

A. The Secretary: With respect to the first question, what Mr. Brezhnev has said, both the President and I have also often said, namely, that we recognize that there are profound differences of ideology between the Communist and non-Communist world. The relaxation of tensions is not based on the assumption that differences of ideology have disappeared, but on the realities of the contemporary period in which nuclear super powers confront each other and in which the necessity to prevent nuclear war and, at the same time, prevent aggression --- those twin necessities have to be recognized and we have to avoid the impression that the relaxation of tensions is a favour we grant or that we can withhold it as a punishment. It is a necessity of this period, and our problem is to have a relaxation of tensions without weakening the defenses of the West. We have to do both of these simultaneously.

With respect to the second question of whether there was a trade-off of Eastern Europe for the Middle East, I do not consider that the European Security Conference sacrificed Eastern Europe or made concessions on Eastern Europe. The borders that were referred to had all been established by treaties that antedated Helsinki. There were no borders that were recognized by Helsinki that had not been accepted previously.

With respect to the political influence in Eastern Europe, it has generally been accepted that the freedom of manoeuvre of the various countries is enhanced in a period of relaxation of tension, and it is precisely those countries most concerned with their autonomy that have also been the greatest advocates of a relaxation of tensions.

To answer your question specifically, there was no relationship whatever between what happened in the Middle East and what happened in Helsinki.

Mr. Hargreaves: John Sawatsky of the Vancouver Sun.

Q. John Sawatsky, Vancouver Sun: Mr. Secretary, earlier this year both you and the President indicated that the United States may use military force in the oil producing countries in the Middle East. In light of that, what would be the United States reaction to cut-backs of energy exports from Canada to the United States?

A. The Secretary: I think we could get some excitement started if I do not answer that question very carefully. (Laughter.)

I was going to make history here by being the first Secretary of State to have visited Canada without calling attention to the "undefended frontier".

I would think that we will settle our energy problems between ourselves without recourse to force, and while we would not object to Canada increasing its defense expenditures, I don't think we would go to this extreme to get you to increase them. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hargreaves: Brian Kappler, Windsor Star.

Q. Brian Kappler, Windsor Star: Mr. Secretary, you spoke of a major effort with the Congress on the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. We've been

(MORE)