James Cairns
Ryerson/York Joint Graduate Programme in Communication and Culture
PhD 3 (ABD)
j3cairns@ryerson.ca

Bringing Parliament to the People:
A Meditated-Politics Approach to the Speech from the Throne

**Bringing Parliament to the People:**
**A Mediated-Politics Approach to the Speech from the Throne[1]**

On 30 September 1974, as the Speech from the Throne was being read in the Canadian Senate, a group of Aboriginal activists demonstrated outside Parliament. News coverage of the ensuing violent clash between picketers and RCMP officers noted that "the bloodied noses and bludgeoned faces of the protesters contrasted sharply with royally bedecked by-standers on the Hill" (Finlayson 1974, 1). According to the *Toronto Evening Star*, in 1896, hundreds of people from the capital region descended upon Parliament to witness the ceremony surrounding the Throne Speech, but returned home unfulfilled after discovering that they had arrived in Ottawa one day early (1). In 1920, the *Globe* expressed relief after watching Ontario's new Farmer-Labour Government commence legislative proceedings "with all the glory of spectacle which has been witnessed in previous openings" (1). In 1966, Opposition Leader John Diefenbaker told the *Toronto Daily Star* that the Pearson Government's Throne Speech was a "pallid, photostatic, puny copy of former addresses" (1). An *Ottawa Citizen* editorial from 1957 announced that the Speech from the Throne delivered by Queen Elizabeth II would give Ottawa "a new dignity and inspire greater efforts to develop a Capital worthy in its architecture and culture of the nation it serves" (6). In 2006, *Globe and Mail* columnist Jane Taber observed that for its first Throne Speech, the Harper Government "chose to emulate the way Americans deliver their State of the Union addresses by inviting Canadian heroes rather than filling the chamber with old politicians." (Taber 2006, A6). The *Ottawa Evening Citizen*'s coverage of the 1938 Throne Speech used four pages to describe the ladies in the Chamber and their gowns; the article includes fifty-two photographs of attendees (17-21).

The common thread running through these stories is that all come from news reports, and, accordingly, are neglected by scholarly interpretations of the Speech from the Throne. Though literature on the Speech is scant, what writing does exist focuses on the institutional aspects of the event to the exclusion of other cultural phenomena.

The Speech from the Throne is the centerpiece of the parliamentary calendar. The climax of Parliament's opening ceremonies, the Speech enables Canada's premier political institution to do business; it is a prerequisite to all subsequent legislation. Moreover, the delivery of the Throne Speech itself has long been a major media event. Along with the budget speech, the Speech from the Throne is perhaps the only part of parliamentary activity guaranteed to attract media attention. Clearly, in terms of both function and form, the Throne Speech is a powerful political exercise; yet the paucity of scholarly research on the ceremony suggests that it is rarely considered to be an object worthy of academic analysis. In light of this apparent tension, there is good reason to ask: Why have students of politics in Canada shown so little interest in the Speech from the Throne?

This essay argues that interpretations of the Throne Speech are conceptually restricted by a prevailing disposition to see the event as an exclusively parliamentary affair. Put differently, I suggest that the traditional organizing principles around which

---

definitions of the Speech are constructed have effectively cordoned off alternative ways of interpreting the Speech—ways which have the potential to generate rich new understandings of the apex of Parliament's opening ceremonies. By contrast, this paper notes the weakness of standard interpretations, and argues that in order to bring citizens into the discussion, researchers must begin to view the Throne Speech through the lens of the mass media. Inspired by the oft-repeated claim that scholarship on Parliament in Canada "has never been highly theoretical" (Atkinson and Thomas 1993, 424), this paper draws on the theoretical perspective that regards news media as major contributors to the social construction of reality, and advocates taking a new approach to the Throne Speech —one that explores representations of the event in mass mediated news reports. Guided by Thompson's (1995, 126) work on "mediated publicness", the paper concludes by providing examples to show several ways in which this new approach would: 1) create analytical conditions to justify constructing a conceptual connection between the Speech and the People; 2) provide a useful way of assessing how the Speech has changed over time; and 3) identify numerous ambiguities that challenge traditional, static interpretations of the highlight of the opening of Parliament.

**Standard interpretations of the Throne Speech**
Although individual words may differ, a typical definition of the Speech from the Throne in an introductory political science textbook looks something like this: "Each new session of Parliament begins with the Speech from the Throne" (Brooks 2004, 225)… "a concise statement (written by the prime minister and passed by the cabinet)" (Dawson and Dawson 1989, 52)… "read by the governor general" (Dyck 2006, 368)… "designed to outline the government's legislative intentions for the upcoming session" (Gibbins 1994, 62). Many (albeit, not necessarily all) of the same points recur throughout what could only by hyperbole be called *the literature on the Speech from the Throne*; therefore, a useful way of analyzing statements on the Speech is to identify the broader context within which such words have been uttered. In the tradition of discourse theory in the field of communication and cultural studies (e.g. Foucault 1972; Phillips and Jorgensen 2002), the following literature review classifies statements on the basis of their location within a larger work, as opposed to lining them up in chronological order, or dividing them by textual species. This makes it possible to group clusters of statements around common themes, thus revealing conceptual patterns that cut across time and genre (Kendall and Wickham 1998), and shedding new light on popular assumptions about what the Speech is and, conversely, what it is not.

Before turning attention to places in which the Throne Speech is discussed, however, it should be pointed out that many publications make no mention of the Speech whatsoever. A sample, with titles included to justify why one might expect their concern for the event: Atkinson's (1986) "Parliamentary government in Canada"; Atkinson and Docherty's (2004) "Parliament and political successes in Canada"; Guy's (1997) "The parliamentary system of government"; Hogg's (1993) "Responsible government"; MacKinnon's (1991) "The value of the monarchy"; Malloy's (2006) "Is there a democratic deficit in Canadian legislatures and executives?"; Sproule-Jones' (1984) "The

enduring colony? Political institutions and political science in Canada."[2] In Grace and Sheldrick's (2006) recent edited collection *Canadian politics*, the Speech from the Throne does not appear in the book's 175-word glossary of key terms in Canadian political discourse. At the risk of being intellectually pretentious, it might even be helpful to suggest that it is *silence* which organizes talk of the Throne Speech in these works.

The resounding silence on the subject in these respected contributions to Canadian politics underlines the dismissive treatment given an activity that this paper argues has greater significance. But we should not make too much of such silences, for there have been many words written about the Throne Speech. Unfortunately, these words tend not to be gathered in the same place, but scattered across a range of texts—neither the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* nor *Canadian Parliamentary Review* has ever published an article with "The Speech from the Throne" in its title. When the topic of the Speech is taken up, it tends to occur against the backcloth of an investigation of: the administration of Parliament; the ceremonial functions of the Crown; or the government's (explicit or hidden) agenda.

*The administration of Parliament*
Perhaps more frequently than any other conceptual link, the Throne Speech is discussed in connection with its practical parliamentary functions. These sorts of statements can be further divided into those concerned with time, and those concerned with space. With respect to the former, the Throne Speech is cast as the central component of Parliament's commencement. The main point here is that there are "a number of smaller cycles within the life of a Parliament" (Whittington and Van Loon 1996, 519), and each of these parliamentary sessions "begins with a formal statement of what the government intends to do" (White, Wagenberg, and Nelson 1972, 129). Only after the Speech comes "the first opportunity available to the House of Commons" to address any other particular concern (Ward 1987, 139). Yes, convention holds that prior to debate on the Throne Speech, the prime minister will introduce a *pro forma* bill in order to demonstrate the power of the Commons to consider business at its leisure (Hambleton 1951); but even this ancient rite can be performed only after the delivery of the Throne Speech itself. By analogy, from the temporal perspective, the Speech is to Parliament what the starter's pistol is to a marathon: a signal that the game has begun.

In contrast to temporally-based analyses, Mallory's (1984) discussion of the Throne Speech is found in a chapter on the Senate. This choice is especially interesting given that the same book contains chapters on both the formal and political executives in Canada (33-75; 76-125). Discussing the Throne Speech in the context of Parliament's Upper House—the *space* in which the Speech is delivered—indicates that Mallory places high priority on the ceremony's physical setting. Also driven by spatial concerns, Jackson and Atkinson (1980) emphasize the Speech's contribution to what here will be called *intra-parliamentary bonding*. Parliament's individual components are rarely examined as a whole (Smith 2003); yet the Speech from the Throne is a most obvious case of "'Parliament Assembled' in its three constituent parts: the House of Commons, the Senate and the Sovereign" (Marleau 1988, 3). Evoking intra-parliamentary bonding,

---

[2] A caveat: a few of these texts mention the debate on the Speech from the Throne, but none takes up the Speech *as* Speech.

Smith (1995) discusses the Throne Speech in a chapter entitled "The Crown-in-Parliament" (110-133; see also Docherty 2004), and Hogg (1993, 22) notes that one of the governor general's powers is the ability "to summon into session the members of the elective lower house" (implying, but not naming the Throne Speech). Although temporal qualities are not absent from the picture, spatially-based interpretations of the Speech focus on the virtual and literal merging of different parts of Parliament.

*A ceremonial function of the Crown*
A second popular description of the Throne Speech anchors the event to the "important symbolic role in the legislative process" played by representatives of the Crown (Archer et al. 1999, 228). Smith (1995) observes that at least one former governor general actually "desired a hand in composing the throne speech," yet bearing in mind the conventional authority vested in the prime minister and cabinet, it is no surprise that this turned out to be "a goal neither [Jules Leger] nor his successors achieved" (124; see also Landes 2002, 117-18). Rather, in Canada, where most analysts (rightly or wrongly) perceive the governor general as wielding no real political power, but acting instead as the "the transmitter of legitimacy and the personification of the state" (Guy 2006, 156-7), it is common to see the Throne Speech cast as one of the Crown's ceremonial functions (e.g. MacIvor 2006). Putting aside whatever else the Speech accomplishes, it is possible to interpret its delivery as but one of the rituals imported from Great Britain—a ritual that recalls "the struggle between parliament and the crown" (Jackson and Atkinson 1980, 87). As Ricker, Saywell, and Skeoch (1982) point out, although the ceremonies surrounding the Speech from the Throne are the product of a bygone era, they offer "a reminder of the majesty and drama of a thousand years of struggle for the free institutions we enjoy today" (90).

Both Berjami (2000) and Forsey (2005) describe the Throne Speech as the culmination of the symbolic activities that constitute Parliament's opening ceremonies; however, it is Monet (quoted in Joseph 2001) who offers the most vivid account of the spectacle that is the Speech. Conjuring up a colourful image, Monet describes the governor general, "enthroned on the dais against the north wall of the Senate chamber"; the Supreme Court Justices, in red robes, "on their nine scarlet leather chairs"; various military and law enforcement officials, "wearing their gold, their braid and their decorations"; and "the speaker of the Senate, in black robes and tricorne hat, the gentleman usher of the Black Rod, with his cocked hat and ebony cane, and his deputy, carrying the great gold Mace of the Senate" (218). The detail that Monet gives to the visual elements of the Speech is instructive. The Speech is shown to be more than an enabling mechanism; rather, it is a pageant, worthy in its own right. It is important not only for what it foreshadows, but also in and of itself, as a symbol-laden political ritual. In fact, Monet boldly concludes that "the opening of Parliament has become the supreme moment of [Canada's] political life." It is a sweeping claim, but two brief examples demonstrate why it should not be dismissed offhand. First, Wallace's (1935) *A reader in Canadian civics* fails to mention the Throne Speech in chapters on provincial and on dominion government, but the book does include a full two-page photo-spread of the Speech being read at the opening of Parliament (156-7). Second, and similarly, the hardcover of Ward's (1960) book *Government in Canada* features a brilliant colour

photograph of Queen Elizabeth II, sitting upon the Throne in the Canadian Senate. The fact that neither author explains why a photograph of the Throne Speech holds such a prominent place lends support to Monet's declaration that the Speech is widely presumed to be the ultimate symbol of parliamentary politics in Canada.

*The government's (explicit and hidden) agenda*
A third common way of characterizing the Throne Speech is by depicting it as an expression of the government's agenda. It is useful, however, to subdivide this organizing principle into two different perspectives: on one hand the Speech is interpreted as an explicit statement of government policy; on the other it is treated as a reservoir of hidden meanings, ripe for ideological analysis. Many observers note that while the Speech is delivered by the governor general, "it is prepared by the prime minister's staff" (Malcomson and Myers 2005, 123; see also McMenemy 2006), thus "provid[ing] the cabinet with an opportunity to outline its legislative program" (Dyck 2006, 319). This makes it possible to treat the Speech itself as "an outline of what the government hopes to achieve in any given session of parliament" (Phillips 2006, 162). The Throne Speech "sets the agenda for most parliamentary business" (Franks 1987, 127); thus it is logical that Soroka (2000) uses the Speech as "an indication—albeit an inconsistent one longitudinally—of the Government's policy priorities" (114). Brooks (2004) links the event to future legislative action by listing eight proposals included in the Speech of 2002; and Docherty (2005) strengthens this connection by noting that "almost all bills that flow from the speech are considered matters of confidence for the government" (141). Former cabinet minister Mitchell Sharp (1988) cautions that the Speech should be used to "give Parliament an indication of the legislation the government intends to place before it", not as "a vehicle of government propaganda" (16).

A handful of other observers have shown less interest in the specific policies outlined in the Speech, instead examining the documents as if they contained clues about underlying features of a particular government or era in Canadian history (see Brodie 2002, 2003; White 1971; see also Weber 1979 on the Queen's Speech in Great Britain). Most intriguing is Brodie's (2003) effort to use transcripts of the Throne Speech to "provide a historical record of how different ideas about Canada and 'Canadianness' are evoked in order to rally support for governing practices and public policies" (21). Specifically, she examines federal Throne Speeches since Confederation and identifies the discursive construction of three ideal-type Canadians—"The Imperial Subject", 1867-early 1940s; "The Caring-Sharing Canadian", 1943-late 1970s; and "The Entrepreneurial Canadian", 1980-present (21-29). Not only is the analysis innovative, but it makes a compelling argument about how national myths can change over time.

**The Throne Speech through the lens of "mediated publicness"**
It should come as no surprise that the three parts of Parliament are well represented in scholarly texts. The Throne Speech is a parliamentary affair; but is it exclusively thus? Reflecting back upon the core organizing principles, it becomes apparent that what has been consistently excluded from debate is the People—Canada's great unwashed masses. Whatever else modern politics is about, surely it is about relations among citizens and governments; and although the Canadian citizenry is not the only audience to which the

Speech is delivered, it does constitute a significant audience, perhaps not by rule, but certainly by convention. Where are citizens located in relation to the Speech from the Throne? Furthermore, on the assumption that it is the institutional preoccupations of traditional approaches that have prevented citizens from receiving a substantial role in Throne Speech analysis, the question now becomes: How can citizens be introduced into scholarly assessments of the Speech?

In treating the Throne Speech as an expression of the ideal Canadian, Brodie's work succeeds in bringing the citizen a step into the frame of analysis. However, this work also makes an unstated assumption that weakens its overall contribution. By emphasizing the importance of the depiction of the ideal Canadian offered in the Speech, Brodie implies that this message—the message of the Speech itself—makes its way to the ears of those people it works to define. Brodie assumes that Canadians are listening to (or watching, or reading) the Speech. Thus, it appears that Brodie believes that the Speech spreads beyond the walls of Parliament. But how does such distribution occur? The question is never asked.

Yes, the Throne Speech embodies a government's vision—in roughly one hour, it expresses grand sentiments and articulates grand objectives. Yes, it is a highly symbolic affair. It is *the promise* of parliamentary politics, in both literal and figurative senses of the term. But where does the public encounter the policy promise and the symbol that is the Throne Speech? Only a fraction of the population has ever sat in the galleries and watched live legislative debate; doubtless an even smaller proportion of that small group has seen the Throne Speech read in the flesh. Live broadcasts of the Speech have been available on radio and television for decades, but they do not draw large audiences. How do people come to see and hear the Speech from the Throne? Like the bulk of official political activity, the event is made public through news reports (Taras 2001; Thompson 1995). Thus, in a sense, for the great majority of Canadians, the Speech from the Throne *is news coverage of the Speech from the Throne*.

The theoretical perspective that supports this claim stems from the large body of research which views news as an integral part of the social construction of reality. On the epistemological claim that "reality itself can only be produced in communication" (Nesbitt-Larking 2001, 85), it adopts Hartley's (1996) position that, "as the sense-making practice of modernity, journalism is the most important textual system in the world" (32). This theoretical framework differs from those which treat news media as mirrors on society, usually referred to in the literature as classical liberal theories of news (Curran 1991, 2002; Nesbitt-Larking 2001; Schudson 1996). Certainly, on one level, the news does report information about individuals and events. The crucial point, however, is that in doing so, news also "defines and redefines, constitutes and reconstitutes social meanings" (Tuchman 1978, 196). Edelman's (1988) excellent *Constructing the political spectacle* elaborates on the power of mediated political discourse:

> It is language about political events, not the events in any other sense, that
> people experience; even developments that are close by take their meaning
> from the language that depicts them. So political language *is* political
> reality; there is no other so far as the meaning of events to actors and
> spectators is concerned. (104)

Thompson's concept of "mediated publicness", the ability of news discourse to transport people and proceedings across space and time—the way the news goes on "reflecting and containing events that remain distant and yet distinctly present" (Barnhurst and Nerone 2001, 6)—is a great boon to the contemporary critic of "the media-politics relationship" (Street 2005, 20). It is precisely what Taras (2001) is alluding to when he argues that media make politicians and political events *real* for the majority of Canadians. To be sure, there is an element of classical liberal theory at play; in one sense, news is reflective. But in another sense, news is creative: it "form[s] our psychic environment, especially with respect to matters beyond our direct personal experience, a realm into which most aspects of politics fall" (Fletcher and Gottlieb 1990, 221).

In the present context, the main contribution of this perspective on news is its provision of theoretical grounds on which to base the incorporation of citizens into a discussion of the Speech from the Throne. But now that millions of Canadians have been welcomed in, what does the researcher do with them? In other words, if one were in fact to break traditional conceptual boundaries and take a mediated-politics approach to Throne Speeches, what are the expected rewards of a study that analyzes the Speech from this angle?[3]

First, this type of study would highlight the fact that the Throne Speech is a much more significant exercise than standard political science interpretations are wont to suggest. Regardless of the substance of other specific insights, the study would demonstrate that the Throne Speech is a crucial event that exists not only within Parliament, but also—because of mass mediated news—in homes, businesses, and other public places throughout Canada. It would show that the Throne Speech has long been a major media event in a way that most other parliamentary affairs are not. In short, by noting the sheer frequency and volume of coverage, it would demonstrate the impressive public presence of the Speech from the Throne. It would bring Parliament to the People.

Second, this approach would see the Throne Speech change over time. Rather than continuing to define the Speech as if it were an institution fixed in stone (notwithstanding courteous but clichéd nods toward its ancient origins), a mediated-politics approach presents an opportunity to examine journalistic assessments of particular Throne Speeches in particular periods. Looking back across the twentieth century, there are indications that news discourse has changed so much that some of the dominant frames within which the Throne Speech was once reported no longer exist today. For example, in a 1910 editorial about Ontario's Speech from the Throne, the *Globe* points to the opening ceremonies as confirmation of its belief that "politics has become a lady's game" (6). Describing the reading of the Speech itself, it notes that "His Honor's gratified recognition, the Premier's deference, and the unstinted admiration of the galleries, all were theirs [the ladies who sat on the Chamber floor], and they filled every place of prominence, with the single exception of the Throne itself." What does the Speech from the Throne have to do with issues of politics and gender? This angle is not covered in political science texts. Yet even a cursory look at newspaper coverage of Throne Speeches in the first four decades of the twentieth century leads to an intriguing

---

[3] The following three preliminary findings are based on work for my doctoral dissertation—*Living together* through mediated-politics: Newspaper coverage of the Speech from the Throne in Ontario, 1900-2001.

discovery: the event appears just as frequently as the topic of discussion in a newspaper's section for women as it does on the editorial page. At the turn of the twentieth century, the day of the Speech was consistently depicted as a "scene of gaiety" (*Toronto Daily Star* 1900, 1), each succeeding year's ceremony being cast as "the gayest display that has yet been witnessed at such a function" (*Toronto Evening Telegram* 1910, 15).[4] Not only does contemporary news coverage often imply that the Speech is a rather dubious political promise, but also it describes the ceremonial elements of the Speech as quaint ornaments decorating parliamentary business-as-usual. Looking at the Speech through the eyes of newspaper journalists and reading-publics of the past, it appears that the event once carried a different kind of cultural significance.

This leads directly to a third contribution of a mediated-politics approach. News coverage of Throne Speeches presents an opportunity to explore more fully the myriad tensions that run through, if not effectively *compose* the opening of Parliament. As Edelman (1988) argues, people spend their lives negotiating contradictory interpretations of the world. In Geertz's (1973) terms, the meanings that people draw from their eternally ambiguous surroundings depend heavily upon the ways in which a given ideological framework "names the structure of situations" (231). Yet, while news may be produced with a "preferred reading" in mind, decades of audience research show that news texts remain open to multiple interpretations (Jones 2006; Hall 1980). Thus, while it would be overly ambitious to claim that textual analysis based upon a mediated approach could account for every possible citizen-reading, it is reasonable to believe that the attempt to identify ambiguities emerging from Throne Speech news coverage would generate new understandings about what the Speech has come to mean beyond Parliament's walls.

In contrast to the predictable results of trying to pin down just exactly what the Throne Speech is, a project that works to demonstrate how the Speech has been variously depicted in news coverage thrives in the rich world of ambiguities. It views the Speech as both functional *and* ceremonial, anachronistic *and* relevant, capable of producing both arousal *and* quiescence; it sees policy *and* posturing, plans *and* uncertainties, fears *and* assurances; it notes promises *and* failures, power *and* fragility; past *and* future. Most important, in a way that challenges Resnick's (1984) thesis that Parliament and People are inherently at odds with one another, it creates a space for thinking about the Speech from the Throne—the ultimate demonstration of Parliament's authority—through the eyes of the person (with the paper)-on-the-street. As the cultural approach to the study of mediated citizenship suggests, while that person may well use Throne Speech news to acquire information about government policy, he or she "is also just as likely to embrace political material that expresses, reifies, confirms, or celebrates the core beliefs and values he or she connects to the state, or those things that affirm his or her identity as a citizen" (Jones 2006, 369). This is not to suggest that a creative thought experiment is a substitute for political efficacy. Surely another ambiguity would be the tension between the Speech as symbol-of-citizen-power and symbol-of-government-domination. But to argue that it is exclusively one or the other is to overlook a mountain of variegated news

---

[4] Clearly a mediated-politics approach would face additional challenges born of ongoing changes in journalistic language. For example, although it is fair to assume that a good deal of gaiety surrounded the composition and delivery of the Conservative Government's Throne Speech of April 2006, even a casual observer would note that reports on the evening news used different words to describe the prime minister's general disposition.

coverage that can neither be characterized in exactly the same way, nor assumed to be read through a unitary mental filter.

**Conclusion**

In Savoie's (2006) recent favourable review of Docherty's (2005) contribution to The Canadian Democratic Audit, the book is praised for dealing "with virtually all important aspects of the Canadian Parliament and provincial legislatures" (426). Doubtless Docherty's book is an insightful assessment of numerous issues central to legislatures in Canada, but it does not analyze mediated constructions of the legislative world. This is a problem, for without viewing the legislature through the lens of the mass media, Docherty's account misses a valuable chance to connect the legislature, the central democratic institution of the political community, to the citizenry at large. The fact that Savoie sees nothing wrong with Docherty's oversight—indeed, he appears not even to notice it—is indicative of the fundamental assumption in mainstream Canadian political science that politics and media, although related in some ways, are essentially separate spheres of life. Regrettably, there is still truth in Wallace and Fletcher's (1984) decades-old critical commentary about the low status given to media in post-secondary politics departments.

This essay has argued that traditional interpretations of the Speech from the Throne are restricted by the inherent conceptual limitations of dominant analytical contexts. Specifically, it criticized both the tendency to view the Speech as an exclusively parliamentary affair, and, subsequently, to neglect to examine links between the Speech and the general population. With the purpose of generating fresh ideas about the role of the Throne Speech in Canadian political culture, the paper advocated adopting a theoretical model from the field of media studies. Viewing the Throne Speech through journalistic accounts would not only shed new light on the Speech itself, but also help to address longstanding concerns about the atheoretical nature of scholarship on Parliament in Canada (e.g. Sproule-Jones 1984; Atkinson and Thomas 1993; Malloy 2002). This is not to suggest that institutional description is no longer a viable enterprise; a study of mediated-politics that is not informed by a firm understanding of institutional processes would lack both depth and worth. However the flip-side of this point is that so too will institutional analysis be strengthened by considering the forms taken by its objects of study after they have been given public life in mass mediated news reports.

**Works Cited**

**Books, chapters in books, scholarly articles**
Archer, Keith, Roger Gibbins, Rainer Knopff, and Leslie Pal. 1999. *Parameters of power: Canada's political institutions*. Toronto: ITP Nelson.
Atkinson, Michael. 1986. Parliamentary government in Canada. In *Authority & influence: Institutions, issues and concepts in Canadian politics*, edited by P. Clarke, C. Cassidy, and W. Petrozzi, 75-112. Oakville: Mosaic Press.
Atkinson, Michael, and David Docherty. 2004. Parliament and political successes in Canada. In *Canadian politics in the 21st century*. 6th ed. Edited by M. Whittington and G. Williams. Toronto: Thomson.
Atkinson, Michael M., and Paul G. Thomas. 1993. Studying the Canadian Parliament. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* XVIII(3):423-51.
Barnhurst, Kevin G., and John Nerone. 2001. *The form of news: A history*. New York: The Guilford Press.
Bejermi, John. 2000. *How Parliament works*. 5th ed. Ottawa: Borealis Press.
Brodie, Janine. 2002. Citizenship and solidarity: Reflections on the Canadian way. *Citizenship Studies* 6(4):377-394.
———. 2003. On being Canadian. In *Reinventing Canada: Politics of the 21st century*, edited by J. Brodie and L. Trimble, 18-29. Toronto: Prentice Hall.
Brooks, Stephen. 2004. *Canadian democracy: An introduction*. 4th ed. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.
Curran, James. 1991. Rethinking the media as a public sphere. In *Communication and citizenship: Journalism and the public sphere*, edited by P. Dahlgren and C. Sparks, 27-57. London: Routledge.
———. 2002. Media and the making of British society, c.1700-2000. *Media History* 8(2):135-154.
Dawson, R. MacGregor, and W.F. Dawson (revised by Norman Ward). 1989. *Democratic government in Canada*. 5th ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Docherty, David. 2004. Parliament: Making the case for relevance. In *Canadian politics*. 4th ed. Edited by and J. Bickerton and A-G. Gagnon, 163-183. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
———. 2005. *Legislatures*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
Dyck, Rand. 2006. *Canadian politics*. Concise 3d ed. Toronto: Nelson.
Edelman, Murray. 1988. *Constructing the political spectacle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Fletcher, Frederick J., and Daphne Gottlieb Taras. 1990. Images and issues: The mass media and politics in Canada. In *Canadian Politics in the 1990s*. 3d ed. Edited by M.S. Whittington and G. Williams, 221-246. Scarborough: Nelson.
Forsey, Eugene A. 2005. *How Canadians govern themselves*. 6th ed. Library of Parliament: Canada.
Foucault, Michel 1972. *The archeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.
Franks, C.E.S. 1987. *The Parliament of Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Geertz, Clifford. 1973. Ideology as a cultural system. Chap. 8 in *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Gibbins, Roger. 1994. *Conflict & unity: An introduction to Canadian political life*. 3rd ed. Scarborough: Nelson.

Grace, Joan, and Byron Sheldrick, eds. 2006. *Canadian politics: Democracy and dissent*. Toronto: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Guy, James John. 1997. The parliamentary system of government. In *Expanding our political horizons: Readings in Canadian politics and government*, edited by J.J. Guy, 89-93. Toronto: Harcourt Brace and Company.

———. 2006. *People, politics, and government: A Canadian perspective*. 6th ed. Toronto: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hall, Stuart. 1980. Encoding/decoding. In *Culture, media, language: Working papers in cultural studies, 1972-79*, edited by S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe, and P. Willis, 128-138. London: Hutchinson.

Hambleton, George. 1951. *The Parliament of Canada*. Toronto: The Ryerson Press.

Hartley, John. 1996. *Popular reality: Journalism, modernity, popular culture*. London: Arnold.

Hogg, Peter. 1993. Responsible Government. In *The Canadian political tradition: Basic readings*. 2nd ed. Edited by R.S. Blair and J.T. McLeod, 20-44. Scarborough: Nelson Canada.

Jackson, Robert J., and Michael M. Atkinson. 1980. *The Canadian legislative system: Politicians and policymaking*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Gage Publishing Ltd.

Jones, Jeffrey P. 2006. A cultural approach to the study of mediated citizenship. *Social Semiotics* 16(2):365-383.

Joseph, Thomas W. 2001. *Essentials of Canadian politics and government*. Toronto: Prentice Hall.

Kendall, Gavin, and Gary Wickham. 1998. *Using Foucault's methods*. London: Sage.

Landes, Ronald G. 2002. *The Canadian polity: A comparative introduction*. 6th ed. Toronto: Prentice Hall.

MacIvor, Heather. 2006. *Parameters of power: Canada's political institutions*. 4th ed. Toronto: Nelson.

MacKinnon, Frank. 1991. The value of the monarchy. In *Politics: Canada*. 7th ed. Edited by P.W. Fox and G. White, 373-377. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd.

Malcolmson, Patrick, and Richard Myers. 2005. *The Canadian regime: An introduction to parliamentary government in Canada*. 3rd ed. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Mallory, J.R. 1984. *The structure of Canadian government*. Rev. ed. Toronto: Gage.

Malloy, Jonathan. 2002. The "responsible government approach" and its effect on Canadian legislative studies. Canadian Study of Parliament Group. *Parliamentary perspectives* 5:1-13.

———. 2006. Is there a democratic deficit in Canadian legislatures and executives? *Canadian politics: Democracy and dissent*, edited by J. Grace and B. Sheldrick, 61-84. Toronto: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Marleau, Robert. 1988. The first days of a Parliament. *Parliamentary Government* 8(2):3-4.

McMenemy, John. 2006. *The language of Canadian politics: A guide to important terms & concepts*. 4th ed. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Press.

Nesbitt-Larking, Paul. 2001. *Politics, society, and the media: Canadian perspectives*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Phillips, Louise, and Marianne W. Jorgensen. 2002. *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.

Phillips, Stephen. 2006. The political executive and bureaucracy: On top and on tap. In *Studying politics: An introduction to political science*, edited by R. Dyck, 155-183. Toronto: Nelson.

Resnick, Philip. 1984. *Parliament vs. people: An essay on democracy and Canadian political culture*. Vancouver: New Star Books.

Ricker, John, John Saywell, and Alan Skeoch. 1982. *How are we governed in the '80s?*. Toronto: Irwin Publishing.

Savoie, Donald. 2006. Review of *Legislatures*, by David Docherty. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 39(2):425-426.

Schudson, Michael. 1996. *The power of the news*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sharp, Mitchell. 1988. Depoliticizing the Speech from the Throne. *Parliamentary Government* 8(4):16-18.

Soroka, Stuart. 2000. Expanding the agenda-setting agenda: Issue dynamics in Canada, 1985-1995. Ph.D. diss., The University of British Columbia, BC.

Sproule-Jones, Mark. 1984. The enduing colony? Political institutions and political science in Canada. *Publius* 14(1):93-108.

Smith, David E. 1995. *The invisible Crown: The first principle of Canadian government*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 2003. *The Canadian Senate in bicameral perspective*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Street, John. 2005. Politics lost, politics transformed, politics colonised? Theories of the impact of mass media. *Political Studies Review* 3(1):17-33.

Taras, David. 2001. *Power and betrayal in the Canadian Media*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Thompson, John B. 1995. *The media and modernity: A social theory of the media*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*. New York: Free Press.

Wallace, Donald C, and Frederick J. Fletcher. 1984. *Canadian politics through press reports*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Wallace, W. Stewart. 1935. *A reader in Canadian civics*. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada, Ltd.

Ward, Norman. 1960. *Government in Canada*. Toronto: W.J. Gage Ltd.

———. 1987. *Dawson's the government of Canada*. 6th ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Weber, Robert Philip. 1979. The dynamics of value change, transformations and cycles: British Speeches from the Throne, 1689-1972. Ph.D. diss., The University of Connecticut, CT.

White, Graham. 1971. Guelphs and Ghibellines: An examination of the brokerage theory of Canadian politics through content analysis of selected Throne Speech debates. M.A. term paper, McMaster University, ON.

White, W.L., R.H. Wagenberg, and R.C. Nelson. 1972. *Introduction to Canadian politics and government*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston of Canada, Ltd.

Whittington, Michael S., and Richard J. Van Loon. 1996. *Canadian government and politics: Institutions and processes*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

**Newspaper articles**

Finlayson, Jane. 1974. Club-wielding Mounties halt Indian charge. *Ottawa Citizen*, 1 Oct, p. 1.

*Globe*. 1910. Opening Ontario's Legislature, January 26, p. 5.

———. 1920. Drury and co. begin new era with old pomp, 10 March, p. 1.

*Ottawa Citizen*. 1957. Her Majesty, The Queen, 12 October, p. 6.

*Ottawa Evening Citizen*. 1938. Ladies in attendance, descriptions of gowns, 27 January, p. 17-21.

Taber, Jane. 2006. A soldier, a singer and a fresh start for Harper. *Globe and Mail*, 5 April, p. A6.

*Toronto Daily Star*. 1900. Scene of gaiety in the chamber, 14 February, p. 1&3.

———. 1966. Tories promise a rough ride, 19 January 1966, p. 1.

*Toronto Evening Star*. 1896. It is a very meagre bill, 20 August, p. 1.

*Toronto Evening Telegram*. 1910. Soon got House to work, 26 January, p. 15.