

large American newspapers. I do not subscribe to that. It seems to me that those in positions of authority in the United States, or many of them, are aware of Canada and are familiar with it, even though the President of the United States recently put himself with the masses in not knowing too much about Canada when he suggested that Japan was their best trading partner.

It seems to me that we are moving into a period where the masses of the United States will become aware of Canada, or more aware of Canada, but in a most unsatisfactory way.

We currently protest the proposal for shipping oil to the West Coast, and many Americans are aware of that. Some Canadians have gone into United States courts to try to prevent that shipment. We have the immediate case of Canada stating that it will be reducing its oil exports to the United States on a diminishing scale over a period of time, and many Americans are aware of that. It is an awareness that does not endear Canada to the United States. We have many Canadians who are protesting—I am not one of them—shipment of resources, and more Americans are becoming aware of that.

Do you feel, as I do, that the things are happening between our two countries that will not endear Canadians to the masses in the United States as they become aware of us in this fashion—that the masses will, as always, have an effect upon the government in not improving relations?

Dr. Johnson: Senator, I detect in all this questioning what is known by those of the radical side as American cultural penetration of Canada. The idea that somehow you ought to endear yourself to the masses is an idea which the British never had when they ran their empire. They did not give a damn about the masses.

It is the American belief that somehow being beloved by the masses of other countries is a great thing. This may be a tremendous handicap.

I start from the fairly economic view of things, which ties up with what I said earlier about the relation between Southern Ontario and Northern New York. The vast mass of Americans do not know anything about Canada because they do not live close to Canada.

What we get essentially is the fact that we are part of a cultural drainage area which involves both New York and us, focused on Washington and New York. We get all this information about the United States because we happen to live close to it and our major media are within a catchment area like the American ones.

Even living in Chicago you learn a lot less about Canada than you would in New York or Washington, but you would learn also less about the United States. If you went to New Orleans or out to California you would learn very little about the United States, at thought of in terms of New York and Washington.

They are mostly concerned about their own problems. Their newspapers are full of gossip about people you have never heard of. They are the local bigwigs, industrialists and political leaders.

They are not much concerned about what goes on elsewhere. It just happens that our population is strung out along the border, whereas theirs is mostly far to the

South of the border. That is why they do not have much news of us. They do not have much news of their own government either. They might get a headline on the front page about Nixon, but when it comes down to political events, mostly what they are getting is what is going on in the state legislature.

That is natural enough. That is what they are interested in. That is where they live. They do not live in Washington or in a big world where they are making policy. They live in a state, or a city, and their main interest is in that.

I do not think you are going to get this mutual knowledge you want. Newspapers are dependent on sales in a particular geographical area. If you watch television in the New Orleans area, or in California, mostly what you get is what is going on in some town nearby.

My wife and I were in California a week ago, and we were getting tremendous television coverage of a black man who was murdering white people in San Francisco. He had killed about 12 so far.

The whole issue was, "Is it legitimate for the police to stop coloured people on the grounds that this guy is known to be coloured, or is it an invasion of their democratic rights?"

I do not know whether anyone in Canada heard about that one. We did not hear much about it in Chicago, but that was the hot news in the bay area.

That is characteristic of the geographical limitation of newspapers. They have to sell their newspapers by producing stuff that people want to read. They are too far away from Washington or Canada to care much about what goes on there.

Perhaps we are safest on that basis, that they do not know much about us. We have to have a protest from them every year or two about something we have done, and maybe on the whole that is less troublesome than having to tell them every time we do anything.

Senator McElman: Perhaps I should say to you, sir, that this simply proves that the U.S. news gets to us very quickly, because we have it before you. It was not one zebra; they caught seven yesterday.

I suggest that what you are saying refers to the past. What I am concerned about is the future—the future of the attitude of Canadians to Americans and Americans to Canadians and that it should be good. And I am afraid that it is not going to be good.

Contrary to what you have said, two years ago the ordinary American on the street did not know anything much about the OPEC countries and cared a hell or a lot less; but today the average American knows about OPEC countries and what he knows he does not like.

What I am concerned about is that the things the American people are now beginning to know about Canada are things they don't like. I want to see excellent trade and other relations between Canada and the U.S., going both ways, and I am concerned.

Dr. Johnson: I take a somewhat different attitude. It does not bother me too much that Americans don't like what they see, because very often what they really like to see is other people sacrificing for the benefit of Americans. I don't see any point in that. I don't see why