> would be better to cover the central border regions from a post further back from which representation over a wider area would be easier. I personally had in mind Cleveland....[71]

Such sentiments were reiterated in a 1950 review of the consular system which remarked that all choices of location except Detroit were justified.[72] The feeling grew to the point that in 1951 the administration of the post was turned over to the Department of Trade and Commerce.[73]

With the appointment of B.C. Butler as Consul and Trade Commissioner, the character of the post changed. Butler told the Consular Conference in 1952 that the major objective of his office was trade promotion, and a report delivered in 1954 confirmed that Detroit spent a much larger proportion of its time on basic selling work and tried to aid Canadian manufacturers more actively in a much more aggressively commercial fashion than previously.[74]

In his 1947 report, Chance recognized that the amount of work performed for Canada by Britain in California had been greatly exaggerated, but nonetheless, recommended a Consulate General in San Francisco for the following reasons:

> (1) Canadian representation was needed on the West Coast, and the leading city of San Francisco was the best choice.
>
> (2) Great Britain and Australia both maintained Consulates General in that city.
>
> (3) The obviously large amount of representational work for an officer to perform.
>
> (4) More vigorous trade promotion in that area could be undertaken by a junior trade officer and vice consul under the direction of the senior officer in Los Angeles.[75]