

His remarks about Canadian-American relations were very moderate. I could call them practical but, unfortunately, what he advocated has not been practised by all. Had it not been for American capital investment, there would not have been the great development that has taken place in the last 50 years in northern Ontario, my section of Canada. During the last election campaign our district had the honour and privilege of being paid a visit by the Prime Minister, who received a big reception in Kapuskasing. In 1924 Kapuskasing was a small and lightly populated but thriving rural section. Today it is a fine town in which the *New York Times* has invested over \$35 million—American capital, my honourable friends. This investment has benefited not only the investors but also the people of Canada generally, particularly those living in the northern section of Ontario. This story of American investment is just as true with respect to the mining sections, the newsprint producing sections and Ungava and British Columbia, and in fact all Canada. I never like the idea of restricting trade with the United States. I remember during the second election campaign in which I voted, in 1911, I heard for weeks on end the cry "No truck nor trade with the Yankees". I do not want that sort of thing to be repeated in Canada's national life, for it is not at all necessary.

Honourable senators, I am going to quote from a newspaper article. This is something that I seldom do and I never did it in the House of Commons. The article is very well worded. I might say it does not come from a Liberal paper, but from a good Conservative paper, the *Ottawa Journal*. Apparently on the night of Saturday, January 4, 1958, a newsreel film was shown in a Toronto theatre. In an editorial entitled "How Foolish Can People Get About Americans?" the *Journal* wrote, on January 7:

When on Saturday night a newsreel film in a Toronto theatre pictured the failure of the United States Vanguard rocket at Cape Canaveral in Florida, people in the audience clapped and cheered and shouted "Hurray".

I shall read most of the editorial, for I believe it provides a great lesson and will be of interest to everyone of us. Providence has willed that Canada and the United States should be neighbours, and they have been good neighbours. The article continues:

What sort of mental madness is this? Failure of a United States rocket was not merely an American defeat; it was as well our defeat, the defeat of our side, the defeat of the West. Yet here we have some Canadians applauding it, taking joy from it, greeting it with cheers.

Why?

To argue from the particular to the general is always wrong, and it might be wrong indeed to conclude that this imbecility in a Toronto theatre represented much or anything of Canadian thought.

We would like to believe this; like to be able to say comfortably that such a moronic manifestation was nothing more than justification of the dictum that "mistakes of great men are the consolation of dunces".

But we confess our inability to believe or say that—to say it without qualification.

And the reason—we may as well speak it frankly—is that we find of late in a section of our press, in the House of Commons and in the statements of some of our so-called commentators, a note of hostility towards the United States, a seeming touch of the ugly thing of anti-Americanism.

We have seen that sort of attitude in the House of Commons for the last three or four years, and it has not been conducive to good friendship between our two nations. I continue reading from the article:

The United States of late has done some things about our trade that should cause us concern, and in such circumstances it must be our part to protest through the right channels; to present our case as one neighbour to another in a frank, manly, good-mannered way.

But that—manly, vigorous protest through the right channels—is a far different thing from loud repetition of our grievances from the housetops, comforting common enemies and perhaps affording them opportunity to exploit what may seem to them serious divisions.

Certainly it is a far different thing from suggestions heard in some quarters about retaliation—about the possibility of our imposing 15 per cent export taxes on newsprint we ship to the U.S., or on "the nickel or the uranium, or the iron ore".

In my own constituency in northern Ontario we have three newsprint and sulphate mills. We have a great gold mining industry and a great lumber industry, and 95 per cent of our products goes directly to the United States. Every day we see the spectacle of loaded freight trains consisting of 45 to 65 box cars leaving Kapuskasing for the United States. We certainly cannot take any chances on losing that kind of trade with our neighbour to the south.

Honourable senators, I am not going to read the whole editorial from which I have been quoting but I wish to read the last three paragraphs:

The diversion of some of Canada's trade from the United States to other markets, notably to the United Kingdom and Commonwealth markets, would be a good thing. But it would be a good thing not because we have reason to dislike Americans or imagine that they dislike us, but simply as a matter of economic wisdom—the wisdom of not wanting to have all our trading eggs in one basket.

Americans are not perfect; far from it. But in bearing their awesome world responsibility they sometimes seem to take courses we find strange, or if in their trading relations with us they sometimes seem to act as if they were too little conscious of our existence, let us not wrap garments of virtue around ourselves and say how much wiser and nobler we would be were we in their position.

Far better, we suggest that occasionally we ask ourselves two questions: First, what nation in all