

if not invented by the Monitor, were certainly popularized by it. The Wall Street Journal, with its regional editions (that don't vary in content greatly) is the chief source of what the paper calls "stand-up" stories, i. e., they stand up for some time. This is because the policy and capabilities of the Journal allow fairly lengthy and deep research into its front and back page stories.

As we know, these national papers carry more news of Canada than other papers. Most of it comes from reporters (their own or those of the wire services) stationed in Canada. We have no data to indicate that the New York, Chicago and West Coast editions of the Wall Street Journal devote more coverage to longitudinally adjacent Canadian regions but discussions with editors suggest this is so.

The prime access to these publications for Canadian officials is in Canada, in Washington and in New York -- probably in that order.

Endless sessions are held by public relations societies on the means of attracting the attention of editors and writers on these national media. Our personal experience is that a "parley" approach is valuable. More so than the wires with their immediately intense but negligible long range memories, the national media are retentive. Editors talk to each other and read each other's work. This is, of course, most true within the publications but to differing degrees across them, e. g., the Washington bureau of the Times and the Washington Post.

We have seen cases where a Wall Street Journal story that originated in Chicago and ran nationally was first suggested by the head of its Washington Bureau. All these papers have some regional writers. The Times has a network of correspondents and stringers across the country within easy access of every Canadian consulate. The value of personal contacts with bureau correspondents and