

Hon. Mr. Lambert: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Pratt: Surely, honourable senators, we can be a loyal Commonwealth nation and a close Commonwealth trading partner, without feeling we are being pushed into that position by such a frightening alternative as a "United States Protectorate". We have to use sense and work reasonably, and at times firmly, with the United States, particularly to improve our economic relationship. We can have, and we should work toward, a practical and close working partnership in both directions.

I am perfectly aware of the need for pushing for and urging upon the United States Government a more liberal policy in tariffs. When referring to this subject on a previous occasion in this chamber, I stated that it was ridiculous to talk complacently about the longest undefended national boundary in the world as if it epitomized the very essence of good relations. At that time I used the expression, and I repeat it now, that we have a tariff shooting war constantly going on right along the whole border between Canada and the United States. It is lamentable how the United States tariff swings against us in this industry or that, without the least consideration for our whole trading relations.

As an example of that condition, and an example of absurd practices, may I cite an instance to the house? There has always been a tariff on Canadian frozen fish going into the United States. Three or four years ago someone introduced into the trade a pre-cooked, ready-for-the-table product called "fish sticks". As soon as it began to sell widely someone thought of the bright idea of putting a prohibitive duty on it so as to protect cooking labour—and I can describe it in no other way—in the United States. The idea was channeled through official lines at Washington, and who over there knew anything about it? Certainly the American public did not know about it. In that country there is an abysmal ignorance of Canadian problems and Canadian trade relations.

I have travelled a great deal in the United States all my life, and even now when I visit the areas outside the big cities I find the two most talked of Canadian subjects are the Mounties—that of course is because of our tourist trade advertising—and the dome railway cars which travel through the Rockies—they being a feature of railway advertising. Now, I do not criticize that situation, but I say it illustrates the need for sound Canadian publicity among the American people. I do not suggest for one moment that we should blame them for their lack of knowledge in this respect; indeed, the blame should be attached to ourselves for having failed to make them better

informed about us. The setting exists for a close and practical relationship in trade matters, but we do not develop it.

How many people in the United States are aware that in addition to the known import tariffs there is a frightful deterrent to trade by reason of tariff interpretations? For instance, the valuing of goods in relation to the selling prices, and in some instances in relation to transportation costs, creates tremendous obstacles. How many people in that country know that by reason of the excess of imports by Canada from the United States over our exports to that country last year, we provided a full livelihood for large numbers of their people? The United States last year shipped to Canada \$1,348 million more in goods—and they were mostly manufactured goods—than Canada shipped to the United States. The actual overall financial deficit, including goods, services, interest and so forth, was \$1,640 million. Calculated on the relation of the total population of the United States to the value of their gross national product, that deficit provided a full living for more than 650,000 American people.

I know it is easy to talk about what should or should not be done to develop a fair measure of understanding by the United States people about Canada. My purpose in bringing out these facts is to show how very little we have done to make even a start on a solution of our common problem. I would like to suggest that as a beginning of organized effort, and I repeat just as a beginning, all the Canadian consulates in the United States—there are eight of them, apart from Washington, and probably there will be more very soon—should have specially appointed and specially trained information officers with adequate staff. Those officers should operate in close relationship with our Department of Trade and Commerce and should be amply financed to put over a wide publicity program of worth to Canada.

From the beginning there might grow a useful and wide movement to make Canada and Canadian problems better known to the American people. The way to get fair and favourable treatment from Government is to have an understanding, as well as a favourable, public. I do not think that that would be too hard a task if we just got busy and applied ourselves. I have no doubt that under the impetus of such a movement we should have far more of our leading citizens in many walks of life speaking of Canada and Canadian interests in all parts of the United States than we have at present.

It is true, of course, that the flow of capital investment into Canada has been a balancing