

countries in it, among which we count Canada, feel that it is in part their own. Therefore, we see no incongruity between an independent stance and close association with the United States. In fact, we would make the argument that a sense of independence makes the closer ties more meaningful. Therefore, we do not object to a contractual relationship between Canada and Europe, or to any other options that Canada chooses to develop, as long as opposition to the United States does not become a cardinal principle for its own sake, which we do not believe is the case. I have found in practice that we can deal with Canada on the basis of equality on the specific issues that concern us and achieve a substantial area of agreement. Therefore, I consider our relationships to be very healthy."

* * * *

Pipeline treaty

Q. "Mr. Secretary, for some time now we have been led to believe that the Canada/U.S. pipeline treaty is ready to be signed. Is there any reason for the delay? Also, I would like to ask you whether in your personal view you favour a trans-Alaska or a trans-Canadian route for Alaskan gas?"

A. The Secretary: "No, I have no personal view on that subject. I consider that a technical matter to be discussed. As to whether the treaty is about ready to be signed, I think we are making some progress."

Special relation

Q. "Mr. Secretary, Mr. MacEachen has spoken of the end of the special relationship between Canada and the United States; yet you said today that there is no country with which you have closer ties and better communication. You have also spoken of negotiating on the basis of equality. I wonder how these things can be reconciled in view of the fact that United States investment in this country is greater than that of any country in any other country in the world? How can we talk about equality and how can we talk about the end of the special relationship in the light of that?"

* * * *

A. The Secretary: "...I would make a distinction between a claim to a spe-

cial relationship and the realities within which foreign policy has to be conducted. Inevitably, any Canadian Government and any United States Government will come up against the realities that you have described. But, we make no claim to special treatment and we do not interpret what I have said as a claim to a preferential treatment. We do believe that there is, for reasons of history and for reasons of close economic relationship, a natural affinity between our long-range national purposes that makes communication easy and the solution of fundamental problems in a common framework substantially necessary. But, if that turns out to be wrong, then each country must go its own way according to its own convictions."

The Minister: "I agreed with what you said last night. I agree with what you say today. I think what I have been saying about the "special relationship", at least as I interpreted it, is that when we do discuss issues, that normally we discuss them in the light of our own national interests. Where these conflict, we attempt to harmonize the differences, or reduce the element of conflict, and where we reach an impasse, we recognize it as such and act accordingly in dealing with issues which, from my point of view, can only lead to an even healthier relationship between our two countries.

However, in defining it in that particular way, a limited definition, I certainly agree with what Dr. Kissinger has described with respect to the kind of relationship that we do have with the United States, which I described last night as "unique"; and which someone told me today in the Webster dictionary was a synonym for "special"; so I don't know where that leaves us. The relationship is satisfactory, in any event."

Defence

Q. "Mr. Secretary, are you satisfied with the scale of Canadian contribution to collective Western defence? Would you like to see Canada do more?"

A. The Secretary: "...Our view is that as strategic weapons become more complicated, and as the defence of the North Atlantic area takes on a more differentiated character, that the role of conventional weapons and, at any rate, of sub-strategic options, becomes more

and more crucial; and that means that all of the members of NATO, and particularly those whose contributions primarily in the conventional field, have to look again at the assumptions that were formed in a period when American strategic predominance was the principal field of NATO. So, it is in this sense and in this framework that our discussions have been conducted."

Pollution of Great Lakes

Q. "Mr. Secretary, the United States and Canada signed an agreement in 1972 to clean up the Great Lakes, but the United States has been dragging its feet ever since and most of the American projects are far behind schedule. What is the United States going to do to live up to its part of the agreement?"

A. The Secretary: "We agreed that we have an obligation under this agreement and, regrettably, we are behind schedule. The Administration will make a major effort with the Congress to encourage it to allocate the funds that are needed and to prevent the diversion of funds that have already been appropriated that might cause further delays. We agree with the objectives. We recognize we have an obligation, and the Administration will do its utmost to live up to these obligations."

* * * *

Energy

Q. "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 cutbacks of energy exports from Canada to the United States?"

A. The Secretary: "...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 defence expenditures, I don't think we would go to this extreme to get you to increase them." [Laughter.]

* * * *

200-mile fishing zone

Q. "Mr. Secretary, I wonder if you could tell me whether or not the questions of both coasts were discussed this morning in your talks with either Mr. MacEachen or the Prime Minister — the stands on the possible 200-mile