

- (1) not the need for consular protection in the ordinary sense since the volume of Canadian work performed by the British was not onerous;
- (2) the considerable amount of non-consular representation performed by the Canadian Trade Commissioner;
- (3) the need to keep close contact with the university and cultural community in that region "here as elsewhere, I am sure, our most fruitful field."¹²⁵

Shortly after this report was submitted, G.R. Heasman, Director of the Trade Commissioner Service, told External Affairs that his Department no longer urgently wanted to close their operation and would maintain a Los Angeles office as late as November 1948, although they "...were only keeping it open in the hope that you would take it over at an early date."¹²⁶ Taking advantage of their year's grace, External set a date early in 1949 to establish a Los Angeles consulate and prepared the plans. Financial cutbacks and resultant staffing problems, however, delayed the date for the new operation for an indefinite period, although the trade office still remained open.¹²⁷ The plans lay dormant until Trade and Commerce notified External Affairs in August, 1952, that they were closing their office ⁱⁿ December 1952, or in the spring of 1953.

In response to Hector Allard's request that the consulate open when Trade and Commerce moved out, the Under-Secretary urged that the general question of consular representation be studied before any action was taken, a review which was promoted by the divergence of opinion in the Department. The Ambassador in Washington had asked that Seattle take precedence over Los Angeles if only one office were to be established.