Printer, annually.

Canada, Parliament, Report of the Royal Commission on Publications, Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1961.

Canadian Advertising, Toronto, Holman-Hunter, bimonthly.

John Cartwright, "Who Owns Canada's Press, Radio, T.V.?", Canadian Commentator, February, 1962.

L.A. Dexter and D.M. White (ed.), People, Society, and Mass Communications, New York, Free Press, 1964.

A.V. Dicey, The Law of the Constitution, London, Macmillan and Co., tenth edition, 1959.

E. Gerald, Social Responsibility of the Press, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1963.

- M. Gopal, Introduction to Research in the Social Sciences, Bombay, Asia Press, 1964.
- Great Britain, Report of the Royal Commission on the Press, London, H.M. Stationery Office, 1949.
- Gordon Hukins (ed.), Order and Good Government, Toronto, Canadian Institute on Public Affairs, 1965.
- J.A. Irving (ed.), Mass Media in Canada, Toronto, Sperson, 1962.
- E. Katz and Paul Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence, New York, Free Press, 1964.
- H.H. Kesterton, "Journalism", J.T. Saywell (ed.), Canadian Annual Review, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, annually since 1960.
- V.O. Key, Public Opinion and American Democracy, New York, Knopf, 1961.
- Dan Lacey, Freedom and Communications, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1965.
- Robert E. Lane and David O. Sears, Public Opinion, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- A.J. Liebling, The Press, New York, Ballantine Books, 1964.
- Sir David Lindsay Keir, Constitutional History of Modern Britain Since 1485, London, Adam and Charles Black, sixth edition, 1961.
- Walter Lippmann, A Preface to Politics, Ann Arbor, Univ. of Michigan Press, reprinted 1962.
- Walter Lippmann, Public Opinion, New York, Free Press, reprinted 1965.
- John Stuart Mill, "Essay on Representative Government", J.S. Mill, Utilitarianism, Liberty, and Representative Government, London, Everyman's Library, Dent, 1910.
- D.C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design, New York, McKay Co., 1964.

Peter C. Newman, Propaganda in France: The Macfarlane Years, Toronto, Macfarlane and Stewart, 1963.

I. Pool, Trends in Content Analysis, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1957.

John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1965.

R.N. Schmidt, Introduction to Computer Science and Data Processing, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Wilbur Schramm, Responsibility in Mass Communication, New York, Harper and Row, 1957.

Albert A. Shea, Broadcasting the Canadian Way, Montreal, Harvest House, 1963.

George Simpson and Fritz Sachs, Basic Statistics, Horton and Co., revised edition, 1957.

Theodore E. White, The Making of the President 1960, Montreal, Pocket Books Inc., 1961.

Raymond Williams, Britain in the Sixties: Communications, Penguin Books, 1962.

Charles E. Wright, Mass Communications: A Sociological Perspective, New York, Random House, 1959.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX I

	<u>Lib</u>	<u>Cons</u>	<u>NDP</u>	<u>Socred</u>	<u>Other</u>
Broadview	8743	6684	5574	166	192
Danforth	14701	10835	14903	212	
Davenport	11023	4520	4347	245	
Eglinton	22215	13984	5151		
Greenwood	7207	7221	9421	224	
High Park	13034	7045	4425	203	420
Parkdale	12694	6308	5538	259	
Rosedale	12860	6803	3534	240	
St. Paul's	15891	7795	3794	543	
Spadina	14850	6094	5888	332	
Trinity	10595	5171	3512		391
York Centre	41485	12807	28505		
York East	21038	14777	11234	349	
York Humber	20188	12218	11821		
York North	21668	14488	8591	330	
York Scarborough	63049	41535	26819	895	
York South	21042	9648	17396		
York West	41480	24479	14003	697	
Peel	28009	15921	8836	354	
Halton	25482	15949	6790	330	481
Ontario	20174	22902	15020		

Source: Report of the Chief Electoral Officer, 1963.

APPENDIX II

1963 Election Statistics

	<u>CANADA</u>			<u>ONTARIO</u>			<u>METRO TORONTO & VICINITY (Metro & York North, Peel, Halton, & Ontario)</u>		
	Seats	% Seats	Pop. Vote	Seats	% Seats	Pop. Vote	Seats	% Seats	Pop. Vote
Liberal	129	48.7%	41.7%	52	61.2%	46.3%	18	85.7%	47.8%
Conserv.	95	35.9%	32.8%	27	31.8%	35.3%	1	4.8%	28.5%
N.D.P.	17	6.4%	13.2%	6	7.1%	15.9%	2	9.5%	23.0%

Source: Report of the Chief Electoral Officer, 1963.

APPENDIX III

A Further Note on Method

Once the selection of the newspapers to be coded was established as the issues of the last week preceding the election, they were examined quickly and without coding, in order to give the coder a general comprehensive picture of the election news of the week under study. This was done to facilitate consistency in the later coding. In particular, the prior reading of all the newspaper issues under study was helpful to the coder in deciding whether a particular press item was an election item or simply an ordinary news item, and also in classifying election coverage as favourable or unfavourable. On the other hand, the prior reading of the newspapers placed an additional responsibility on the coder to avoid letting subjective bias creep into the coding process. Accordingly, every effort was consciously made to maintain consistency and impartiality in the coding of the election coverage.

After the preliminary reading of all the newspaper issues under study, the election campaign items were coded, one paper at a time. The Globe and Mail was coded first, in reverse chronological order, from the November 6 issue back through to the November 1 issue. The Telegram was coded next, in a similar manner, and then the Star. The length of each election item was marked and circled near the heading of the item. As each item was coded, the results were entered in a loose-leaf notebook, using one

horizontal column per newspaper item. After all the election items for the three Toronto newspapers were coded, the results were keypunched on I.B.M. data cards directly from the loose-leaf notebook.


```

$      FORTRAN      TABLE 1.1
C  FORTRAN PROGRAM FOR CHART 2 AND SUM TOTALS
C  SINGLE AND MULTIPARTY ITEMS
C  FAVOURABLE, UNFAVOURABLE, AND NEUTRAL ITEM
C  SORTING RE PAPERS INCLUDED IN PROGRAM
05600      DIMENSION SI(3)
05600      INTEGER PAPER,SI,S
05600      DO 2 I=1,3
05634      2      SI(I)=0.
05694      5      READ 10, PAPER,S
05730      10     FORMAT (I1,28X,I3)
05760      IF(PAPER-1)6,1,1
05828      1      SI(PAPER)=SI(PAPER)+S
05912      GO TO 5
05920      6      PRINT 100,(SI(I),I=1,3)
05994      100    FORMAT (25X,5HGLOBE,6X,4HSTAR,6X,4HTEL
06120      CALL EXIT
06132      END
```

O.K. \$ EOC

JOB	TABLE 1.1		
	GLOBE	STAR	TELY
	14430	14249	13596

EXIT
CHECK

END OF JOB , RUNNING TIME 00.0702 HOURS

00

PAGE 01

8257 JOBS LEFT 4 7 06340129

96

1

TOTALS OF ELECTION COVERAGE

CHART 2

AL ITEMS

RAM

6X,4HTELY//20X,3110//)

TELY

13596

```

$      FORTRAN      TABLE 2.1
C  PROGRAM FOR CHART 5
C  SINGLE PARTY ITEMS ONLY
C  FAVOURABLE ITEMS ONLY
C  SORTING RE PAPERS INCLUDED IN PROGRAM
05600      DIMENSION SI(21,6,3)
05600      INTEGER PAPER,PARTY,SUPPRT,SI,S
05600      DO 2 I=1,21
05634      DO 2 J=1,6
05668      DO 2 K=1,3
05702      2  SI(I,J,K)=0
05822      5  READ 10, PAPER,ITEM,PARTY,SUPPRT,S
05876      10  FORMAT (I1,8X,I2,3X,I2,4X,I1,8X,I3)
05946      ITEM=ITEM+1
05982      IF(SUPPRT-1)6,7,5
06050      7  IF(PARTY-6)1,1,5
06118      1  SI(ITEM,PARTY,PAPER)=SI(ITEM,PARTY,PAPER)
06298      GO TO 5
06306      6  PRINT 100, (((SI(I,J,K),K=1,3),J=1,6),I=1,21)
06466      100  FORMAT (45X,5HGLOBE,6X,4HSTAR,6X,4HTELY.
      2 30X,7HCONSERV,3X,3I10/30X,3HNDP,7X,3I10/
      3 4HCRED,6X,3I10/30X,5HOTHER,5X,3I10//)
06892      CALL EXIT
06904      END

```

O.K. \$ EOC

JOB TABLE 2.1

GLOBE

PHOTOGRAPH

LIBERAL	407
CONSERV	380
NDP	141
SOCRED	16
CRED	10
OTHER	10

NEWS ARTICLE

LIBERAL	1494
CONSERV	993
NDP	360
SOCRED	151
CRED	13
OTHER	64

97

E 2.1

CHART 5

PROGRAM

SI,S

UPPRT,S
1,8X,I3)

M,PARTY,PAPER)+S

,3),J=1,6),I=1,21)
AR,6X,4HTELY///(30X,7HLIBERAL,3X,3I10/
3HNDP,7X,3I10/30X,6HSOCRED,4X,3I10/30X,
,5X,3I10///))

GLOBE	STAR	TELY
-------	------	------

407	841	635
380	872	693
141	996	390
16	7	34
10	72	24
10	34	0

1494	1289	696
993	1184	1710
360	618	405
151	74	150
13	209	165
64	88	75

SIGNED COMMENTARY

LIBERAL	131	24
CONSERV	44	
NDP	0	11
SOCRED	0	
CRED	0	
OTHER	0	

EDITORIAL

LIBERAL	0	35
CONSERV	128	
NDP	0	
SOCRED	0	
CRED	0	
OTHER	0	

CARTOON

LIBERAL	0	
CONSERV	0	
NDP	0	
SOCRED	0	
CRED	0	
OTHER	0	

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

LIBERAL	29	49
CONSERV	54	49
NDP	42	61
SOCRED	0	
CRED	0	
OTHER	0	

OPINION POLLS

LIBERAL	0	34
CONSERV	0	
NDP	0	
SOCRED	0	
CRED	0	
OTHER	0	

FEATURE

LIBERAL	167	6
CONSERV	127	
NDP	0	
SOCRED	0	
CRED	0	
OTHER	0	

DRAWING OR DIAGRAM

LIBERAL	0	0
CONSERV	0	0
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0

131	245	289
44	0	310
0	110	209
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0

0	357	0
128	0	215
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0

0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0

29	49	17
54	44	227
42	60	40
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0

0	34	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0

167	0	0
127	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0

0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0

OTHER

0

STATISTICAL TABLE OR GRAPH

LIBERAL

0

CONSERV

0

NDP

0

SOCRED

0

CRED

0

OTHER

0

ADVERTISEMENT

LIBERAL

428

CONSERV

1649

NDP

4

SOCRED

0

CRED

0

OTHER

28

ITEM ON ELECTORAL PROCEDURE

LIBERAL

0

CONSERV

0

NDP

0

SOCRED

0

CRED

0

OTHER

0

CONSTITUENCY STUDY

LIBERAL

0

CONSERV

0

NDP

0

SOCRED

0

CRED

0

OTHER

0

ELECTION MEETING NOTICES

LIBERAL

0

CONSERV

0

NDP

0

SOCRED

0

CRED

0

OTHER

0

ELECTION ROUNDUP ITEM

LIBERAL

0

CONSERV

0

NDP

0

SOCRED

0

CRED

0

OTHER

0

MAP

LIBERAL

0

CONSERV

0

NDP

0

SOCRED

0

0 0 99 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

428 585 583
1649 611 1159
4 9 18
0 0 0
0 0 0
28 27 27

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 18
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 39 0
0 0 0

CRED	0
OTHER	0

LIBERAL	0
CONSERV	0
NDP	0
SOCRED	0
CRED	0
OTHER	0

LIBERAL	0
CONSERV	0
NDP	0
SOCRED	0
CRED	0
OTHER	0

LIBERAL	0
CONSERV	0
NDP	0
SOCRED	0
CRED	0
OTHER	0

LIBERAL	0
CONSERV	0
NDP	0
SOCRED	0
CRED	0
OTHER	0

OTHER

LIBERAL	0
CONSERV	0
NDP	0
SOCRED	0
CRED	0
OTHER	0

EXIT
CHECK

END OF JOB , RUNNING TIME 00.0964 HOURS

0 0 100 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

\$ FORTRAN TABLE 2.1
 C PROGRAM FOR CHART 5B
 C SORTING RE PAPERS INCLUDED IN PROGRAM
 C UNFAVOURABLE ITEMS ONLY
 C SINGLE PARTY ITEMS ONLY

```

05600      DIMENSION SI(21,6,3)
05600      INTEGER PAPER,PARTY,SUPPRT,S,SI
05600      DO 2 I=1,21
05634      DO 2 J=1,6
05668      DO 2 K=1,3
05702      2  SI(I,J,K)=0
05822      5  READ 10, PAPER,ITEM,PARTY,SUPPRT,S
05876      10  FORMAT (I1,8X,I2,3X,I2,4X,I1,8X,I3)
05946      ITEM=ITEM+1
05982      IF(PAPER-1)6,7,7
06050      7  IF(SUPPRT-2)5,8,5
06118      8  IF(PARTY-6)1,1,5
06186      1  SI(ITEM,PARTY,PAPER)=SI(ITEM,PARTY,PAPER)+S
06366      GO TO 5
06374      6  PRINT 100, (((SI(I,J,K),K=1,3),J=1,6),I=1,21)
06534      100  FORMAT (45X,5HGLOBE,6X,4HSTAR,6X,4HTELY///((30X,7H
2 30X,7HCONSERV,3X,3I10/30X,3HNDP,7X,3I10/30X,6HSDI
3 4HCRED,6X,3I10/30X,5HOTHER,5X,3I10///))
06960      CALL EXIT
06972      END
  
```

\$ EOC

O.K.

JOB

TABLE 2.1

GLOBE STAR

PHOTOGRAPH

LIBERAL	73	50
CONSERV	0	86
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

NEWS ARTICLE

LIBERAL	196	195
CONSERV	88	35
NDP	45	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	6

00:00

PAGE 01

8280 JOBS LEFT 4 7 06340129

98
101

2.1

CHART 58

ROGRAM

,SI

PPRT,S

,8X,13)

,PARTY,PAPER)+S

3),J=1,6),I=1,21)

R,6X,4HTELY///130X,7HLIBERAL,3X,3I10/

HNDP,7X,3I10/30X,6HSOCRED,4X,3I10/30X,

5X,3I10///1)

GLOBE STAR TELY

73	50	290
0	86	90
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0

196	195	188
88	35	0
45	0	0
0	0	0
0	6	6

OTHER	0	0
-------	---	---

SIGNED COMMENTARY

LIBERAL	0	0
CONSERV	0	192
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

EDITORIAL

LIBERAL	409	20
CONSERV	0	136
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

CARTOON

LIBERAL	229	103
CONSERV	0	311
NDP	47	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

LIBERAL	107	49
CONSERV	36	165
NDP	0	31
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

OPINION POLLS

LIBERAL	0	0
CONSERV	0	0
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

FEATURE

LIBERAL	0	0
CONSERV	0	0
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

DRAWING OR DIAGRAM

LIBERAL	0	0
CONSERV	0	0
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0

0 0 0

102

0 0 129
0 192 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

409 20 528
0 136 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 12
0 0 0

229 103 209
0 311 0
47 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

107 49 155
36 165 6
0 31 0
0 0 7
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

STATISTICAL TABLE OR GRAPH

LIBERAL	0	0
CONSERV	0	0
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

ADVERTISEMENT

LIBERAL	0	0
CONSERV	0	0
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

ITEM ON ELECTORAL PROCEDURE

LIBERAL	0	0
CONSERV	0	0
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

CONSTITUENCY STUDY

LIBERAL	0	0
CONSERV	0	0
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

ELECTION MEETING NOTICES

LIBERAL	0	0
CONSERV	0	0
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

ELECTION ROUNDUP ITEM

LIBERAL	0	0
CONSERV	0	0
NDP	0	0
SOCRED	0	0
CRED	0	0
OTHER	0	0

MAP

LIBERAL	0	0
CONSERV	0	0
NDP	0	0

0
0

0
0

0
0

103

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0
0
0
0

0
0
0

0
0
0

0
0
0

SOCRED	0
CRED	0
OTHER	0

LIBERAL	0
CONSERV	0
NDP	0
SOCRED	0
CRED	0
OTHER	0

LIBERAL	0
CONSERV	0
NDP	0
SOCRED	0
CRED	0
OTHER	0

LIBERAL	0
CONSERV	0
NDP	0
SOCRED	0
CRED	0
OTHER	0

LIBERAL	0
CONSERV	0
NDP	0
SOCRED	0
CRED	0
OTHER	0

OTHER

LIBERAL	0
CONSERV	0
NDP	0
SOCRED	0
CRED	0
OTHER	0

EXIT
CHECK

END OF JOB , RUNNING TIME 00.0911 HOURS

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

104

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0
0 0 0

TABLE 4.1	
\$	FORTRAN
C	FORTRAN PROGRAM FOR CHART 4 AND BREAKDOWN OF ELECT
C	BY SUPPORT
C	SINGLE PARTY ITEMS ONLY
C	SORTING RE PAPER INCLUDED IN PROGRAM

05600		DIMENSION SI(6,3,3)
05600		INTEGER PAPER,PARTY,SUPPRT,S,SI
05600		DO 2 I=1,6
05634		DO 2 J=1,3
05668		DO 2 K=1,3
05702	2	SI(I,J,K)=0.
05834	5	READ 10, PAPER,PARTY,SUPPRT,S
05882	10	FORMAT (I1,13X,I2,4X,I1,8X,I3)
05938		IF(PAPER-1)6,7,7
06006	7	IF(PARTY-6)1,1,5
06074	1	SI(PARTY,SUPPRT,PAPER)=SI(PARTY,SUPPRT,PAPER)+1
06254		GO TO 5
06262	6	PRINT 100,(((SI(I,J,K),K=1,3),J=1,3),I=1,6)
06422	100	FORMAT (35X,5HGLOBE,6X,4HSTAR,6X,4HTELY///(20X, 2 X,5HUNFAV,5X,3I10/20X,5HNEUTL,5X,3I10///))
06694		CALL EXIT
06706		END

O.K. \$ EOC

JOB **TABLE 4.1**

LIBERAL

FAVBLE	2656	3400	2220
UNFAV	1014	417	1499
NEUTL	18	0	0

CONSERVATIVE

FAVBLE	3379	2711	4332
UNFAV	124	925	96
NEUTL	0	0	0

N.D.P.

FAYBLE	543	1832	1062
UNFAV	92	31	0
NEUTL	14	0	0

00:00

PAGE 01

8250 JOBS LEFT 4 7 06340129

105

TABLE 4.1
AND BREAKDOWN OF ELECTION COVERAGE

CHART 4

PROGRAM

,S,SI

T,S
,I3)

PARTY,SUPPRT,PAPER)+S

,3),J=1,3),I=1,6)
TAR,6X,4HTELY///(20X,6HFAVBLE,4X,3I10/20
EUTL,5X,3I10///))

STAR	TELY
------	------

3400	2220
417	1499
0	0

2711	4332
925	96
0	0

1832	1062
31	0
0	0

SOCRED

FAVBLE	167	81
UNFAV	0	0
NEUTL	0	0

CREDITISTE

FAVBLE	23	281
UNFAV	0	6
NEUTL	0	0

OTHER

FAVBLE	102	149
UNFAV	0	0
NEUTL	80	0

EXIT
CHECK

END OF JOB , RUNNING TIME 00.0728 HOURS

81
0
0

184
7
0

106

281
6
0

189
18
0

149
0
0

102
0
0

\$ FORTRAN TABLE 5.1
C FORTRAN PROGRAM FOR CHART 6 AND THE FAVOURABLE LOCA
C SINGLE PARTY ITEMS ONLY
C FAVOURABLE ITEMS ONLY
C SORTING RE PAPERS INCLUDED IN PROGRAM

05600		DIMENSION SI(6,9,3)
05600		INTEGER PAPER,PARTY,SUPPRT,S,SI
05600		DO 2 I=1,6
05634		DO 2 J=1,9
05668		DO 2 K=1,3
05702	2	SI(I,J,K)=0
05822	5	READ 10, PAPER,LOCATN,PARTY,SUPPRT,S
05876	10	FORMAT (I1,7X,I1,5X,I2,4X,I1,8X,I3)
05946		IF(SUPPRT-1)6,8,5
06014	8	IF(PARTY-6)1,1,5
06082	1	SI(PARTY,LOCATN,PAPER)=SI(PARTY,LOCATN,PAPER)+S
06262		GO TO 5
06270	6	PRINT 100,(((SI(I,J,K),K=1,3),J=1,9),I=1,6)
06430	100	FORMAT (50X,5HGLOBE,6X,4HSTAR,6X,4HTELY///(45X, 2 3I10/45X,3I10/45X,3I10/45X,3I10/45X,3I10/45X,3
06772		CALL EXIT
06784		END

O.K. \$ EOC

JOB **TABLE 5.1**

GLOBE S

LIBERAL

Page one	512
Other front page	21
Editorial page	29
Page seven	410
Last page of section	0
Other main news page	22
Election coverage page	1263
Frontpage - election coverage	0
Any other page	399

CONSERVATIVE

Page one	317
Other front page	64
Editorial page	182
Page seven	214
Last page of section	0
Other main news page	
Election coverage page	

107

E 5.1 THE FAVOURABLE LOCATION HYPOTHESIS

CHART 6

PROGRAM

S, SI

```

,SUPPRT,S
1,8X,I3)

```

ARTY,LOCATN,PAPER)+S

3), J=1,9), I=1,6)

AR,6X,4HTELY/// (45X,3I10/45X,3I10/45X,
3I10/45X,3I10/45X,3I10/45X,3I10///))

GLOBE STAR TELY

512	621	524
21	556	0
29	406	17
410	296	245
0	0	114
22	0	170
1263	730	342
0	0	218
399	791	590

317	439	590
64	508	0
182	44	442
214	179	140
0	0	137

Other main news page	395
Election coverage page	2162
Front page - election coverage	0
Any other page	45

N.D.P.

Page one	50
Other front page	0
Editorial page	42
Page seven	0
Last page of section	0
Other main news page	33
Election coverage page	418
Front page - election coverage	0
Any other page	0

SOCRED

Page one	0
Other front page	4
Editorial page	0
Page seven	0
Last page of section	0
Other main news page	0
Front page Election coverage page	163
Front page - election coverage	0
Any other page	0

CREDITISTE

Page one	0
Other front page	0
Editorial page	0
Page seven	0
Last page of section	0
Other main news page	0
Election coverage page	23
Front page - election coverage	0
Any other page	0

OTHER

Page one	0
Other front page	5
Editorial page	0
Page seven	0
Last page of section	0
Other main news page	35
Election coverage page	34
Front page - election coverage	0
Any other page	28

EXIT
CHECK

END OF JOB , RUNNING TIME 00.0884 HOURS

395	0 108	504
2162	801	751
0	0	545
45	740	1223

50	271	296
0	181	140
42	60	40
0	275	131
0	0	68
33	0	0
418	817	46
0	0	201
0	228	140

0	0	0
4	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	73
0	0	0
page 163	74	55
0	0	0
0	7	56

0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	17	0
0	0	104
0	0	0
23	240	52
0	0	0
0	24	33

0	0	0
5	8	0
0	0	0
0	19	0
0	0	0
35	0	0
34	88	57
0	0	0
28	34	45

\$ FORTRAN TABLE 5.2
 C FORTRAN PROGRAM FOR CHART 5AA AND BREAKDOWN OF
 C OF PARTY LEADERS ONLY
 C SINGLE PARTY ITEMS ONLY
 C FAVOURABLE ITEMS ONLY
 C SORTING RE PAPERS INCLUDED IN PROGRAM

05600		DIMENSION SI(6,3)
05600		INTEGER PAPER,PARTY,SUPPRT,S,SI
05600		DO 2 I=1,6
05634		DO 2 J=1,3
05668	2	SI(I,J)=0.
05764	5	READ 10, PAPER,PARTY,INDIVL,SUPPRT,S
05818	10	FORMAT (I1,13X,I2,I1,3X,I1,8X,I3)
05880		IF(INDIVL-1)6,7,5
05948	7	IF(SUPPRT-1)5,8,5
06016	8	IF(PARTY-6)1,1,5
06084	1	SI(PARTY,PAPER)=SI(PARTY,PAPER)+S
06216		GO TO 5
06224	6	PRINT 100,((SI(I,J),J=1,3),I=1,6)
06340	100	FORMAT (25X,5HGLOBE,6X,4HSTAR,6X,4HTELY///
		2 11X,7HCONSERV,2X,3I10/11X,3HNDP,6X,3I10/1
		3 4HCRED,5X,3I10/11X,5HOTHER,4X,3I10//)
06756		CALL EXIT
06768		END

\$ EOC

O.K.

JOB

TABLE 5.2

GLOBE

STAR

TELY

LIBERAL	1043	998	967
CONSERV	954	1018	1236
NDP	263	980	652
SOCRED	108	42	177
CRED	23	281	189
OTHER	0	0	0

EXIT
 CHECK

END OF JOB , RUNNING TIME 00.0698 HOURS

00:00

PAGE 01

8252 JOBS LEFT 4 7 06340129

109

TABLE 5.2
AND BREAKDOWN OF ELECTION COVERAGE

CHART5AA

PROGRAM

T,S,SI

VL,SUPPRT,S
1,8X,13)

PAPER)+S

),I=1,6)
STAR,6X,4HTELY///11X,7HLIBERAL,2X,3I10/
X,3HNDP,6X,3I10/11X,6HSOCRED,3X,3I10/11X,
ER,4X,3I10//)

TELY

967
1236
652
177
189
0

CODE FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS OF TORONTO PRESS COVERAGE OF
THE 1965 FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN

C CODED BY DON B. ROGERS, INSTITUTE OF CANADIAN
C STUDIES, AT CARLETON UNIVERSITY, OTTAWA CANADA, JAN.-FEB.
C 1966.

COLUMN(S) CODE

1-2 NAME OF NEWSPAPER

10 GLOBE AND MAIL

20 TORONTO STAR

30 TORONTO TELEGRAM

3-6 DATE OF ITEM -- MONTH/DAY

7-8 PAGE NUMBER

9 LOCATION WITHIN NEWSPAPER OF ITEM

1 PAGE ONE

2 OTHER FRONT PAGE

3 EDITORIAL PAGE

4 PAGE SEVEN

5 LAST PAGE OF SECTION

6 OTHER MAIN NEWS PAGE

- 7 ELECTION PAGE
- 8 FRONT PAGE - ELECTION COVERAGE
- 9 ANY OTHER PAGE

10-11 TYPE OF ITEM

PHOTOGRAPH

- 1 NEWS ARTICLE
- 2 SIGNED COMMENTARY
- 3 EDITORIAL
- 4 CARTOON
- 5 LETTERS-TO-THE-EDITOR

6 OPINION POLLS

7 FEATURE

8 DRAWING OR DIAGRAM

9 STATISTICAL TABLE OR GRAPH

10 ADVERTISEMENT

11 ARTICLE ON ELECTORAL PROCEDURE

20 NONE OF THE ABOVE

12 SOURCE OF ITEM

- 1 WIRE SERVICE
- 2 SYNDICATED ITEM
- 3 LOCAL
- 4 CORRESPONDENT
- 5 REPRINT
- 6 OTHER
- 7 UNKNOWN

13-14 AUTHOR OF ITEM, IF SPECIFIED IN BYLINE

13-14 OMIT

15-16

ORIGINATING PARTY IN THE ITEM

1	LIBERAL
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE
3	NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY
4	SOCIAL CREDIT
5	RAILLEMENT CREDITISTE
6	OTHER PARTIES AND INDEPENDENTS
7	COMBINED LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE
8	COMBINED LIBERAL AND NDP
9	COMBINED CONSERVATIVE AND NDP
10	ANY OTHER TWO-PARTY COMBINATION
11	COMBINED LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, AND NDP
12	ANY OTHER THREE-PARTY COMBINATION
13	ANY FOUR-PARTY COMBINATION
14	ANY FIVE-PARTY COMBINATION
15	ANY COMBINATION OVER FIVE PARTIES I.E.
ALL PARTIES	
16	UNSPECIFIED PARTIES IN GENERAL
17	NO PARTY CONTENT

17

ORIGINATING INDIVIDUAL IN THE ITEM

1	PARTY LEADER
2	KEY PARTY SPOKESMAN
3	CABINET MINISTER
4	FORMER CABINET MINISTER
5	LOCAL CANDIDATE
6	NONE OF ABOVE
7	UNKNOWN OR UNSPECIFIED

18-19

ORIGINATING PARTY (IF ANY) IN HEADING OF THE ITEM

SAME CODE AS ORIGINATING PARTY (COLUMNS 15-16) ALSO

20

ORIGINATING INDIVIDUAL (IF ANY) IN ITEM HEADING

SAME CODE AS ORIGINATING INDIVIDUAL

(COLUMN 17 ABOVE)

21

SUPPORT

- 1 FAVOURABLE
- 2 UNFAVOURABLE
- 3 NEUTRAL

22-23

SOURCE AREA OF ITEM

- 10 METROPOLITAN TORONTO
- 11 SOUTHERN AND SOUTH-WESTERN ONTARIO
- 12 NORTHERN ONTARIO
- 20 QUEBEC
- 30 THE MARITIMES
- 31 NEWFOUNDLAND
- 32 NOVA SCOTIA
- 33 NEW BRUNSWICK
- 34 PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND
- 40 THE PRAIRIES
- 41 MANITOBA
- 42 SASKATCHEWAN
- 43 ALBERTA
- 50 BRITISH COLUMBIA
- 60 NATIONAL
- 70 FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL
- 80 MIXED

90 INDEFINITE

24-25 SUBJECT AREA OF ITEM

SAME CODE AS SOURCE AREA OF ITEM

(COLUMNS 22-23 ABOVE)

26-29 OMIT

30-32 LENGTH OF ITEM (IN COLUMN-CENTIMETRES)

C ORIGINAL RAW DATA AS CODED FROM ELECTION COVERAGE

C COPY IN THE THREE TORONTO DAILY NEWSPAPERS IN THE WEEK

C NOVEMBER 1-6 IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO THE CANADIAN GENERAL

C ELECTION OF NOVEMBER 8, 1965.

C CODED BY DON B. ROGERS, INSTITUTE OF CANADIAN

C STUDIES, AT CARLETON UNIVERSITY, OTTAWA CANADA, JAN.-FEB.

C 1966.

10110610701315115177110100000067

101106107011000251771111100000008

10110610701700013013110600810048

101106107014000751771111109000038

101106107014160350351111100000078

10110610711700177177390300000043

10110610701400032032120200000019

10110610701700015177110100000013

10110610701401011011111600806063

10110610701400021027150900000075

101106117017000751771106000000030

101106117004000111771111100000049

10110611713700155177310100000004

10110611701100031037150600600008

101106117014000650651111100000013

10110611701100012012120601110027

10110611701400041041150601000044

10110611701700025177210100000006

10110611701700013177190430000006

10000611701700015177120200000005

10000611701700135177320200000009

10110611701700015177120200000019

101106126106000251771901100000010

101106126106000251771901000000032

101106126106000271771906000000343

101106149106000651771901000000028

10110601101301011011111600102088

10110601101402021021143600304080

10110601120600177177390600000006

101106011017001511773906000000034

101106011014001411773505000000031

10110501101700081081110600600081

101105011007000311771106000000050

10110501101401011177111110600092

101105011014000210211436000000021

101105011007000111771906000000010

10110501101700013013210601300017

101105011017001151771101000000051

10110602601403065065120200300035

10110502901700011011211600600014

101106036106000251771901000000010

101106047106000251771901000000500

101106063046170111772906000000048

101106063036000111772906000500067

101106063036001671773906000000037

101106063036000111772901106000043

101106063056000161772906000700017

101106063056000261771906000000006

10110506303700017017290601000073

10110506304717017177290601000057

10110506305700011177211600800052

10110506305700037177110603800020

10110506305700017177111601008022

10110506305700017177211116000015

10110506305700013017210600700017

10110506305700071177311600000016

10110507407418012177190600000167

10110507402414117177190600500207

10110507400700012177190600000056

10110507400700011177190600000056

10110608712410135177320200000055

10110608712409075177334340000020

10110608712408075177333330000036

10110608712407135177350500000045

10110608712700115177300000000009

10110608712411115027342420000040

10110608712412115177332320000033

10110608709700155177390600000047

10110608720700177177390600000012

10110608712413075177331310000030

10110608712404115177310130000054

10110608712405125177343430000057

10110608712406115017341410000040

10110508714700115177110100000113

10110508700700013177110100000010

10110508700700022177110100000010

10110508701700032032120200000037

10110508700700013177110600000054

10110508701700025027210100700054

10110508701700065177110100000011

10110508701100013013111601200026

10110508701304013013110100000120

10110508700700035177110100000010

10110609700700011177190600000037

10110609700700021177190600000037

101106097124141551773906000000343

101105097144031250371202000000095

101105097017000950251106008000030

101105097017001170171101000000025

101105097014030350352202000000045

101105097137001651773101000000008

101105097014000110111117000000028

101105097001000321771414100000039

10110509701700025177110601200008

101105097011000420421502010000017

101105097017001110311906000000056

101105097107000130131901000000007

101105097007000511771902000000010

101105097007000321771902000000010

101105372017000651771202000000005

101105372017000111771116006000004

101104011014010110111116006080083

10110401101402021021111600613053

101104011017000170171101000000017

101104011017001470513909000000032

10110401101400011011111601200028

10110406303700017177290600800065

10110406304700013177290601300060

101104063037000131772101000000020

10110406305700021177210601100005

10110406305700037177111110000011

10110406305700167177311600000033

10110406305700077177211600000006

10110406305700011177211600800006

10110406305700021177211601100009

10110406305700071177311601100008

10110406302318135177110100000079

10110407415700177177310900000091

10110407412304155177110100000121

10110407412700155177110100000263

10110408712700155177110100000504

10110409712700155177110100000504

10110410712700155177310100000504

10110411701700013013110601200038

10110411711100177177390600000030

10110411713700155177310100000009

10110411701100013013150600000012

10110411701100035177150600000009

10110411701700015015110600000018

10110411701414011011220200000081

10110411700100011177220200000044

10110411700100017177220200000029

10110411701100011177220200000017

10110411701700031031110100000036

10110411701700025025110600600025

10110411701100013013211600700026

10110411701419131011170601200094

10110412701700015015110100000042

10110412701100027027131310000015

10110412711100177177360600000015

10110412701700035177111110000006

10110412701700177177320200000009

10110412701700115177111110000007

10110412701700085035110600000017

10110412701700115015110600806037

10110412701100022022132320600015

10110412701100021021120201000018

10110412700300022177110100000044

10110412701410031031120200000034

10110412701100041041143600800018

10110412701100031012120200000016

10110412701401011011111301000068

10110412701700135177110600000024

10110412700100031177120900000032

10110413714410135025320200000120

10110413701420027027160600000066

10110413701700024024110600000021

10110413701100177177300000000039

10110413701700025025110600600016

10110413700700015177120200000010

10110413700700065177120200000010

10110413700700025177120200000010

10110427201700011177111600600006

10110437201700011177220200000004

10110437201700021177111600613005

10110437201700013177112120000006

10110301101321013013110100000038

10110301100700013177110100000045

10110301101700011011190601400027

10110301101100177177360600000042

10110302610700011177190600000013

10110303610700015177190100000009

10110304610700067177311601106080

10110306304700071177290600000063

10110306303700022027190601100061

10110306302318117177390900000079

10110306305700037177390600000014

10110306305700021177190600000039

10110306305700027177190600000009

10110306305700021177290600000004

10110306302322075177110100000040

10110307407423025025112120000127

10110307400700025177112120000058

10110307400700025177112120000029

10110307402414111177111420000102

10110308701404011011112600800100

10110308701401011011120601008058

10110308701400011011112600600015

10110308701700115177110100000056

101103087014000150152111100000037

101103087011000210211111100000015

10110308713700155177310100000013

101103087014020210211111100000050

10110308701400021177111600000056

10110309701700115012110601510038

10110309714403155312320200000118

10110309701700013013110600000026

10110309701700115015110601300034

101103097001001031771111100000026

10110309701700075021110601506027

10110309701400024024142600900018

10110309701700051077120200000013

10110309701700042177150100000005

10110310701410012012120601416097

10110310710700027177190600000212

10110310710700025177190100000029

10110310710700025177190110000009

10110310701400025025112120000030

10110310701100031031141600600021

10110310701100042042143430600021

10110331202324021177111110000044

10110331201100177177320200000010

10110331200700021177190900000006

10110201101100147177160600000104

10110201101402021021111601200127

10110202601100031031142600600033

10110206303700017177290601108066

10110206304717031177290600800047

10110206303700013177290601300044

10110206305700077177311600102019

10110206305700013177110600600007

10110206305700027177211600201018

10110206305700037177110600000008

10110206305700037177111600000003

10110206305700077177210601100018

10110207402414014013160600000131

10110208701404011011141900000076

10110208701100011177160900000009

10110208701400032177111130600030

10110208701100177177360110000013

10110208701700013013110900000025

10110208714100115177112120000048

10110208700400044177190600000016

10110208700600021177190600000016

10110208701100141177190601100081

10110208700400177177310100000064

10110208701402021021111600713087

10110209701410145177120200000109

10110209713700133177310100000010

10110209701700115025110600000041

10110209700300015177110100000080

101102097017000250252101200000028

10110209701400024024111600900027

10110217900400021021111600000045

10110218910700011177390600000018

10110218910700177177390600000018

10110235202324177177390900000051

10110235231700021177111600700004

10110101101700021021110900000036

10110101101404011011141900000084

101101047107000251771901000000504

10110106304317011177290600000064

10110106303700027177120201000067

10110106303700011177290600800031

10110107414414115025111110000153

10110108701407011011150600000044

10110108711100177177390600000037

10110108701100141177190600000085

10110108701100147077190600000054

10110108713700155177110100000008

10110108701425145107120200000117

10110108701401021021132601013072

10110108700700021177110900000063

10110108701700135077210600000025

10110109701100031031150600000033

101101097017000150151111100000005

10110109701700135075110600800026

10110109700700024177111900000062

10110109714100135031150500000051

10110109701400022022111601300044

10110109701416041041111600000042

10110109714416135177111110000090

10110110701400013013111600000028

10110110910700017177190600000364

10110110910700015177190100000035

10110121201700041177111600000004

10110121201700021177110900000005

10110121201700011177141900000005

20110601100300011177111600000088

20110601101467021021142600000093

20110601101400021021150500000018

20110601101700011011111600000065

20110601101100011011111601200006

20110601106266155011190600000163

20110601106600155037190600000027

20110602901400021021143200300011

20110602901700024024110100000017

20110604910700015177190100000167

20110605910700017177190600000350

20110605910700015177190100000039

20110606304374021177290601000108

20110606303700017017190600102055

20110606303700017177190600600055

20110606305700021021210600000017

20110606305700071177210601100007

20110606305700017177210600700006

20110606305700025021111601100016

20110606305700017177110600000013

20110607400700021177190600000004

20110607400700031177190600000004

20110607400700177177390900000027

20110607400700011177190600000004

20110607401700011011190600000126

20110607401700021021190600000126

20110607401700031031190600000144

20110608712700155177110100000307

20110608715700177177310100000098

20110608701700155177110100000136

20110608700700115177110100000063

20110608712700155177110100000345

20110610702477017017190600800135

20110610701388115075110100000118

20110610700700015177110100000057

20110610700700035177110100000045

20110610700700011177190600000019

20110610701473071071190600000083

20110612701472031031150600000063

20110612701700036177110100000050

20110612700700036177110100000025

20110612701700013013110600800019

20110612701700177177310100000030

20110612701473011011111600813100

20110612701700085013110600000019

20110612700700021177150600000105

20110612706100017177190600000034

20110612701700024024150600600009

20110612701700046047150500000006

20110612701700041177150601300006

20110612701700042042150600000006

20110612701700022022120201000008

20110613910700065177190100000027

20110620910700025177190100000035

201106209107000271771906000000327

20110627901368177177390600000035

20110632910700177177311110000150

20110659900700025177110100000038

20110659901400177177300000000024

201106599017001410371906000000032

20110659901469051051120600600024

20110659900700015177110100000090

20110659900700025177110100000013

20110659901370115177110100000042

201106612013711451771906000000068

20110661200400025177111110000066

20110661200400025177111110000034

20110661200400013177111110000060

20110661200300035177110100000046

20110661200400025177110100000016

20110661200400025177112120000007

20110661200300035177110100000007

20110501101372031031110100000102

20110501100300031177110600000114

20110501101700081011111600600049

20110501101473011011111600600088

20110501101700141131190600000010

20110501101467021021143600000069

20110551901700177177310100000015

20110503901100025177111110000015

20110504901100017177120200000015

20110524910700177177390600000018

20110524910700177177390600000018

20110545200300037177110100000083

20110506303700017017190601200060

20110506303700013013190600600027

20110506304374011177290600700103

20110506305700027177210600000024

20110506305700021177210601300010

20110506305700021177110600000017

20110506305700021177210600000012

20110506305700021177210600000006

20110506305700077177120600800035

20110506305700017177210600800014

20110506301700177177390600000003

20110507400400051177190600000017

20110507400100031177190600000017

20110507400100021177190600000017

20110507400700011177190600000017

20110507414469145017120200000090

20110507401475131177120200000111

20110527202376131071190600000075

20110527208700131177190600000035

20110507400700015177120200000039

20110507400100065177120200000019

20110508701400065065120200300081

20110508701700115315110601307060

20110508701400015015134340000055

201105087009700015177190340000006

20110508701700095025110600000025

20110508700400051177190600000055

20110508701475051051120600700055

20110508701400015015111110000022

20110508701700017017110100000013

20110508713700155177310100000015

20110508701700015031150500000011

20110508701700025025110100000013

20110508701700105177111111200011

20110508701700041177150600000007

20110508701700042177150200000007

20110508701700177177334340000007

20110508701700015177120200000007

20110508701700013013132320600007

20110508701700015177190900000027

20110509700700032177110600000061

20110509700700031177110600000141

20110509700700031177110600000036

20110509700700037177110100000056

20110509700700035177110100000109

20110401101700177177310100000040

20110401101700177111190600000017

20110401101473011011111600613068

20110401101467021021120200000049

20110401101400021021143430000009

20110401106466115037111110000144

20110401101700167177111110000005

20110401101400011011211110000051

20110402901700031031190600600005

20110403915300037177111110000039

20110403910700013177110100000010

20110406304374111177190600000116

20110406303700017177190601000086

20110406305700021177211601210021

20110406305700071177210601100010

20110406305700015015110601000011

20110406305700031031110600000012

20110406305700011177210601300005

20110406305700021177210601300007

20110406305700011177110600800016

20110406305700167177310600800005

20110406305700031037210600800010

20110406305700037177110600000006

20110406305700021177211601300010

20110407400300021177190600000032

20110407402200021021290600000094

20110412701700065177132320000007

20110412701472031031120601008063

20110412701300031177110100000028

20110412701700013013110601200043

20110412701700115035110600600024

20110412701400024024120200000043

20110412713700155177390100000016

20110412700300031177110600000095

20110412701700025025110600600011

20110412701700024024110600600020

20110412701700027027190600000048

20110412701400013013132601300031

20110412701700041177143600000009

20110412701700022022132320600009

20110412701700012012220200000008

20110412701700022177190600000006

20110412701100021021141600000006

20110432901100011011120200000015

20110432910700037177190100000009

201104329017001151771106000000026

20110435214378115177110100000131

20110435215700177177310100000009

201104352003000151771101000000095

201104352003000251771101000000026

201104352003000351771101000000037

201104389003000251772101000000086

201104389017001150151101006000045

201104572004000151771111100000068

201104572004000251771111100000097

201104572004000151771000000000051

20110457201479015015100000000087

201104572014710751771111100000095

201103011007000111772202000000050

201103011014000110112202000000059

201103011014730171772202000000048

20110301101473011011120601012083

201103011017000110111906000000006

20110301106700157017190600000026

20110301101473011011111600600031

20110301101467021021111600000032

20110301101700071177190600000011

20110302910700015177190100000006

20110302901100031037120200000007

201103049107000271771906000000216

201103049107000251771901000000033

201103049011000270271906000000013

201103063044740211772906000000103

20110306303700017017190600100074

20110306303700021021290601200043

201103063037000171772902000000020

20110306305700167177310601100016

20110306305700017177111600600009

20110306305700031177111600000007

20110306305700037177110600800005

20110306305700021177270600000005

20110306305700027177111600600005

20110306305700015177210100000010

201103063057000271772106000000010

20110306305700021177210601100010

201103107004000211771116000000040

201103107004000211771116000000040

201103107004000211771116000000026

20110310701400021021111601800049

20110310701467021021111600700047

201103107017001250651101000000034

20110310701400022022111601300026

20110310701700031031141600000020

20110310701700015015110100000019

20110310713700155177390100000033

20110310701700011011190600000047

20110310701700027027142420000013

2011031070170001501511060006000008

20110310701100177177320200000012

20110310701700015021111601300010

20110310701700051051190600000007

20110310701700041041143600800007

20110310701700042042143600000007

20110310701700177177343430000007

20110323202376077017190900000080

20110323200300013177110100000098

20110326901700013013110600000029

20110340910700011177190100000013

201103419107001671773901100000032

20110356901700031031110100000042

20110357914480135177111110000103

20110357900400035177111110000089

20110357900700015177111110000007

20110357900700025177111110000007

20110357900700045177111110000007

20110357915700177177111110000007

20110357901700013013110601200007

20110201106466115025111110000125

20110201101100177177320200000015

20110201101100021021111601200017

20110201101467021021111600000079

20110201101473011011141600600111

20110201101700167177190900000006

20110202901700037037111110000014

20110206304374021177290601100100

20110206303700021021290601100063

20110206305700167177210600800005

20110206305700037017111600700017

20110206305700037037110600000013

20110207402477017017190600000110

20110207402473021021290600600098

20110208701700013177150601700007

20110208701700042042150600000006

20110208701700041047143600000007

20110208701700011011190110000006

20110208701700024024111600900009

20110208700300016177110100000041

20110208701700147177190600000088

20110208701100031031142600900025

201102087017000250252121200000035

20110208701467021021111110000027

20110208713700155177190100000023

20110208701700024177111600800013

20110208701475051051120600000123

20110218910700177177390600000018

20110218910700177177390600000018

20110227214481135177111110000105

20110227200700015177111110000008

20110227200700024177111110000069

20110227200700035177111110000008

20110227200700065177111110000008

20110227215700177177311110000028

20110101101100031037150600800055

20110101101700021021111600000056

20110101101482011011141600000075

20110101101700166025190900000012

201101011014000210211323300000017

20110104701383115177110600000070

20110104700700166177310100000056

20110104701400022022111601300043

20110104701400021021132601300032

20110104701100167177190600000013

20110104700400025177112120000027

20110104701484025025112120000118

20110104701100011011290600000029

20110104701700025025110601100010

20110104701700013013120601300006

2011010470170004101111601100006

20110104701700055057220200000006

20110104701700025025110100000003

20110104713700155177110100000017

20110106303700027177290601300030

20110106305700027177111600000006

20110106305700027177211600600015

20110106305700037031211600000021

20110106305700011177220600800008

20110106305700024177211600000009

20110106305700027177210601400009

20110106305700011177233601400006

20110107402385037177190600800110

20110122901300167177390900000007

20110127214386115177110100000070

20110127200300115177110100000050

20110127225700177177310100000008

20110127201700177177310100000019

20110127201700011011110600000014

201101289144841351771111100000082

201101289157001771773111100000023

201101289003000151771111100000018

201101289003000251771111100000015

201101289003000351771111100000023

201101289003000651771111100000007

201101289011000130131121200000025

201101432003000251771101000000099

201101432003000251771101000000018

201101432003000151771101000000018

201101432003000151771101000000032

201101432003000151771101000000025

201101432003000251771101000000050

201101432013870751771101000000163

201101462003000251771101000000026

301106011013330110111116000000061

301106011013340210211426010000093

301106011011000310311506000000046

301106011017001011011906000000018

301106011007000111771906000000004

301106011007000211771906000000004

301106011007000311771906000000004

301106011014000160172112000000008

301106011017001771773101000000037

301106011017001511771906000000010

301106036107000150151901000000164

301106056107000250251901000000504

30110606304335011177290601000068

30110606303700017177290201008075

30110606303700011177290600600038

30110606305700177177310600000017

30110606305700177177310100000012

30110606305700021177111601110013

30110606305700011177110600600012

30110606305700017177212600700010

30110606305700027177110600207018

30110606305700011177210600800016

30110606305700036177110100000009

30110606305700177177310600000006

30110607402434021021142601100104

30110607402433011011111601100104

30110607400700011177190600000023

30110607400700021177190600000023

30110607400700011177190600000013

30110607400700021177190600000013

30110607402436017177290600800129

30110608901100042047150500000007

301106099107000271771906000000329

30110609910700025177190100000051

30110610901700177177310100000025

30110610901100024024150600600014

30110610901700025025112120000050

30110610901100051051120601200018

30110610901100041041150600000024

30110610910700065065110100000027

301106129107000171771906000000350

301106129107000151771901000000035

30110632901400177177300000000027

30110634714337115177110100000086

30110634700700011177211601200032

30110634700700011177111600000039

30110634700700011177211600000055

30110634701400021021150500000041

30110634701400022021120201000031

30110634701100167177390600000016

30110634701700013013110600806033

30110634700700013013110600000084

30110634701700111177190600000027

30110635712700135177113130000071

30110635712700135017120200000072

30110635712700115177130300000074

30110635712700025177100000000018

30110635712700135027140400000110

30110635712700135177150500000088

30110635700700024177190600000007

30110635700700015177190110000007

30110635700700024177190600000018

30110635700700041177190600000007

30110635700700013177190600000007

30110635700700031177190600000015

30110636500700011177190600000063

30110636500700021177190600000063

30110636500700041177190600000027

30110636500700031177190600000028

30110636500700051177190600000024

30110636501700011011190600000040

30110636501700021021190600000052

30110636501700031031190600000040

30110636501700041041190600000046

30110636501700051051190600000035

30110636501700177177310100000018

30110661202337035177110100000094

30110661200700035177110100000046

30110662901700025177110100000043

30110662900700025177110100000025

30110664901700025027110100000013

30110501100700031177110600000083

30110501101700031031110600600120

30110501101700115013110601300042

30110501101433011011111600600081

30110501101700051051220200000006

30110501101700177177310100000050

30110505901700031031110100000009

30110506304335177011290601000068

30110506303700027027190201000112

30110506303700017177290600807055

30110506303500027177142600000044

30110506305700027027110600201060

30110506305700021177150601300019

30110506305700011177211600713008

30110506305700011177210600700012

30110506305700017177211600700010

30110507402439077177290601008089

30110508701434021021143601310084

30110508701700065177110600000025

30110508700700025177110100000088

30110508701340025025110100000122

30110508701700025025110100000028

30110508701400024024143600000035

30110508701441051051120200300052

30110508701400017017120200000018

30110508701700065177110600000032

30110508713700155177110100000008

30110511914442135177111110000093

30110521800700035177110100000046

30110521800700031177110600000045

30110521800700031177110600000046

30110521801343031037110100000056

30110521814344115177110100000080

30110521800700015177110100000012

30110521800700025177110100000008

30110521800700035177110100000008

30110521802345017177190600800080

30110534501700131177190600000039

30110538902346131177190600000022

30110538910700127177190600000038

30110401101400011011111601200097

30110401101434021021120601000122

30110401101700027027190600000073

30110401100700011177211600700012

30110401100700017177211600000022

30110401101400031031120601000043

30110404914344135177110100000080

30110404901700025025110100000028

30110404900700025177110100000049

30110405901700115035110600000032

30110405901100167177390600000023

30110405901700136016110100000031

30110405901100051051120601000015

30110405901700135115110600000040

30110405900700025177110100000045

30110405901700125177110100000024

30110405901700025025110100000043

30110406304335011177290600100069

30110406303700011177290600000054

30110406303500017177242600000072

30110406305700021177110600000017

30110406305700167177350200000007

30110406305700017177210601400007

30110406305700037177110600000010

30110406305700027177110201000010

30110406305700011177110601100005

30110406305700017177210600800012

30110406305700011177210600800010

30110406305700037177120600000011

30110406305700081177211601300009

30110407402436037037190600000115

30110407400700031177190600000016

30110407402439077177290600000094

30110407401340167177390600800086

30110408901700013013110601200038

30110410913700155177310100000020

30110411901700031031110100000039

30110424901100167177390600000055

30110427914442115027111110000095

30110427900700015177111110000008

30110427900700035177111110000009

301104279007000251771111100000039

301104279007000151771111100000008

301104279007000351771111100000008

301104279007000251771111100000008

301104279007000151771111100000006

301104279007000251771111100000005

301104279007000351771111100000005

301104289107000131771901000000010

301104289107000171771901000000018

30110432901100013013132601300011

30110433901100011011120200000019

301104358007000251772101000000090

301104358017001151771101000000049

301104358013470250251101000000066

301104358007000851771101000000125

30110435801100177177320200000008

301104469017000270271101006000030

301104759011000410411436000000025

30110301101434022022111601300062

301103011001000111771202000000102

301103011014410110112202000000106

301103011014000110112202000000030

301103011014000270271424200000028

301103026007000161772202000000062

301103036107000151771901000000006

30110306303700017177290600800110

301103063043351311771906000000072

301103063057000211771206000000020

301103063057000111772106000000019

301103063057001471772106000000007

30110306305700167177210600800005

30110306305700027177110600000016

30110306305700021177120600800008

~~30110306305700167177310600000008~~

30110306305700177177310100000015

30110306305700031177110600700010

~~30110307402439017177190600800105~~

3011030890143301101120601012074

30110308901100031031141600800043

~~30110309910700025177190100000005~~

30110310700700015177210100000060

30110310700700015177210100000047

~~30110310700700015177110100000030~~

30110310701700135015110100000055

30110310701400021021111601800054

~~30110310701400021021111100000038~~

30110310701400021021111600000026

30110310700700095177110100000119

~~30110321910700027177190600000204~~

30110321910700025177190100000048

30110325901100177177390200000009

~~30110332513733155177190100000030~~

30110333800300013177110100000126

30110333814348115035110100000091

~~30110333801344025025110100000040~~

30110333801700025025110100000040

30110333800700025177110100000005

~~30110333800700025177110100000005~~

30110333802345021177190601200078

30110334901700177177390600000025

30110336901700115 77110600600038

30110346901700015177110600000013

30110348902349025025110100000128

30110358910700027177190100000018

30110363901400021021111600600040

30110363901700115011110600600031

30110363901700025177110600700027

30110201101434021021111601200155

30110201106600135177190130000031

30110201101433011011141600810097

30110202901100177177390600000042

30110205901100065177132320000018

30110206303700017177290600800070

30110206303700027177190600613059

30110206303500051177220600000012

30110206305700027177110601100038

30110206305700021177210601100006

30110206305700017177250600000007

30110206305700021177120601300008

30110207402450146177120200000243

30110207402436115177110100000133

30110207402439115177141410000096

30110208714442115017111110000120

30110208700700015177190110000007

30110208700700025177190110000007

30110208701400021021111600800038

30110208701700115027110600000028

30110208700700025177110100000021

30110208700700035177110100000031

30110208700700021177111600000070

30110208703700155177110100000018

30110208706700155027110100000114

30110208701700015015110600600021

30110210901100031031142600000009

30110211901700025025110600000011

30110227801351025025110100000083

30110227800700025177110100000110

30110227800700025177110100000047

30110227800700025177110100000063

30110228901700115087110600000019

30110244910700177177390600000018

30110244910700177177390600000018

30110244910700037177190100000013

30110101101434021021111600800053

30110101101433011011150500000062

30110104901100177177390600000036

30110106304335017177290600700072

30110106303700017177290600800054

30110106305700017177210600000012

30110106305700041177220600000007

30110106305700013177210600700013

30110106305700017177211600700011

30110106305700017177210601300004

30110106305700017177210600700004

30110107402439071177150000000082

30110110701700115177110600000054

30110110701434071177111600600047

30110110700400015177111110000045

30110110701452041041111600000048

30110110701100145177120600000014

30110110700100011177150600000051

30110110701400022022111600000025

30110110701100136177190600000056

30110110713700155177190100000011

30110110701700011177290600800044

30110110700700167177310100000079

30110126501100111177220200000011

30110138501700025027110100000022

30110138501700095037110600000035

30110138501700135024110600000056

30110138501441051051120600000045

30110138501700015015110600600011