



CANADA

COMMUNIQUE

No. 97
N°

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
POUR DIFFUSION IMMÉDIATE

Le 16 octobre, 1975.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
AFFAIRES EXTÉRIEURES
OTTAWA
NOV 5 1975
LIBRARY / BIBLIOTHÈQUE
REFERENCE

VISIT OF DR. HENRY KISSINGER,
SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE U.S.A.,
TO OTTAWA, OCTOBER 14-15, 1975

PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE
AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OF CANADA, THE HONOURABLE ALLAN J. MACEachEN

* * *

VISITE EFFECTUÉE À OTTAWA PAR
LE SECRÉTAIRE D'ÉTAT DES ÉTATS-UNIS,
M. HENRY KISSINGER,
LES 14 ET 15 OCTOBRE 1975

DÉCLARATIONS PAR LE SECRÉTAIRE D'ÉTAT
AMÉRICAIN ET LE SECRÉTAIRE D'ÉTAT AUX
AFFAIRES EXTÉRIEURES DU CANADA,
L'HONORABLE ALLAN J. MACEachEN

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES EXTÉRIEURES

WELCOMING STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,
THE HONOURABLE ALLAN J. MACEachEN, TO DR. HENRY KISSINGER, U.S.A.
SECRETARY OF STATE, OTTAWA, OCTOBER 14, 1975

Mr. Secretary,

On behalf of the Government of Canada, and on my own behalf, it is a deep pleasure for me to welcome you and Mrs. Kissinger to Canada. This is your third visit to our capital in recent years and in many ways you could not have picked a better time to come to Ottawa, bedecked as it is in the reds and golds of autumn.

In our meetings, Mr. Secretary, at various places throughout the world; in Europe, at the United Nations, in Washington, I have placed great value on the discussions we have had about matters of interest to both our countries. I have profited from learning of your views on major issues facing our nations and our contemporary world. Our discussions have been very much in the tradition of the close communication which has existed between our two countries. In this tradition, your visit to Ottawa will, I am sure, add further to our mutual understanding and enhance what I believe is a unique bilateral relationship. Our discussions will, I think, be friendly and wide-ranging and of the kind that takes place between Foreign Ministers of countries which are old friends who know and respect each other.

During your all too short stay in Ottawa, Mr. Secretary, you will have an opportunity to meet the Prime Minister of Canada, a number of my colleagues in the Cabinet, and Canadians from different parts of our vast land. I know that all whom you will meet will join me in welcoming you and in voicing appreciation for the indefatigable and constructive efforts you have made to enhance peace and stability in our troubled world. Bearing in mind the bicentennial of your great nation, I want to express the profound admiration of Canadians for the achievements, creativity, vitality and leadership which are so representative of the United States of America.

Thank you.

MOT DE BIENVENUE DU SECRÉTAIRE D'ÉTAT AUX AFFAIRES EXTÉRIEURES,
L'HONORABLE ALLAN J. MACÉACHEN, AU SECRÉTAIRE D'ÉTAT DES
ÉTATS-UNIS, M. HENRY KISSINGER, OTTAWA, LE 14 OCTOBRE 1975

Monsieur le secrétaire,

Au nom du gouvernement du Canada et en mon nom personnel, j'ai le très grand plaisir de vous souhaiter, ainsi qu'à madame Kissinger, la plus cordiale bienvenue. Vous en êtes à votre troisième visite dans notre capitale au cours des dernières années et, à maints égards, le moment est fort bien choisi pour venir à Ottawa, parée de ses atours automnaux d'or et de pourpre.

Lors de nos différentes rencontres, monsieur le Secrétaire, que ce soit en Europe, aux Nations Unies, à Washington, j'ai toujours accordé une grande importance aux échanges que nous avons sur des sujets intéressant nos deux pays. J'ai trouvé fort utile de connaître vos vues sur les questions importantes dont sont saisis nos peuples et le monde contemporain. Nos entretiens se sont déroulés dans le cadre des communications étroites qui ont toujours existé entre nos deux pays. C'est dans cette optique que votre visite à Ottawa ne manquera pas, j'en suis sûr, d'ajouter à notre compréhension mutuelle et de mettre davantage en valeur des relations bilatérales qui, à mon point de vue, sont uniques en leur genre. Nos entretiens seront, je le crois, cordiaux et étendus, comme il convient entre les ministres des affaires étrangères de pays qui, en vieux amis, ont appris à se comprendre et à se respecter.

Vous aurez l'occasion, monsieur le Secrétaire, durant votre brève visite à Ottawa, de rencontrer notre Premier Ministre, certains de mes collègues du Conseil des ministres, et des Canadiens venant de tous les coins de notre vaste territoire. Je suis persuadé que tous ceux que vous rencontrerez se joindront à moi pour vous souhaiter la bienvenue et pour vous exprimer le prix que nous attachons tous aux efforts inlassables et constructifs que vous déployez pour assurer la paix et la stabilité dans notre monde agité. Dans l'esprit du bicentenaire de votre grand pays, je désire exprimer l'admiration profonde des Canadiens pour les réalisations, la créativité, la vitalité et le leadership qui caractérisent si bien les Etats-Unis d'Amérique.

Merci.

INFORMATION RELEASE

UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE, UNITED STATES EMBASSY, OTTAWA, ONTARIO, K1P 5T1

(43)

Ottawa, Ontario, October 14, 1975 -- Following is the transcript of Secretary of State Kissinger's response to the toast by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, The Honourable Allan J. MacEachen, at dinner, Ottawa, October 14, 1975:

"Mr. Minister, distinguished guests: first of all, on behalf of Nancy and myself, I would like to thank you for the very warm reception we have had here, and to thank Allan (Hon. Mr. MacEachen) for the occasion to let us meet so many old friends.

"As I was preparing for this trip, it was called to my attention that after the War of Independence about half of the students of Harvard left the United States and settled in Canada. I could say many things about this, including the fact that it proves what a strong nation you are to have overcome so important a handicap. But then, of course, we were left with the other half, so we started from about the same position. (laughter)

"Mr. MacEachen was nice enough to refer to American foreign policy at this moment. It is true we have gone through an important period of transition in recent years. As events turned out, the late sixties and early seventies in the United States marked the end of the period that was inaugurated by the great acts of creation immediately following World War II. We had come to the end of the men, and maybe of the ideas, which had formed the immediate post war period. In that period, American physical power was predominant, and the legacy of the New Deal created the belief that all problems in the world could be solved by a kind of social engineering. Economic aid by itself seemed to be the solvent of political instability. We thought for a while -- and not unsuccessfully -- that all problems could be dealt with by massive applications of resources and good will.

"Now this policy, which is often derided in the United States today, was, on the whole, quite successful. It took an element of naivety and faith to take a shattered continent and help build its self confidence and its political consciousness. And it took an

element of good will to deal with defeated enemies on the basis of equality and the consciousness of the need to rebuild an international order.

"But the achievements of the forties and fifties brought with them a new world, in which other countries had to play an increasingly important role, and the shattering impact of Vietnam and of Watergate taught Americans that there were limits to what could be achieved, even with our resources, and that America, too, was not immune from the domestic turmoil that had afflicted other nations.

"We are now in a period in which we must found our foreign policy on a more mature conception -- one that oscillates less wildly between excessive idealism and excessive pragmatism; one that can be sustained by our public over an indefinite period of time. In this effort, we face the challenge that we must deal on many fronts and in highly ambiguous situations.

"We must improve relations with old adversaries, not because the ideologies have become less clashing, and not because the dangers have disappeared, but because in the nuclear age every leader has a pre-eminent responsibility to do his utmost to prevent the danger of nuclear war, and if he cannot prevent confrontations, to have demonstrated to his public beyond any question that he has used every means to avoid a catastrophe. So we must be strong enough to pursue a policy of relaxation of tensions without illusion, and not to believe that good will alone can produce relaxation, but also not to fall into the danger of mock heroic rhetoric.

"We must adjust our alliances to new conditions of equality and partnership, and to change old habits of preeminence to the new requirements of a global international system. We must change alliances based on defense against a common danger to the new challenges of our period in the relations between North and South and the necessities of interdependence.

"We must deal with the problem of the relationship between the developed and the developing countries, without sentimentality but also without arrogance. We do not favor the creation of a new bloc distinguished only by calling itself 'non-aligned', but we also believe that the developed countries have an obligation to help the developing countries to find a place in the community of nations in a manner in which they believe that their just aspirations are being met, and that truly co-operative efforts can succeed.

"I go into all this detail because it makes perhaps more meaningful the conventional pleasantries that one would otherwise say about the relationship between Canada and the United States. We used to speak of a 'special relationship', and I agree that that no longer exists, if it ever did. On the other hand, we have a very close and very intimate

relationship, and one that is peculiarly important in the period that I have described, because if we have to found a new international system that is built on justice and equality in which all nations participate because they feel it is partly their own, then the relationship of a rather powerful country with perhaps what is too modestly called a middle power in such close proximity becomes of crucial importance. We can deal with each other without complexes; we can found our relationship on the consciousness of interdependence; we can live with disagreements, recognizing the different origins, the different background, and the different domestic necessities. We also know that disagreement is not pursued as an end in itself and that when we do agree -- which we do, after all, on the vast majority of fundamental issues -- that disagreement is all the more meaningful for having been freely achieved.

"In this sense, in striking the balance between national consciousness and international responsibility, between self confidence and the necessities of interdependence, our two countries can set an example to many other parts of the world.

"In no place in the world today is it possible for any one nation, no matter how powerful, to achieve its security or its prosperity by its own efforts. A few years ago, the United States proposed the economic coordination of the policies of the major industrial countries. That was considered then a daring idea; it is today commonplace. When in a few weeks the economic summit meets, that will be one of its principal objectives. As I stated on my arrival this afternoon, the United States considers it essential that Canada participate in such an effort, because it is only through the free cooperation of friendly nations that the interdependence of the world can be vindicated.

"This is why I was very glad to be invited to come here -- to continue conversations that have been going on informally, and easily, over the months and years of our joint service, and conversations that will continue over the years to come.

"I told the Minister (Hon. Mr. MacEachen) when I arrived that I don't really know how to handle the situation in which we would both have to try very hard to make the talks fail. (laughter) It is in this spirit that I look forward to our talks tomorrow.

"I should like to propose a toast to the friendship between the Canadian and the American peoples and to our host, the Minister."

A. The Secretary: Feelings on the issue of deletion of television commercials on Canadian cable television are rather intense in the United States. I receive a large volume of mail from influential senators on that subject. I have brought that fact to the attention of the Canadian Government and I am told that this issue is before the courts in Canada at this moment, so we have to wait for the court decision. In the meantime, I have asked that no commercials of this program be run in the United States. (Laughter)

Mr. Desbarats: I do not know if we can comply with that.

Q. Hugh Winsor, The Toronto Globe and Mail: Dr. Kissinger, a number of reports have come out in recent months about the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in countries in which the United States has substantial interests. Given the fact that the United States has very substantial interests in Canada, it would seem reasonable that the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency would be somewhat in that proportion. I wonder, since you are chairman of that group of 40 that oversees the C.I.A. activities, would you comment on the extent to which they do operate in Canada and, if so, what you learn that's interesting? (Laughter)

A. The Secretary: Your assumption may be reasonable, but it isn't true. I am not aware that we are learning very much that is interesting which may reflect the scale of our activities here.

Mr. Winsor: That is not a very direct answer, sir.

A. The Secretary: The answer is that your assumption is incorrect.

Q. Jack Best, Canada World News: Mr. Kissinger, a question in the multi-lateral field: in Helsinki President Ford said that the results of that conference were to be judged not by the promises made, but by the promises kept. And he said that peace is not a piece of paper. I wonder if you could give us your assessment it's a little bit early in the game thus far of the degree to which those agreements reached at Helsinki are working, particularly in the area of better human contacts between east and west and the freer flow of information and peoples?

A. The Secretary: I think it is too early to draw any conclusions; there have been some beneficial results in the sense of multiple-entry visas for journalists and there has been some progress in re-uniting families. But I think that it is too early to draw any final conclusions, whether those represent isolated cases, or a trend that is related to the Helsinki conference.

Q. Don McNeill, C.B.C. News: Mr. Secretary, Canadian policy in the past few years has been one of attempted detachment, or dissimulation from the United States, something called here the "Third Option". This has been particularly manifest in an attempt to get something we call a contractual link with Europe. I wonder what is the American response to this policy?

(MORE)

A. The Secretary: As I pointed out yesterday evening in my toast, we judge our relationship with Canada not by the other links that Canada may have, nor by whether the motives are those of independence or so-called special relationship, but by whether on the fundamental issues we can achieve a certain parallelism of action. We believe that the international system will be most stable if the key 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.

Q. Peter Thomson, Montreal Star: Dr. Kissinger, I wonder if I could trade on your reputation as a diplomat to give us an opinion on whether the umpire blew a call last night? (Laughter)

A. The Secretary: That's really testing my reputation as a diplomat; I am a Red Sox fan, so I'm a little biased.

Q. Mr. Kalb, C.B.S.: Dr. Kissinger, the word from Washington is that in the State Department you have not responded to the subpoena from the Pike Committee for the memorandum on the Cyprus affair. Can you tell us, Dr. Kissinger, whether you informed Mr. Pike that you would not comply and whether you feel there is any possibility of a citation for contempt?

A. The Secretary: I believe you received some press reports that were somewhat premature. Quite frankly, my associates did not look at the subpoena in sufficient detail to realize that it had a time and not just a date on it. So we thought that we had all day in order to respond; in fact, shortly before noon I submitted a letter to the Pike Committee in which I stated my views on the subject and made some proposals to the Pike Committee on how the matter might be resolved. So we have responded in some detail to the request of the committee.

Mr. Kalb: Dr. Kissinger, could you state your views, or give them to us in shorthand form, and outline, perhaps, some suggestions you may have made?

A. The Secretary: We plan to release the letter, but in shorthand form our view is that any officer of the Department of State can testify as to facts available to him. Any policy-making officer of the Department of State, that is, any presidential appointee, can testify as to the recommendations he received and recommendations he passed on; and I am, of course, prepared to testify as to the opinions I received and as to the opinions, recommendations I made. We are not prepared to attach the opinions we received to the

(MORE)

names of officers at the middle and junior level, because we believe that this is contrary to the integrity of the policy-making process and that it is essential for the integrity of the Foreign Service that they can make recommendations that are not subject to later public scrutiny and that those whom the President has appointed to policy-making positions bear the responsibility before the Congress and before the public. But we are prepared to state the substance of the opinions; we are simply not prepared to attach them to names.

Q. Mike Benedict, Toronto Star: 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.

Q. Charles Lynch, Southam News Service: 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'll let Mr. MacEachen explain what he meant by the end of the special relationship.

Mr. Lynch: I have been trying to get him to do so for months. (Laughter)

The Minister: Except that you endorsed that it ended, whatever it was, you agreed last night that it had ended.

A. The Secretary: That is right; I agreed last night and several Canadians have been pained with me ever since. It is apparently all right for Canadians to say it but not for Americans. (Laughter) I would make a distinction between a claim to a special 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

(MORE)

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.

Mr. Hargreaves: Bruce Phillips, C.T.V.

Q. Bruce Phillips, C.T.V.: Mr. Secretary, are you satisfied with the scale of Canadian contribution to collective Western defence? Would you like to see Canada do more?

(MORE)

A. The Secretary: WE discussed the problem of defense today. Our view is that as strategic weapons become more complicated, and as the defense 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.

Mr. Hargreaves: The gentleman from N.B.C.

Q. Richard Valiriani, N.B.C.: 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.

Mr. Hargreaves: Ed Ellison, Radio Canada International.

Q. Edwin Ellison, Radio Canada International: Mr. Secretary, a few days ago I was talking to Dr. Loucks, in Brussels, and he expressed, shall I say, concern about Canada's contribution to NATO. A few moments after that a gentleman who described himself as a senior NATO official -- I must confess, a phrase that sounded vaguely familiar -- went on to say that Canada's contribution was utterly contemptible, and that Canada apparently had no concept of the importance of the problems facing NATO vis-a-vis Portugal and other sectors of the defense front.

Would you like to comment on those rather high ranking statements, and perhaps Mr. MacEachen would like to as well.

Q. The Secretary: Was that an American NATO official?

A. Mr. Ellison: It was not an American. It was an official with a European accent. (Laughter)

The Secretary: I do not share these views. I had the opportunity to listen to your Prime Minister at the NATO Summit Meeting and I had the opportunity to talk to him at great length today, to your Foreign Minister and your Defense Minister. I think that the problem of the defense of the Atlantic is fully understood in Canada, and while we would, on the whole, prefer to see a larger effort in conventional defense by several of our allies, I do not believe that these adjectives were appropriate.

(MORE)

I have not had a discussion with any Canadian about events in Portugal, so I can give no judgment about this particular aspect. I find that our philosophical understanding of the level of the approach to the problems of the Western World, I do not find any substantial difference between the United States Administration and the Canadian Government.

The Minister: I have just one comment on that, and I refer to the statement to which Dr. Kissinger referred made by the Prime Minister at the Summit, at the recent Summit in Brussels, in which he repeated our commitment to the Alliance in terms which were, I believe, quite satisfactory, and which indicated that the Canadian effort would be continued in a character that would be regarded as satisfactory by the other members of the Alliance, and I believe that was certainly a very solid and fundamental commitment by the Head of the Government of Canada.

I would regard these comments to which you have referred as offensive.

Mr. Ellison: They were not made, Mr. MacEachen, by me.

The Minister: To which you have referred.

Mr. Hargreaves: Doug Fisher.

Q. Douglas Fisher, Toronto Sun, CJOH-TV: Mr. Secretary, should there be a positive response in the United States and Canada to the appeal by the Russian citizen, Nobel Prize winner, for a campaign in the West for more civil rights in the U.S.S.R.?

A. The Secretary: The United States has repeatedly stated its concern on this subject in the European Security Conference and in certain bilateral discussions with the Soviet Union. We have, on the whole, believed that we could be more effective by making our appeal in a non-dramatic way, but this is a question of method, not a question of principle.

Q. Mr. Fisher: Have you any advice for other than governmental organizations on how they could respond to that appeal?

A. The Secretary: I don't think it would be appropriate for me to give that advice.

Mr. Hargreaves: Lubor Zink.

Q. Lubor Zink, Toronto Sun: Two questions, Mr. Secretary. You are one of the chief architects of Detente. In his talks with Giscard d'Estaing, Mr. Brezhnev has just reaffirmed the Soviet position that there is no such thing as ideology for Detente; that it is out of the question.

Do you think any other form of Detente has any value and has any meaning without ideological Detente?

The second question: Was there a trade-off between Eastern Europe and the Middle East in Helsinki?

(MORE)

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)

hearing of renewed efforts to meet American commitments for many years and, of course, now the commitment is only a couple of months away.

Was there any discussion in detail of this issue this week and, if so, how hard did the Canadian Government press you on this?

A. The Secretary: We discussed it this morning and the Canadian Government pressed us with its characteristic eloquence and intensity. (Laughter.) As those journalists who have accompanied me here will tell you, it happens occasionally that this Administration gets defeated in Congress, and we will do our best to avoid this unhappy event.

Mr. Hargreaves: We have time for about two more questions. Peter Ward and Geoff Scott.

Q. Peter Ward, Freelance: 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 jurisdiction zone for fisheries and resources and also whether or not the issue of tankers in the Puget Sound was discussed and Head Harbor Passage on the other coast?

A. The Secretary: Yes, both of these problems were discussed at great length, and our views on the subject of the Law of the Sea, as I understand our views, are very similar. We would prefer that the legislation, that the regime for the economic zones, be established by international treaty and not be unilateral legislation. We appreciate the fact that Canada up to now has resisted the temptation for unilateral legislation. We, of course, have our own domestic pressures in favor of unilateral legislation.

With respect to the tankers in the Puget Sound, that was discussed, but no final conclusion was reached.

Q. Mr. Ward: And, Mr. Secretary, Head Harbour Passage?

A. The Secretary: That, too, was raised, and again no conclusion was reached.

The Minister: On the question of the Law of the Sea, I think we had Dr. Kissinger cover the ground four times since his arrival in Ottawa. I do not think he could have failed to realize the interest that various members of the government had in this particular question.

The Secretary: That is correct.

Mr. Hargreaves: The last question, Geoff Scott. He is gone. Geoff Stevens.

Q. Geoffrey Stevens, Globe and Mail: Dr. Kissinger, we understand that you are proposing to transfer Ambassador Porter from Canada to Saudi Arabia, and replace him here with Mr. Thomas Enders.

Can you tell me what your timing is on that?

A. The Secretary: Well, I do not think any official announcements have been

(MORE)

made. I do want to say that Ambassador Porter is, of course, a very old friend of mine and somebody whose judgment I respect enormously.

Assistant Secretary Enders is also one of my most valued assistants who has had a very major role in designing certain aspects of our economic policy. We are dealing here with two of the superior officers in the Foreign Service.

Mr. Hargreaves: One final question.

Q. Mr. Schweid, Associated Press: Mr. Secretary, in response to the Pike Committee, isn't this a bit of a surrender, and even though the names won't be attached, won't it have a chilling effect on dissenting views? After all, the junior officer's views are going to be conveyed to Congress even without his name.

Wouldn't he be wiser to just go along and present a united front so at least his agency seems unified?

A. The Secretary: I think you should wait until my response is published. We will not submit documents, even without names. We may give a summary of all the dissenting views from all sources that were received. No officer's recommendations will be submitted with or without names.

We are prepared to give a general summary of all dissenting views on a subject, but we are not going to segregate individual opinions.

Mr. Hargreaves: Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Minister.

INFORMATION RELEASE

UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE, UNITED STATES EMBASSY, OTTAWA, ONTARIO, K1P 5T1

(42)

Ottawa, October 14, 1975 -- Following is the text of Secretary Kissinger's arrival statement:

"Mr. Minister, on behalf of my colleagues and myself I would like to express our great pleasure at being able to realize this long held plan to visit Canada. I have visited Canada, this is in fact the third time in recent months, but this is my first official visit to Ottawa and I look forward to friendly, warm and detailed talks with my colleague and with other ministers.

"The Foreign Minister has correctly characterized our relationship not as special, as has sometimes been said, but as unique. We have closer consultation with Canada than with any other nation. We share more common problems and we share the need for parallel solutions on a whole range of issues.

"Canada is no longer a junior partner but a country which rightfully takes its place in the economic and political councils of the world, a country whose participation we think is crucial in the meetings of the producers and consumers and also at the Economic Summit that is being planned for Paris in November.

"Beyond this we have benefitted enormously from the frequent, cordial, and informal exchanges of view that take place at all levels between all ministries and also at the highest levels. I look forward very much to my talks with my colleague here as well as with the Prime Minister and to the warm and cordial reception which I have already received and which I know is always characteristic of Ottawa. Thank you very much."

REMARKS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE
FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,
THE HONOURABLE ALLAN J. MACEachEN
AT DINNER FOR
U.S.A. SECRETARY OF STATE
DR. HENRY KISSINGER,
OTTAWA, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1975

Mr. Secretary,

Mrs. Kissinger,

Your visit to Ottawa is the first occasion that I have of returning the hospitality you have extended to me in Washington -- and also aboard the United States jet from Paris to Brussels which seems to have become your natural habitat! I welcome this further opportunity to exchange views with you, an experience I find rewarding, both on the ground and in the air.

This evening could have been devoted to a working dinner; but I felt it would be more useful to bring you in contact not only with members of the Government and officials, but also with members of the opposition and citizens from all the regions of Canada. Around this table, Mr. Secretary, we have a cross-section of the Canadian people involved in a variety of ways in the very close and diversified relationship that exists between our two countries.

During our talks tomorrow, we shall be exchanging views on the international situation. In this way we will be participating in the process of the building of a lasting structure of peace and security, the main aim of your foreign policy.

As a student of history, Mr. Kissinger, you are aware of the inherent instability of any world order which is too heavily weighted in favour of a given country. As a citizen of the United States, you recognize the need for pragmatism and flexibility in the conduct of foreign affairs: principles which, I hasten to recall in the spirit of your country's bicentennial celebrations, Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, each in his own way, made the corner-stone of the United States foreign policy.

What you seek to achieve, Mr. Secretary, was well described in a speech that you made in New Delhi last October. Allow me to quote from it.

"Our goal is to move toward a world where power blocs and balances are not dominant, where justice, not stability, can be our overriding preoccupation, where countries consider co-operation in the global interest to be in their national interest. For all that has been achieved, we must realize that we have taken only the first hesitant steps on a long and arduous road ...".

This goal, which induced the United States Government to recast its diplomacy in a multi-polar framework, is very similar to our own. Of course, we do not emphasize the same elements in the evolving power structure; nor do we necessarily draw the same policy conclusions from the same elements. For we are distinct societies, each with its own history, array of national interests and bevy of domestic constraints. But there is no doubt in my mind that the current evolution of United States foreign policy allows Canada to implement its own policy of diversification -- what we call the "Third Option". That is, an attempt to develop further and deepen our relationships with other countries of the world while moving on with our very close and valued links with your country, the first and the most important among all our partners.

Thus, we hope to play a role on the world scene which corresponds to Canada's aspirations, and resources. As you have stated many times yourself, leadership, in the international community, cannot be the burden of only one great power; I would add that leadership equally cannot be the exclusive prerogative of the great powers. Thus it should be considered quite normal for middle powers and even small countries to participate in the resolution of international problems, or in the de-fusing of localized conflicts. This form of leadership sometimes carries risks; it is nonetheless necessary to assure humanity's constant progression towards the new political and economic order to which all peoples aspire.

On occasion we in Canada have been able to play a leading role in world affairs. We have done so with your sympathy and understanding and we are confident this will be so in the future. That a middle power bordering the world's strongest power can act freely and independently is high tribute to the maturity of our bilateral relationship and our conception of international relations.

Our shared heritage of North American development, our joint achievement of the largest bilateral trading relationship in the world, and similarities in our basic values, have all contributed to our healthy and mutually beneficial relationship. That each government responds from different perspectives to different imperatives only serves to underscore the significance, and the soundness of maintaining good relations, and of our mutual accomplishment in the maintenance of continued good relations. Indeed the mutual respect, enormous goodwill and undeniable

benefits accruing to both countries as a result of the successful co-operation of our societies, point up the unique importance of our relationship, no matter from whose perspective it is viewed.

As a Canadian, I have become increasingly conscious of Canada's distinctiveness, as well as of her capacity and determination to chart and control her chosen course.

As a Member of Parliament and Minister of the Crown, I am particularly aware of the interests and priorities of the Government of Canada. I refer particularly to:

- assuring stable economic growth and thus jobs for Canadians and adequate incomes for their efforts;
- combatting inflation, so that these are not dissipated;
- stimulating the development of our manufacturing sector, especially of those industries which have a high technological base;
- assuring a rational development of our own energy resources, so that long-term domestic needs can be met;
- deriving significant benefit from foreign investments in Canada;
- strengthening the economic base for developing cultural expression; and
- diversifying and expanding our foreign trade and other economic relations.

But as Foreign Minister, I am struck by the interdependence of the world's political and economic entities, by the need for nations to take reasonable account of each other's legitimate interests, and by the heavy burden upon us all to work unrelentingly for the elusive balance between safeguarding the vital interests of one's own nation and avoiding injustice and prejudice to the proper interests of other nations.

Canada and the United States, because of our complex and varied interrelations, inevitably and frequently make decisions which affect the interests of the other. Perhaps now more than ever before.

The challenge we face, constantly, is to keep abreast conceptually of the changes that have taken place or will take place in our relationship, so that mutual understanding is based on reality rather than fiction or emotion -- past or present -- so that this understanding effectively bears upon the resolution of bilateral issues.

With these thoughts in mind, and in the spirit that has stimulated these thoughts, it is now my privilege and distinct honour to propose a toast to the enduring friendship between Canada and the United States of America, and to the continued health and prosperity of our esteemed guests, Dr. Henry Kissinger and his charming wife, Nancy.

The challenge we face, constantly, is to keep abreast conceptually of the changes that have taken place or will take place in our relationship, so that mutual understanding is based on reality rather than fiction or emotion -- past or present -- so that this understanding effectively bears upon the resolution of bilateral issues.

With these thoughts in mind, and in the spirit that has stimulated these thoughts, it is now my privilege and distinct honour to propose a toast to the enduring friendship between Canada and the United States of America, and to the continued health and prosperity of our esteemed guests, Dr. Henry Kissinger and his charming wife, Nancy.

Monsieur le Secrétaire, votre allocution prononcée à New Delhi en octobre dernier, décrit bien le but que vous poursuivez. Permettez-moi d'en citer le passage suivant:

"Our goal is to move toward a world where power blocs and balances are not dominant, where justice, not stability, can be our overriding preoccupation in the global interest to be in their national interest. For all that has been achieved, we must realize that we have taken only the first hesitant steps on a long and arduous road ...".

Cet objectif qui a amené le gouvernement des Etats-Unis à refondre sa diplomatie dans un cadre multipolaire, est très proche du nôtre. Il va de soi que nous ne nous attachons pas toujours aux mêmes composantes de la dynamique du pouvoir, pas plus que nous ne tirons nécessairement de conclusions identiques à partir d'un même point de départ. En effet, nous constituons des sociétés distinctes, chacune ayant sa propre histoire, de multiples intérêts nationaux conditionnés par le jeu de contraintes internes. Néanmoins, je suis convaincu que l'évolution actuelle de la politique étrangère des Etats-Unis permet au Canada de réaliser sa politique de diversification, notre "troisième option".

Par cette option, nous cherchons à étendre et à renforcer nos relations avec les autres pays, tout en conservant des liens très étroits avec le vôtre, le premier et le plus important de tous nos partenaires.

Ainsi, nous espérons pouvoir jouer un rôle sur la scène mondiale qui correspond aux ressources et aux aspirations du Canada. Comme vous l'avez reconnu à maintes reprises, le leadership, au sein de la communauté internationale, ne saurait être dévolu à une seule des grandes puissances; j'ajouterai que le leadership ne saurait être non plus l'apanage exclusif des grandes puissances. Il est normal en effet que les puissances moyennes et même les petits pays participent à la résolution des problèmes internationaux, ou au désamorçage de conflits localisés. Cette forme de leadership comporte parfois des risques; il est toutefois nécessaire pour assurer la progression constante de l'humanité vers le nouvel ordre politique et économique auquel aspirent tous les peuples.

Le Canada a pu, à l'occasion, jouer un rôle de premier plan sur la scène internationale. Nous sommes confiants que la sympathie et la compréhension dont vous avez fait preuve à cet égard se continueront dans l'avenir. En réalité, le fait qu'une puissance moyenne, voisine du pays le plus puissant du monde, puisse agir en toute liberté et indépendance, témoigne éloquemment de la maturité de nos relations bilatérales et de notre conception des relations internationales.

Les relations que nous entretenons à notre avantage mutuel reposent sur notre participation commune au développement de l'Amérique du Nord, sur la réalisation du commerce bilatéral le plus considérable au monde et sur la convergence de nos valeurs essentielles. Le fait que nos gouvernements obéissent à des impératifs différents tributaires de situations particulières, souligne d'autant plus l'importance et la justesse d'un bon voisinage et justifie les gestes que nous avons posés au service de cet objectif.

D'ailleurs, le respect mutuel, la bonne volonté et les indéniables avantages qu'ont valu à nos deux pays une collaboration fructueuse font ressortir la valeur inestimable de nos relations, quelle que soit la perspective adoptée.

Comme Canadien, je suis de plus en plus conscient de l'individualité du Canada et de son aptitude et de sa détermination à infléchir et à façonner son devenir.

En tant que député et ministre, je suis particulièrement sensibilisé aux intérêts et aux priorités du gouvernement du Canada, qui cherche notamment à -

- assurer une croissance économique régulière et fournir ainsi aux Canadiens de l'emploi et des bénéfices proportionnés à leurs efforts;
- combattre l'inflation pour éviter que ne soient anéantis ces efforts;
- activer le développement du secteur manufacturier, en particulier dans le cas des industries à haute technologie;
- assurer une exploitation rationnelle de nos ressources énergétiques afin de répondre à nos besoins nationaux à long terme;
- tirer des bénéfices importants des investissements étrangers au Canada;
- renforcer l'infrastructure économique de nos moyens d'expression culturelle;
- diversifier et étendre notre commerce international et nos autres relations économiques.

Mais en tant que ministre des Affaires extérieures, je suis confronté à l'interdépendance politique et économique du monde; les nations se doivent d'accorder une place raisonnable aux intérêts légitimes des autres membres de la communauté internationale et rechercher sans relâche le fugitif équilibre entre leurs intérêts vitaux et la justice et l'équité dont elles doivent faire preuve à l'endroit des autres nations.

Le Canada et les Etats-Unis, en raison même de leurs relations complexes et variées, prennent inévitablement et fréquemment des décisions affectant les intérêts de l'autre partie. Cette interaction est peut-être plus considérable aujourd'hui qu'elle ne l'a jamais été.

Il nous faut donc constamment être présent à l'évolution de nos rapports, afin que ceux-ci soient ancrés dans le réel et non pas tributaires de l'imaginaire ou de l'émotivité et qu'ils puissent contribuer effectivement à la solution des questions bilatérales.

C'est dans l'esprit qu'a suscité cette réflexion que j'ai l'insigne privilège et le grand honneur de porter un toast à l'amitié de longue date qui unit les Etats-Unis d'Amérique et le Canada ainsi qu'à la santé et à la prospérité de nos charmants invités, M. Henry Kissinger et sa gentille épouse, Nancy.