**Appendix: Codebook**

Coders were chosen on the basis of pre-existing knowledge of the notwithstanding clause, and were trained in qualitative content analysis by coding five randomly selected articles from each province (10 total). The codebook was revised, an additional 20 sample articles were coded, and intercoder reliability was measured on these initial 30 articles. Several questions (not listed here) were removed from the codebook entirely due to lower intercoder reliability; the intercoder reliability on the remaining questions ranged from 93 to 100 percent per question. The authors resolved any coder disagreement on these initial articles, after which each coder coded half of the remaining articles from Saskatchewan and from Ontario independently. Intercoder agreement was calculated both using percent agreement and Krippendorff’s alpha; both values are listed after each question. During statistical analysis using SPSS, certain categories were collapsed together to aid with analysis.

1. **What is the main topic of the story? Pick only one.***[Percent = 90%; alpha = 0.8709]*
   1. Notwithstanding Clause (includes SK/ON use of notwithstanding clause)
   2. Policy Issue Toronto: City Council Decrease
   3. Toronto Court case: Belobaba
   4. Toronto Court case: Court of Appeal stay
   5. Policy Issue Saskatchewan: Catholic School Funding
   6. Religious school funding more broadly (beyond the SK policy issue)
   7. Saskatchewan court case, including appeal
   8. Other (specify)
   9. NA
2. **What is the tone of the author(s) towards the Ontario government’s / Saskatchewan government’s legislation (proposed or actual) that contains the notwithstanding clause? NOTE: This observation should be made independent of whether the author believes the notwithstanding clause is good or bad. Instead, it assesses whether the legislation (proposed or actual), which happens to contain the clause, is good or bad.**

*[Percent = 97%; alpha = 0.9247]*

1. **Positive** – The **author**(s) of the article is primarily/clearly positive about the legislation. The author paints the legislation in a positive light. The author(s) of the article primarily uses positive language when describing the legislation.
2. **Neutral / Mixed** – The **author**(s) of the article is neither primarily negative nor positive; the author is void of judgment about the legislation; the author includes statement of facts or reports of events. If the author makes positive or negative portrayals, s/he does so with roughly equal measure.
3. **Negative** – The **author**(s) of the article is primarily/clearly negative about the legislation. The article paints the legislation in a negative light. The author(s) of the article primarily uses critical language when describing the legislation.
4. **NA – legislation containing clause not mentioned** 
   * + If so, specify
5. **If the answer to #2 was negative, what was the primary reason for the criticisms? If there are multiple, select the one that was most prominent.***[Percent = 93%; alpha = 0.8510]*
   1. Ontario: The court decision was legally correct / good
   2. Ontario: Middle of municipal election / not enough time
   3. Ontario: Ford’s Personal vendetta against Toronto City Council
   4. Ontario: Attack on progressive politicians / policies
   5. Ontario: Ford Doesn’t understand how democracy works
   6. Ontario: Other
      * If so, specify
   7. Saskatchewan: The court decision was legally correct / good
   8. Saskatchewan: Religious school public funding is bad
   9. Saskatchewan: Other
      * If so, specify
   10. Unable to tell
       * If so, explain why
   11. NA: article was not negative
   12. Saskatchewan: Religious school public funding is okay, but public funding for **only** Catholics is bad
6. **If the answer to #2 was positive, what was the primary reason for the support?   
   If there are multiple, select the one that was most prominent.***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
   1. Ontario: The court decision was legally incorrect / bad
   2. Ontario: Smaller city council is good
   3. Ontario: Complex policy issue, judges shouldn’t interfere
   4. Ontario: Attack on progressive politicians / policies
   5. Ontario: Other
      * If so, specify
   6. Saskatchewan: The court decision was incorrect / bad
   7. Saskatchewan: Religious school public funding is good
   8. Saskatchewan: Complex policy issue, judges shouldn’t interfere
   9. Saskatchewan: Other
      * If so, specify
   10. Unable to tell
       * If so, explain why
   11. NA: article was not positive
   12. Saskatchewan: Religious school public funding for everyone is bad, but public funding for **only** Catholics is good
7. **What is the tone of author(s) towards the notwithstanding clause? In all cases, provide quotes as examples.***[Percent = 93%, alpha = 0.8670]*
   1. **Positive** – The **author**(s) of the article is primarily/clearly positive about the notwithstanding clause. The author paints the notwithstanding clause in a positive light. The author(s) of the article primarily uses positive language when describing the notwithstanding clause.
   2. **Neutral / Mixed** – The **author**(s) of the article is neither primarily negative nor positive; the author is void of judgment about the notwithstanding clause; the article includes statement of facts or reports of events. If the author makes positive or negative portrayals, s/he does so with roughly equal measure.
   3. **Negative** – The **author**(s) of the article is primarily/clearly negative about the notwithstanding clause. The author paints the notwithstanding clause in a negative light. The author(s) of the article primarily uses critical language when describing the notwithstanding clause.
   4. **NA – the notwithstanding clause is not mentioned**
      * If so, specify
8. **Does the author refer to the clause as the “override” or “overrule” at any time?***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
   1. Yes, **override,** as a descriptive term for the clause / action
      * If so, specify sentence(s)
   2. Yes, **overrule,** as a descriptive term for the clause / action
      * If so, specify sentence(s)
   3. Yes, both **overrule and override** as a descriptive term for the clause / action
   4. No
   5. Yes, **override,** but only to disagree with that usage (i.e., “wrongly referred to as override”)
   6. Yes, **overrule,** but only to disagree with that usage (i.e., “wrongly referred to as overrule”)
   7. Yes, both **overrule and override,** but only to disagree with that usage (i.e., “wrongly referred to as overrule”)
   8. NA – clause isn’t mentioned
9. **Does the author discuss the historical reasons for the existence of the notwithstanding clause in the Charter?***[Percent = 97%; alpha = 0.7855]*
   1. Yes – if so, give quotes
   2. No
10. **Did the article mention past uses of the notwithstanding clause?***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
    1. Yes
       * If so, specify what they said
    2. No
    3. Difficult to tell
       * If so, specify
11. **Did the article mention Quebec’s omnibus use of the clause from 1982-1985, wherein the clause was used for every piece of legislation passed by the National Assembly?***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
    1. Yes
       * If so, specify what they said
    2. No
    3. Difficult to tell
       * If so, specify
12. **Did the article mention Quebec’s sign law, *Ford v. Quebec*, and/or the use of the clause in response?***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
    1. Yes
       * If so, specify what they said
    2. No
    3. Difficult to tell
       * If so, specify
13. **Did the article mention Saskatchewan’s back to work law from the 1980s, which contained the notwithstanding clause?***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
    1. Yes
       * If so, specify what they said
    2. No
    3. Difficult to tell
       * If so, specify
14. **Did the article mention Alberta’s 2000 *Marriage Act*, or Alberta’s use of the clause with respect to same sex marriage?***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
    1. Yes
       * If so, specify what they said
    2. No
    3. Difficult to tell
       * If so, specify
15. **Did the article mention anything about Quebec’s religious covering legislation (whether current or forthcoming), and how the law might include the notwithstanding clause?***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
    1. Yes
       * If so, specify what they said
    2. No
    3. Difficult to tell
       * If so, specify
16. **FOR ONTARIO ONLY: Did the article mention Saskatchewan’s 2017/2018 use of the notwithstanding clause (whether it referenced the Catholic schools issue or not)?***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
    1. Yes
       * If so, specify what they said
    2. No
    3. Difficult to tell
       * If so, specify
    4. NA: Article about Saskatchewan
17. **FOR SASKATCHEWAN ONLY: If the article is written before May 23, 2018 (the date of the Third Reading vote), did the article mention that the bill containing the notwithstanding clause had not yet passed? (the bill was introduced November 8, 2017, passed at 3rd reading on May 23, 2018, and received Royal Assent on May 30, 2018)***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
18. Before November 8, 2017: **Yes**, the article correctly stated the bill had not yet been introduced and/or that the notwithstanding clause did not yet apply
    * + If so, specify what they said
19. Before November 8, 2017: **No**, the article gave the incorrect impression the notwithstanding clause was in effect
    * If so, specify what they said
20. On or After November 8, 2017: **Yes**, the article correctly stated the bill been introduced, but that it had not yet passed and/or that the clause was not yet in effect
    * + If so, specify what they said
21. On or After November 8, 2017: **Yes**, **but** the article incorrectly stated that the bill containing the notwithstanding clause had not yet been introduced
22. On or After November 8, 2017: **No**, the article gave the incorrect impression the notwithstanding clause was in effect
    * If so, specify what they said
23. The article was written on or after May 23, 2018
24. Difficult to tell
    * + If so, specify why
25. NA: The article does not mention the notwithstanding clause
    * + If so, specify why
26. NA2: Article about Ontario
27. **Does the article make clear that the notwithstanding clause must be contained in legislation? This includes, for example, reference to a law, bill, or legislation.***[Percent = 93%; alpha = 0.8589]*
    1. Yes, included in legislation
       * If so, specify
    2. No
    3. NA – article does not discuss notwithstanding clause
28. **Does the author assess the quality of the judicial decision? In Ontario, this specifically refers to Justice Belobaba’s decision.***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. Difficult to tell
       * If so, specify why
29. **If the answer to #17 is yes, was the author positive or negative about the judicial decision?***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
    1. Positive
       * If so, specify sentences
    2. Negative
       * If so, specify sentences
    3. Neutral / Ambivalent
       * If so, specify sentences
    4. NA – answer was not yes
30. **Genre of story***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
    1. Hard news
    2. Column, opinion piece, commentary
    3. Unsigned Editorial
    4. Letter to the editor
    5. Other
       * If, specify
    6. NA
       * If, specify
31. **Position of Author 1***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
    1. News reporter employed the newspaper / press outlet
    2. Opinion columnist employed by the newspaper / press outlet
    3. Other person employed by the newspaper / press outlet
    4. Guest columnist – professor of political science
    5. Guest columnist – professor of law
    6. Guest columnist – professor (other)
    7. Guest columnist – politician
    8. Guest columnist – other (please specify)
    9. Unsigned editorial
    10. No author named (e.g., “Canadian Press”)
    11. Other (please specify)
    12. NA (explain)
32. **Position of Author 2 (if any)***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
    1. News reporter employed the newspaper
    2. Opinion columnist employed by the newspaper
    3. Other person employed by the newspaper
    4. Guest columnist – professor of political science
    5. Guest columnist – professor of law
    6. Guest columnist – professor (other)
    7. Guest columnist – politician
    8. Guest columnist – other (please specify)
    9. Unsigned editorial
    10. No author named (e.g., “Canadian Press”)
    11. Other, (please specify)
    12. NA (explain)
33. **Position of Author 3 (if any)***[Percent = 100%; alpha = 1.0]*
34. News reporter employed the newspaper
35. Opinion columnist employed by the newspaper
36. Other person employed by the newspaper
37. Guest columnist – professor of political science
38. Guest columnist – professor of law
39. Guest columnist – professor (other)
40. Guest columnist – politician
41. Guest columnist – other (please specify)
42. Unsigned editorial
43. No author named (e.g., “Canadian Press”)
44. Other (please specify)
45. NA (explain)
46. **Based on your knowledge of the notwithstanding clause, did the author make a factual error?***[Percent = 97%; alpha = 0.8715]*
    1. Yes
       * If so specify what was said, and why error
    2. No
    3. NA – clause not mentioned