

CA1
EA980
77V36
V.1
DOCS

THE CANADIAN EMBASSY

WASHINGTON, D.C.

VISIT OF

PRIME MINISTER PIERRE ELLIOTT TRUDEAU

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT

Date FEB 21 1977

MILLER COLUMBIAN REPORTING SERVICE

Official Reporter

927 FIFTEENTH ST., N. W.

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005

THE CANADIAN EMBASSY

Washington, D.C.

beautiful wife. of Canada, who have come
to be with us this afternoon, and all of our own welcome ones
who have come here on this occasion to make our neighbors feel
at home. I am very grateful to be here to welcome to the
White House, and to our Country, a man who shares with me the
tremendous friendship that has always existed between the
United States of America and the people of Canada in the
North.

WELCOMING CEREMONY
SOUTH LAWN
THE WHITE HOUSE

- for -

PRIME MINISTER PIERRE ELLIOTT TRUDEAU

February 21, 1977

LIBRARY DEPT. OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
MINISTRE DES AFFAIRES EXTERIEURES

43-230-451

LIBRARY DEPT. OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES EXTÉRIEURES

PRESIDENT CARTER: Prime Minister Trudeau, his beautiful wife, Margaret; the people of Canada who have come to be with us this afternoon; and all of our own welcome ones who have come here on this occasion to make our neighbors feel at home: I am very grateful to be here to welcome to the White House, and to our Country, a man who shares with me the tremendous friendship that has always existed between the United States of America and the people of Canada to the North.

We share a common Border of more than 5,000 miles.

We share a common defense of our own people.

We share the human and natural resources of an entire Continent.

We share a great respect and friendship for each other.

We share a commitment to human decency and to personal freedom.

We share a historical belief in the principles of Democracy; and these principles have been tangibly demonstrated by our Government for generations.

And we share a common commitment to World peace!

Canada is a most important Trade partner.

We have many common purposes, and common concerns, and common problems and, also, the potential for common solutions of those problems.

These next two days, I will spend with Prime Minister Trudeau; and he will have a chance to visit with our top Officials, and Canadian Officials, who will share in these discussions.

We will be talking about Defense--Peace.

We will be talking about the World economy and our Nations' great contribution to that economy.

Prime Minister Trudeau has been recognized for many years as one of the of the Developed Nations' leading negotiators and understanders of the problems of the Developing Nations of the World.

Because of his commitment to humanitarian purposes, he has the trust and confidence of people who are not quite so fortunate as are we.

He is a singular Statesman of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization--having been in Office now for more than eight years--and his common and unique and persistent commitment to the principles of the Democratic Nations of the World has made him a leader, even from the first day that he was in Office.

He made a comment, recently, that I think is important for all of us to remember; which typifies his own attitude toward human beings.

He said: "It is not enough to measure a Nation's product in our gross National financial products. What makes

you think about the outcome, and the output of our Nation is on the basis of our net human benefit; how well the people find a better life because of the activities and decisions of Government."

So, because of all of these reasons, in a personal way and as a leader of our great Nation--I want to welcome to our Country, Prime Minister Trudeau, and his wife, Margaret.

Welcome, Mr. Prime Minister!

(Applause)

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Mr. Carter and American friends: First, I wanted to tell you, Mr. President, that I brought the greetings of some 22 million Canadians, but I see -- by the flags over on the lawn, there -- that a lot of them have preceded me here!

The greetings are warm, nonetheless.

I want to tell you, also, that we bring you our greatest wishes as you assume the very arduous, important Office of President of this great Nation.

Canadians are looking forward to this period of good relationships with you at the head of this great Nation. With your dedication, your hard work, your discipline, your sense of morality, we feel that these are great days for our relationship and for the World.

We are particularly grateful and honored, Sir, that you invited your North American neighbors very early in the term of your Office.

I am sure I can speak for President Lopez Portillo, and I certainly speak for myself, and for Canadians, when I say that we have great expectations that this Continental neighborhood will flourish and develop because of the great personal interest you have shown in it.

The links between our Countries are so numerous; the cooperation that we are involved in is so deep, that this kind of meeting is as natural as it is friendly.

As I looked through the enormous briefing books that I have, sir -- and I am sure it happened to you, too -- I just felt that perhaps there is nothing that our Countries can do that does not involve one another. There are so many associations, so many committees, so many clubs, so many links between us--of all kinds--that I believe they are absolutely legion! I tried to get a count, and I was told that it was impossible; and I can well understand that!

We have been such old friends, and our links are so deep; but this number of associations together can only rest on the deep friendship between our peoples.

The International Women's Year, Sir, is only past, in the history, fourteen months now; and it seems that our wives -- Mrs. Carter and Margaret -- have already met and established a good agenda for the discussions. You and I are only meeting this moment, but I am quite convinced that we will, in a friendly way, rival theirs with achievements, and catch up to their

friendly relations.

I want to thank you, Sir, for your very warm hospitality to all of the visiting Canadians. You have received us in this beautiful garden, and this nice sun makes me feel that Canadians, now as they are buried deep in snow, have hope. They have hope that when that snow melts, there will still be grass there under it!

(Laughter)

And, Sir, we hope, with the same faith, that you will favor us with your visit, and Mrs. Carter's, to Canada one of these days.

Thank you very, very much.

(Applause)

(Whereupon, the meeting welcoming Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau of Canada was concluded.)

THE CANADIAN EMBASSY

Washington, D.C.

Canadian Media Center
East Room, Mayflower Hotel
Washington, D.C.

Monday, February 21, 1977

BACKGROUND BRIEFING

-by-

IVAN L. HEAD
SENIOR ADVISOR
OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER

INTRODUCED BY:

RALPH COLEMAN,
Spokesman of the Prime Minister's Office

-with-

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

MR. COLEMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, could we have your attention now, please?

Mr. Ivan Head has arrived.

To those of you who are not familiar with our briefings, this briefing is a background briefing by Mr. Ivan Head from the Prime Minister's Office, for attribution unto the official from the Prime Minister's Office.

Mr. Head has twenty minutes, so, if--after his initial remarks--you would confine your questions to today's talks, we will have another briefing after the talks tomorrow.

MR. HEAD: Thank you.

The conversations this afternoon took place in the Cabinet Room in the White House.

Present on the United States side were the President, the Vice President; the Acting Secretary of State and Officials.

On the Canadian side were the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and Officials.

The conversations, as you know, lasted approximately an hour-and-a-half.

After you last saw us, we moved inside; had a cup of coffee; and then sat right down to business while some photographs of the Prime Minister and the President, together, were taken.

The agenda that was pursued this afternoon was quite similar to that which had been anticipated, and with which you are familiar. We got under way on the International Economic Issues; the question of the proposed Economic Summit was discussed; the timing of the Summit -- not so much its location, but the kind of agenda -- the topics that should be dealt with--and, in particular, the placing, in time, the data for the Summit should have, vis-a-vis the next Ministerial Session of CIEC.

Referred to, as well, was the upcoming Commonwealth Heads-of-Government meeting which will take place -- just the one fixed meeting. It is scheduled to take place in London in mid-June.

The CIEC meeting, as you know, has not been fixed; nor has the timing for the Economic Summit. It is a question of how to coordinate all of those for the most effective outcome.

The second topic that was dealt with was one of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons; non-proliferation in the broader sense of safeguards against non-useful uses and transfers of nuclear facilities, materials, and technology.

We then moved to Human Rights, which was a topic that I don't think had been signaled to you in previous anticipatory briefings: a discussion on the position that should be taken by the United States; by Canada; and the most effective.

results that might be expected from this or that attitude or posture.

We came, then, on to disarmament, and had rather a full discussion about SALT; about arm sales; about conventional and nuclear disarmament issues inside and outside of the SALT; the possibilities of test bans, and the like.

This brought us full up to 5:30. We had not concluded the full schedule of multi-lateral topics. There was still a desire, on the part of both principals, to focus on some of the issues, and some of the regions of the World in which there is considerable concern at the present time and, certainly, we will deal with Southern Africa tomorrow.

The Secretary of State arrives back, later tonight, from his Middle Eastern tour, and is expected to join the meeting tomorrow. It is, therefore, likely that we will also deal with the Middle East in that kind of a globe-hopping exchange.

The mood of the meeting was exceedingly relaxed. There was a charm -- I think it is fair to say -- about the Cabinet Room in the White House, that impressed all of us; a degree of informality that was expressed or presented to us by the President, emphasizing that he has been in Office, now, for only a month; that he knows what he wants to do; that he was seeking some assistance from friendly Allies in advising him on how most effectively some of these aims could be carried out, and some of these goals could be achieved.

There were constant references to the importance he attached to close consultation and, wherever they appeared effective, to coordination in the application of policies with Allies and, of course, Canada was mentioned, constantly, as one of them because of our presence here today.

I am prepared to take questions now.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: I have two things:

First, can you tell us how much of the meeting was devoted to each of those topics?

Secondly, on the Human Rights topic: can you tell us in more detail what kind of action by Canada the President sought or expressed a wish for; and what advice the Prime Minister gave him on useful or unuseful methods for the Americans to adopt?

MR. HEAD: I am sorry, but I did not keep a time chart as we went through these various items.

A good deal of time was spent on the forthcoming Summit, and the interrelation that it might have with the other meetings-- largely because it offered us an opportunity to talk a good deal about CIEC and the progress--or lack of progress--that we anticipated most within CIEC, itself.

The non-proliferation issue was a technical one; and we did talk in technical terms; and several around the table entered into that discussion.

I should add, as well, that on both the Economic

Summit and this topic of Non-proliferation, the Vice President was invited by the President to report to the meeting on some of his impressions from the conversations that he had had in his recent tours with the European Allies, and with Japan.

The Disarmament Issue and SALT were largely carried, by the President, in response to questions from the Prime Minister, because this is an activity, of course, which is more American than it is ours--with respect to Strategic Weapon Systems.

On the Human Rights Issue, the question was frankly put by the President to the Prime Minister, and there was no full and final response. The Prime Minister's answer was that we must seek means which will be the most effective, and that there is a constant shift in terms of advice from one side or the other within any Country--as to whether one should raise these and be more tough and more specific than the other.

"Will that be more effective than doing it in a more diplomatic and soft-tone fashion?"

We talked about the track that we had pursued on the re-unification of families, for example-- with the Soviets trying to take that off the front pages and off of Diplomatic notes but to be dealt with, nevertheless, in a quiet and a pushing fashion, and the success that we had with it.

There was no real answer.

There was some recognition that, in a number of

Countries in the World -- and, seemingly, almost in the past six to eight weeks -- there had been more attention paid to Human Rights, and some movement forward; and the President hoped that that might have been a reflection of his own well-known attitudes on this subject.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Two questions.

Was Mr. Brzezinski present?

Secondly, on the Human Rights issue, I am wondering -- maybe you have already answered this: Did they get to any concrete discussion of the kind of attitudes the two Countries should take at the Review Conference in Belgrade?

Did they come to any conclusions in that respect?

MR. HEAD: Yes, Mr. Brzezinski was present. If you would like me to run down the other side of the table, in addition to Mr. Brzezinski was Mr. Christopher, who is the Acting Secretary of State -- the new Deputy Secretary of State; there was United States Ambassador Enders; and Dick Vine, who is the Assistant Secretary for Canadian Affairs--and Western European Affairs, as well.

On the Canadian side was Ambassador Warren, of course, and you know the rest of us that were there.

There was an exchange carried on as to how best we could move this in the Belgrade Review Conference of the CSCR.

There was a belief expressed on the United States side--that Helsinki was a step forward. You are familiar with the argument that we now have a legitimate handle on the

Soviet Government and--well--all Governments that were signatories to the final Act; in order to ask them what they are doing; to demand that they live up to their undertakings and-- in that respect--the wish was expressed that we do consult in a way that we can; not necessarily put pressure on, but ask them any questions and, bit by bit, employ the final Act to Helsinki to change things in the Eastern European Union Countries.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Can you reply to the question of Human Rights?

You started off by saying that the President "put the question" to the Prime Minister.

Are you implying that the President asked the Prime Minister what he thought of his -- the President's -- actions and statements in recent weeks regarding certain wrong public image. Also, a second question, sir:

In mentioning what you were going to re-unification of families, do you mean this is the way that Canada would prefer the United States to pursue this issue?

MR. HEAD: Dealing with your first question first, Mr. Harris, the way in which the President put the question to the Prime Minister was not by way of asking for his opinion-- or his assessment of the rights or wrongs of what he has done. But, rather, what effectiveness he felt the Prime Minister would attach to the consequences of those acts.

The Prime Minister was unable to respond to him in a total fashion. He did agree that the measurement--the standard--by which we should judge these acts is their effectiveness, finally, in bringing some relief to bear on the dissidents and the others that we are seeking to help.

The answer to the second question really is, "No".

We have had a system in play with the Soviet Union and we were successful in negotiating a similar one with the Chinese--with respect to the re-unification of families; and the Prime Minister mentioned this to the President as one way that we had explored in dealing with the problem. But it is in application only to that very special category: that is: those persons in those two Countries/^{who} had relatives in Canada and were seeking to join them there.

The technique is a simple one.

We have agreed that the list would be constantly brought up to date and that, and with the pressure of the agreement of Mr. Trudeau and Kosygin, ---- having inaugurated this progress--that we ceased to move with some degree of

We have had many hundreds that have come within the last few years, but there are shortcomings. (Inaudible in part).

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: So that the Prime Minister did not really offer any advice to the President? Is that it?

MR. HEAD: Exactly!

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Was the Prime Minister surprised

when the President raised this subject outside of the agenda that he was anticipating?

When you say that he said that, in effect, we would have to wait and see what the results of the President's action were--that certainly cannot be construed as approving it.

MR. HEAD: No! We were not surprised that it did come up. It was a rather natural slip into this subject, Peter. I put it down as an entire category, because of the amount of time that was attached to it.

It seemed to follow naturally in our discussion about non-proliferation and, then, leading with the anticipation of moving from there to disarmament.

The President did say that he was working in several directions in his discussions with the Soviets. Human Rights was certainly one, and the proposals with respect to SALT were another.

Now, the Prime Minister's response was not intended to be approving or disapproving, but it was definitely of an encouraging rise and that we cannot help but be dedicated to the human conditions in other Countries; and that it is necessary that we constantly seek techniques that will be most effective in relieving their plight.

But I am certain that the President did not seek either approval or disapproval--nor did the Prime Minister choose to give it in that form.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Just one quick question -- just a "Yes" or "No" answer.

I gather from your outline, and from what you said, that there was no reference to internal political developments in Canada; or to the Quebec situation in Canada?

MR. HEAD: None whatsoever! It was not mentioned, no.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: On the question of the Summit -- the Economic Summit -- and particularly the Agenda, did the Prime Minister advance the point that I understand he has advanced in the past when this came up: That is, that the Agenda should be broadened to include -- for want of a better expression -- Social issues, as opposed to purely Economic issues?

If so, what was the President's response?

MR. HEAD: When we did talk about the Summit, there was not a great deal of detail directed towards the Agenda. It is the intention, we understand -- somewhat similarly to the Puerto Rico meeting -- to establish, in each Country, a general Coordinator; and that these people will then deal with one another in the preparation.

A great deal of emphasis was placed by both the President and the Prime Minister on the necessity for careful preparation for a third Economic Summit, to insure that it meets the expectations that it will arouse when it is announced.

With respect to the kind of Summit, Paul, the

Prime Minister did say -- as he had in Puerto Rico -- that it was important-when the leaders of industrialized democracies arrange themselves around the table--that they not feel obliged to remain constrained by purely economic or technical issues.

I think it was accepted that the discussion should be economically oriented. There was no desire -- that I detected -- on the part of any of those involved in these Summits that they should become a directorate for the World, or a steering committee for (inaudible)-- or anything of that sort.

These are Economic Summits; but, with that degree of elasticity--that some issues that are of an economic origin, or economically related, be brought up for discussion.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Ivan, did you come up -- you said you discussed the timing of the CIEC vis-a-vis the Economic Summit.

Did you come up with an agreement on a strategy there?

Secondly, you talked about some form of -- you suggested that the President was asking for our assistance-- either in this relation, or in some other term.

Could you clarify what type of assistance we were being asked for?

MR. HEAD: The President was speaking to the Prime Minister in our guise of Co-Chairman of CIEC: asking his views

on what would be the most productive timing.

The Vice President, of course, has spoken to the other Summiteers, and sought from them what they felt would be most useful: to have a Summit prior to the Ministerial Meeting of CIEC; after the Ministerial meeting. And, in that event, would it be likely that there would be still another Ministerial Meeting, prior to the Summit. ?

The Prime Minister was able to respond, speaking-- to a degree--from his knowledge of what the G-19 had expressed. Mr. MacEachen as you may know, met with Mr. Guerero just a few days ago on this very topic. In that sense, he was asking for assistance: He was asking for advice on our views.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: What did he advise?

MR. HEAD: As to what way it should go?

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Yes.

MR. HEAD: I think the advice--basically--is that, if the United States policy is sufficiently firmly set with respect to the Third World Countries, and what its response will be at CIEC, then there is no reason to delay the CIEC meeting until after the Summit; and no reason to encourage--rather--the delay of the CIEC meeting until after the Summit; but that much depended on whether the United States--in the early days of its Administration--was able to mount the policy and take the decisions necessary in order

to respond to those kinds of questions that we know are going to come at CIEC on commodities, and the rest; and left the President -- who was not in a position to tell us now about how quickly, or what direction his policy would be taking.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: With relation to international economic issues -- particularly relating to Canada and the United States -- some newspapers in the United States have reported President Carter was concerned about the Seaway toll on the St. Lawrence and Welland Canal?

Did this, in fact, come up today?

MR. HEAD: Not today, no. The discussion tomorrow will be devoted largely -- not entirely, -- to the bi-lateral issues; and some Canada/U.S. economic issues; and topics such as the ones you mentioned will be mentioned tomorrow -- should our leaders wish to do so.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: When Dr. Kissinger was Secretary of State, it was thought that Canada might be prepared to play some role with other Commonwealth Countries -- to find some sort of solution to the problem.

Now that Mr. Carter and Mr. Vance are there, one gets the impression that they are less interested in playing a bigger role in that part of the World.

Is that your general view of their posture on this problem that they are going to talk about tomorrow?

MR. HEAD: I am sorry. Which part of the World were

you referring to?

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Southern Africa.

MR. HEAD: I would just be guessing, at the present time, because we did not get to it.

What the Prime Minister and the President said today-- almost as we were getting up from the table was that there was a need and a desire on the part of each to talk about Rhodesia, Libya, and so on.

We have no idea, at the present time, what the current U.S. Administration attitude is towards the Kissinger proposal for the Rhodesian Fund, for example. I would just be speculating. We will have to wait until tomorrow.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Head, did I understand you to say that while the President was not asking, necessarily, for Mr. Trudeau's advice; that Mr. Trudeau encouraged the President to continue his current approach towards Human Rights?

I think you used the word "encouraging".

MR. HEAD: Yes, "encouraging", but encouraging his continued interest, and attention, and attitudes.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Not necessarily his methods?

MR. HEAD: Not necessarily his "methods", no. It would be wrong for the Prime Minister, I think, to say; "Good! I will write to Sakharov next week, too!"

That kind of detail did not come up.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: A really similar question: You did say that the President did not seek approval or disapproval, But does the Canadian Government approve or disapprove of the initiative taken by the Government in view of the escalation since this (inaudible) about the ultimate consequences of this: (inaudible)

MR. HEAD: It is going to be a neat question to decide and to learn -- you better put it that way -- whether the Soviets are willing to accept what Mr. Carter says-- inasmuch as it is such a contrast -- a break from the Kissinger technique in the past. Kissinger pursued techniques of linkage -- linkage of issue -- one or the other.

President Carter has now said that he does not pursue that kind of structuring in his relationships with the Soviet Union; and that he wants to continue amicably, hopefully, productive discussions on SALT, disarmament -- this kind of thing. But, at the same time, they must recognize that he feels it necessary to deal with the Human Rights issue; to bring responses, as I understand it, to the effect that you cannot kick us one day and shake our hand the next.

These things must not be linked or mixed, but must be understood to have some kind of a relationship, and this is why I cannot be any more clear at this time.

I am just speculating on what the Soviet response would be.

You are aware that in the Canada/U.S. relations, we have always been successful because there is a desire on both sides of the Border not to link issues. Therefore, we can be tough on one; disagree on another; and be happy on another. This is a rather sophisticated approach. It worked well for Canada and, I hope, for the United States. It appears that Mr. Carter may well be wanting to introduce this kind of policy-application in his relations with the Soviet Union. I think we have to wait for a while to find out what the Soviet response would be. You do know that Mr. Vance plans to visit the Soviet Union sometime this Spring. And the first signal, I should think, would come back following that trip.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Are we waiting for that signal to come back before we say whether they approve or disapprove?

MR. HEAD: We seek effectiveness, and we have, possibly, followed the opposite view. We have tended not to be overly critical in public, hoping that -- by being critical in a more quiet fashion -- we would get what we wanted.

It is a question of measurement as to whether we have gotten enough by our technique.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: You did not answer the second part of my question:

Were there other ways that the President sought assistance on nuclear matters?

You used that term; that he "sought assistance" and

possible coordination.

MR. HEAD: I don't want to be misunderstood on this, but there was an openness--and a genuine low-key human approach of the President--that was really quite remarkable. I don't think any of us were in a position not to expect this kind of thing, but we were, all, very struck by it.

Now, I have not consulted with everybody at our side of the table; but the manner in which he raised topics--or asked the Prime Minister to raise them, and said to us that, "I have only been in Office three weeks. I have not had these responsibilities. I am anxious to hear your views" -- I know -- I recall his comments on the lawn about the high stature that Canada enjoys, particularly among developing Countries; "Your position in the Commonwealth; "Your experience would give me considerable comfort if you would share with me how you think I should go about these things"; inviting the Prime Minister to express his views, not only today, but constantly, by telephone or otherwise; to "pick up the telephone and let me know if you think that what I am doing is off course, or ineffective, or otherwise"; I don't ever recall quite that open an invitation from a President of the United States to a Prime Minister of Canada, before.

Thank you very much.

MR. COLEMAN: I ask you all, tonight, to check the blackboard for an updated timing of tomorrow's activities,

and any other information we may want to pass on.

(Whereupon, the Press Briefing was concluded.)

-o0o-

THE CANADIAN EMBASSY

Washington, D.C.

State Dining Room
The White House

Monday, February 21, 1977
(9:00 p.m.)

EXCHANGE OF TOASTS

-by-

PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER

-and-

PRIME MINISTER PIERRE ELLIOTT TRUDEAU

PRESIDENT CARTER: I learned that we have very intense competition with our friends from the North. In a George Gallup poll, recently, people who live in the United States were asked to name their favorite Nations. The United States got 95%; Canada got 91%! So I feel that I am in an intensive and very challenging competition with Pierre Trudeau for the hearts of our people.

I think this does indicate the great compatibility and friendship and sense of warmth and mutual admiration that has always existed among American people towards Canada.

We share a border that is 5,200 miles long and, for 200 years, our people have lived-with one very brief interval around 1812--in the spirit of friendship. And that is important to us.

Even more, we think, in our daily lives, we are dependent on Canada for many things.

Canada has about 22 million people, and, every year, 60 million people cross the Border, and there is a kinship and a sharing of the life, the challenge, and the enjoyment of life, that transcends the political realities of a modern, fast changing, technological World.

Of course, the technologies are important, as well.

We are now beginning to see that many of the things that we took for granted -- the purity of water in the

Great Lakes; an unlimited supply of oil and gas; security in our Borders free of possible direct attack in a time of war -- those things are now no longer sure and, I think, in a way, that has bound us even closer together.

I know that on the other side of the Border the Canadians feel that we are -- the last time that Prime Minister Trudeau came to our Country he said that being a neighbor of the United States was like sleeping with an elephant!

(Laughter)

That you could very quickly detect a twitch, or a grunt!

(Laughter)

Well, the elephants are gone. The donkeys are here!

(Laughter)

And the donkeys are much more companionable beasts.

I do want to thank the Canadian people and Prime Minister Trudeau for their gracious offer during this time of energy shortage for our people -- for their offer to help us. They exported some of their cold weather, but they followed it up with oil and natural gas.

We had a very delightful meeting, this afternoon, to discuss some of the International problems that face us both. And, tomorrow, we are going to talk about some things that affect both Canada and the United States, in a bi-lateral fashion.

Prime Minister Trudeau's wife, Margaret, came a couple of weeks ago to visit Rosalynn and open up a display in one of our famous Art Galleries, of contemporary Canadian Art. I think it indicated, first of all, that we are interested in the same things but, also, that our Nations are distinctive. Although we live in close proximity, we are quite different, and the differences are carefully preserved.

There is an understandable determination not to be dominated, and not to be pressured; and to be unique; and to maintain individuality; and that is a sign of strength on our side, and their side, of the Border that expresses to us both, I feel, that we have approached an era of recognition, of mutual purpose and ideals and hopes and dreams and aspirations and, also, concerns and problems that might bring us even closer together ^{now,} than in the past. In a way, I am thankful for it.

I am proud of the friendship that was almost instantaneous when I met Pierre Trudeau this afternoon. I had a sense of relaxation and a sense of compatibility that I ^{accurate} hope will be an indication, on a permanent basis, of what our Nations mean to one another.

I would like to close by saying that we have been close in time of war and, quite often, when our own Nation has made a mistake because of a dependence on our own Military strength, Canada and its people have maintained the kind of

standards of ethics and morality, and commitment to unchanging truths, that are a sort of reminder to us to reassess our own position. So we have learned from one another.

I am very grateful to our visitors for coming to honor us with their presence.

I would like to propose a toast to the Queen of Canada; to the Prime Minister of Canada, and to the people of Canada.

(Applause)

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Thank you, Mr. President.

President Carter, friends: I want to thank you, first of all, for your very warm hospitality and for the informality of the dinner which we are attending tonight. The informality was to be expected from a host where you have a child of school age and a puppy, I understand; and the hospitality and the warmth of it was to be expected from you, sir, and from your very charming wife.

I want to say that I am always a little bit moved and, perhaps, even intimidated--when I am in the White House. It has such history! It has such great memories of remarkable Statesmen and American leaders; and it is particularly moving to be here on George Washington's birthday.

I find some consolation in that, because I was told an anecdote about George Washington when he was retiring from Office.

The Philadelphia Aurora -- there was a paper called by that name; I don't know if it still exists -- had been rather unkind to President Washington during his Term of Office. When he retired, they had an editorial saying that if ever there was a day for great rejoicing, this was it!

I feel, sir, that an old politician like myself takes some consolation in feeling that times never change.

(Laughter)

You don't have to seek solace in this type of anecdote but, indeed, you added to the sense of hospitality when you were good enough to quote this finding of Dr. Gallup-- of which I knew nothing. It makes me feel that, if ever I get in trouble in Canada, politically, maybe I will come down here!

(Laughter)

I can assure you that if you are in trouble -- which I pray will never happen -- you would be very handily chosen to be the leader of the Canadian people.

Well, your generous remarks are something which are very much in keeping with the friendship and the long history of cooperation between our peoples. It began, I think, around 1781 when the Articles of Confederation proposed that Canada be admitted -- be invited to join the Confederation just by applying; and I believe other Colonies had to have the consent of nine States in order to be admitted. But

Canada was to be admitted just on invitation and acceptance. Whether it is good, or not, that we did not accept in those days, is very hard to speculate on, except to say that if Canada had accepted, I am sure we would not be having such a time in here tonight!

(Laughter)

Apart from that, the short incident of hostilities to which you alluded very gently, we have since then -- since the past 165 years, I guess it is -- have had very good neighborhood relations, indeed. We have cooperated in many, many ways. We have built together some of the greatest of man's enterprises. We have maintained Democracy, alive within our Countries; and we have cooperated in assisting wherever we could--around the World, in helping other Nations in one way or another.

I think it is fair to say that, if, in those days, 150 years ago, we were the hope of the New World -- a large part of the hope of the New World -- I would think that today, perhaps, in large part, we represent the hope of the Third World; and this joins many of the discussions we had this afternoon. I must say that, on behalf of the Canadian Government and people, that we are more than delighted -- we are excited -- with the generous approach that your ideas convey as regards the World order which would be based on equality and justice.

In our case, sir, we have done our part. In terms of Foreign Aid, Canada is among the top four or five Nations of assistance to the Third World and, in terms of our proportion of GNP, we have, since the end of the Second World War, admitted more refugees--political refugees--to Canada than any other Nation--barring the United States. You have a slight edge on us. But they have come to Canada by the tens of thousands--from Czechoslovakia, from Hungary, from Tibet, from Guyana, from Chile, and many, many other places.

So we do try to -- as Canadians -- show this hospitality to the World; which corresponds to the generosity of the Canadian people.

I was telling you, this afternoon Sir, that though we had been a nuclear power for some thirty years, we have not -- I know we have the technology and the financial means of building a bomb -- we have chosen not to do so. We have tried to put our technology towards a more creative and fraternal use.

We, and the United States, are the only Members of NATO which have troops on both sides of the Atlantic. We are into our fourth term in the Security Council. We have been in every peace-keeping operation since the end of the Second World War. We were in Korea. We were in the formed Indo China Control Commissions.

I think these things are -- partly to be chauvinistic; -- also because we, in Canada, today, tend to be a little bit cynical towards the role of Canada in the World, and towards its "generosity".

I think you won't be angry at me for using this occasion, and these hidden microphones, to talk a little bit about Canada's contribution, because these things would not have been possible without a strong and united Canada. I just want to assure you, Sir, that we intend to keep Canada that way!

It is said that Daniel Boone--when giving advice to those who wanted to join him on the Frontier--said there were three essentials:

To have a good gun; a good horse, and a good wife!

Well, now the Frontier has changed in kind. We are still very much living in a new kind of Frontier land in these days when changing values in the World and the increasing closeness of mankind to each other, and where any special kind of brotherhood is called for, I think we could replace Daniel Boone's three essentials by three others: I would say it is to have good goals, good discipline, and good friends.

Well, I know we have the goals; and we discussed them a great deal this afternoon, and we found that, together, we shared many, many of the goals, in Foreign Relations and, indeed, in Internal Affairs.

In terms of having good friends, you have shown us,

tonight, through your hospitality and your friendship. But that is a reality.

What has to be achieved is good discipline. I speak for Canada and I feel that it is a virtue that we can do with a bit more of--if I can twist my grammar that way.

We are going through a period, now, in discipline. Self discipline is being understood as the only substitute for discipline from the outside; or discipline from the State.

I must say that I, personally, was very, very enthusiastic to see the measure of discipline that appears in your thoughts, Sir; in your approach to problems, and in your way of life, and I would propose a toast-not to the friendship that we have, and not to the goals that we share--but to the disciplines of our people -- that they may increase; and to President Carter and to Mrs. Carter, who will help President Carter in imparting some of his disciplines on the industrialized Democracies.

President Carter and Mrs. Carter!

(Applause)

- - - - -

CA1
EA980
77V36
V.2
DOCS

THE CANADIAN EMBASSY

WASHINGTON, D.C.

VISIT OF

PRIME MINISTER PIERRE ELLIOTT TRUDEAU

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT

Date FEB 22 1977



MILLER COLUMBIAN REPORTING SERVICE

Official Reporter

927 FIFTEENTH ST., N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005

THE CANADIAN EMBASSY

Washington, D.C.

PRESS ROOM
THE WHITE HOUSE

Tuesday, 5:30 p.m.
February 22, 1977

BACKGROUND BRIEFING

-by-

IVAN L. HEAD
SENIOR ADVISOR
OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER

Accompanied by:

The Honorable Zbigniew Brzezinski
Assistant to the President, for National Security Affairs

Richard Vine
Assistant Secretary for Canadian Affairs

Jerry Schechter
Associate Press Secretary
National Security Council

Introduction by:

Jody Powell
White House Press Secretary

43-230-451

LIBRARY DEPT. OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES EXTERIEURES

THE CHIEF OF BUREAU

Washington, D.C.

PRESS ROOM
THE WHITE HOUSE

Monday, 5:30 p.m.
Tuesday, 12:15 p.m.

BACKGROUND BRIEFING

-0-

WILLIAM W. WARD

SENIOR ADVISER

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

The following information is being provided for your information. It is not to be disseminated outside your agency.

Background information on the subject of this briefing is being provided for your information.

LIBRARY DEPT. OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
MONTELEONE DEPT. AFFAIRS EXTERIORS

MR. POWELL: My only purpose here is to introduce the principals in the briefing and, of course, out of a nagging feeling of loneliness--not having seen all of you today. I would like to mention a couple of ground rules here.

As was previously announced, this is a background briefing. It is for attribution to "Senior Officials in the Prime Ministers Office" and to "Senior Administration Officials".

The purpose of the briefing is to provide information to you on the visit of the Prime Minister of Canada and his meeting with the President. We would ask that you confine your questions to that general area, if you will.

For your information, the Prime Minister and the President met alone today from 3:20 until 3:30 -- I beg your pardon. The Prime Minister and the President and Secretary Vance met in the Cabinet Room from 3:20 until 3:30. They were then joined by the rest of the participants. That list of participants has been posted for you. I will be glad to go over it with you again, if you so desire. That meeting lasted from 3:30 until 4:50.

Let me introduce to you -- if you will -- the participants in the briefing.

First, Mr. Ivan L. Head, who is a Senior Advisor of International Relations in the Office of the Prime Minister.

I think most of you know Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski who is Assistant to the President for National Security

Affairs.

We also have with us today, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Richard Vine.

MR. HEAD: Good afternoon.

I will run over, very quickly, those areas of topics that were covered today by the participants; and the range of questions that we are anticipating from you will handle both days -- yesterday and today -- because, for the Canadian participants, you did not have an opportunity to have access to Dr. Brzezinski yesterday, when I briefed you.

We concluded, today, the general round of multi-lateral discussions that had commenced yesterday.

There were discussions of situations of Southern Africa. Secretary Vance was good enough to acquaint us with his insights and reports on his visit, recently, to the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East.

We moved from these general multi-lateral issues which, I should add, included some references to the multi-lateral Trade negotiations in Geneva.

Onward to the bi-lateral situation, which is in good hands and in good shape.

The discussions there took the form of an exchange of views on the most appropriate manner in which the Canada/United States relationship could be managed.

As previously indicated, I think, in Washington --

and certainly in Ottawa -- there was no list of irritants on either side.

There were a series of subjects that each -- the President and the Prime Minister -- found that they wanted to hear from the other about.

There was some discussion on the question of the Pipeline from the North Slope of Alaska. The discussion there was, really, confined to the phasing of the quasi-judicial processes in each Country, and the assurance that each was aware of the small -- the very small -- window of time that was open for the decisions that will be taken this summer.

There was some discussion, as well, of investment flows back and forth; and trade between the two Countries. The manner in which Canada and the U.S. applications, sometimes, of extra-territorial dimensions of Anti-Trust laws, could be if not coordinated, at least examined, to insure that there was a good understanding on both sides as to how this happened.

The Prime Minister did raise with the President the continuing examination of the Auto Pact. I remind you that he and President Ford had asked that this be looked at by a Committee of Officials. That examination, we understand, is concluded and the Prime Minister was just flagging this to the President's attention.

Another area that has been given some interest today on both sides is that of Maritime boundaries and

fisheries. We are very happy, indeed on the Canadian side -- and I think on the United States side -- on how well we proceeded.

I have nothing more to say by way of opening.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Are you available for questions, Mr. Head?

MR. HEAD: Indeed!

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Did the Prime Minister bring up the subject of his address to Congress in his talk with the President?

MR. HEAD: No, he did not.

The Vice President was generous, at the beginning of the conversations this afternoon, to draw to the attention of the President the Prime Minister's address, and one or two of the points that were made by the Prime Minister.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Could you give us some details of the discussion which ensued?

MR. HEAD: Not a great deal. I think the President is familiar with -- or has access to -- the text.

MR. BREZEZINSKI: The President has actually read the speech and, at the end of the meeting, when we were saying "Good-bye", he complimented the Prime Minister extremely highly on his remarks. He told him how much he admired the remarks that he did make.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Was there any discussion of

Quebec in the bi-lateral talks?

MR. HEAD: Not really around the table, per se. Now, the Prime Minister and the President were together for 15 minutes -- as Mr. Powell has indicated to you. I have not had an opportunity to find out from the Prime Minister what was exchanged there. But the Prime Minister will be open to you at a press conference tomorrow morning, as you know.

Dr. Brzezinski says that he was listening when I was not -- that there was some touch on that -- on Quebec.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: What did they say?

DR. BRZEZINSKI: I was not there, but I know it was discussed.

MR. HEAD: That is the 15 minutes alone. They did touch on it.

MR. POWELL: That was in the Oval Office.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: When you were in Ottawa last week, you stressed the importance of the personal relationship -- the two men trying to feel each other out.

I am wondering if you could assess for us that relationship.

Did they get along famously?

Did the Prime Minister, say, "Pick up the 'phone and talk any time"?

MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: What was the question?

MR. HEAD: The question was: What was the nature

of the relationship?

Have they begun on a good, sound footing?

And, finally, can it be expected that there will be telephone discussions between the two men from time to time?

The invitation was certainly given to do that, should the occasion arise. It was gratefully received. I cannot do better, I think, than assess the manner in which they did

begin -- in the President's own words in his toast to the Prime Minister after dinner last night. You are familiar with that.

DR. BRZEZINSKI: I can just add, to that, a word or two.

I have seen President Carter and, also, earlier, Governor Carter in operation, and I can say that I have not often seen him relate, so well and so quickly to someone, as he did to Pierre Elliott Trudeau. The two men really got on extremely well, and the conversations between them were natural. They were easy. They were not at all formal. They really were very direct and, very clearly, there were very honest exchanges. You could just see the "chemistry" was working extremely well.

MR. HEAD: Mr. Brzezinski is speaking as an American, not as a Canadian, but I join with him on that!

(Laughter)

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Head, what is Canada's attitude towards this Pipeline?

Could you put us in the picture a little bit more about the context in which it was discussed?

MR. HEAD: The context in which the Pipeline question was discussed: In the context of the awareness -- and the need to be aware -- on both sides of the Border, that there are certain regulatory processes entrained on each side.

In Canada we have two of these: One before the National Energy Board which is required to examine -- they are examining the two competing competing routes, basically; and the Royal Commission, under the Chairmanship of a Supreme Court Judge, that is examining the question of environmental impact and social conditions, as they would be affected by the Pipeline.

It is important for President Carter -- as it is for Prime Minister Trudeau -- to realize the inhibiting factors, largely in terms of time constraints that are coming to bear here, and to insure that neither misunderstands that certain decisions cannot be taken before these reports are in. Nor, indeed, can they be pre-judged.

The Prime Minister is not, by law allowed to pre-judge or indicate what his attitude will be. He did stress, however, that the attitude of Canadians towards the United States--and to this neighborhood-- is to do what we can do to insure that the neighborhood is properly maintained; that it is your gas; it is your market , in some measures

and, beyond that, he cannot go until he hears what the Board and the Commission have declared.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Ivan, it had been understood before the trip that one of the main areas of interest would, of course, be the Quebec situation. Also, it was really up to Mr. Trudeau to raise it, and talk as much about it as he saw fit.

You seem to be telling us now that there were, at most, perhaps ten, or at the very maximum, fifteen minutes of discussion on this..... topic.

Can you tell us why that is?

MR. HEAD: The question is: Why was there only ten or fifteen minutes, perhaps, devoted to Quebec?

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: During the whole visit.

MR. HEAD: Ten or fifteen minutes today, but the two men did sit side by side last night, throughout the course of the dinner, and had an opportunity to exchange views on whatever they wanted. I should think, if you pose questions tomorrow to the Prime Minister, you will find that Quebec was one of the topics talked about there.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Could you elaborate a little more about what you said -- that things went well in discussions on the 200-mile zone for both Countries?

MR. HEAD: There have been a series of discussions and consultations between Canadians and Americans, apart from

external affairs and environment issues on our side and the Department of State of the United States on the other. With respect to these issues, we are satisfied that the outstanding points have now been resolved; that we have a means of going forward without concern that when the United States 200-mile Fishery Zone Legislation becomes effective on March 1, there will be friction. There is an understanding -- I think it is fair to say, and Mr. Vine will correct me -- that we now have a firm basis for an interim arrangement, while we look to the long term -- and the long term, of course, includes the Law of the Sea Conference and how this will be dealt with, with all Countries.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: What is the firm basis for this interrelationship?

MR. HEAD: I am sorry. I am not aware of the particular details. Perhaps Mr. Vine could help us, because he could certainly be involved in those discussions.

MR. VINE: Thank you.

We have been negotiating with the Canadian Government, over the past several months, through the major meeting in Los Angeles, and since, on an Interim Fisheries Agreement that would bridge the transition of the coming into force of our 200-mile Zone on March 1.

The Canadian Zone has been in effect since the first of January, and they have generally foreborn any

enforcement of jurisdictional claims against American fishing vessels.

The sense of this Interim Agreement -- which I think will be concluded in the next day or so, and be submitted to Congress -- is basically to try, where possible, to hold the existing pattern of Fisheries relationships between our two Countries, so that Canadian fisherman can fish in American waters, and American fisherman can continue to fish in their important fisheries off the Canadian coast.

The issues involved, here, were relatively technical. They involved a number of small fisheries. They were talked about in great detail on the edge of these discussions -- not much by the principals themselves -- the principals in the final analysis simply ratified, indeed, the technical arrangements that had been made.

I think, as I said, there were technical issues. There is no point in going into them now. They will be incorporated in an Interim Agreement which should be -- as I said -- signed within the next day or so.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Vine, are you saying "status quo", and that nobody is giving up anything?

MR. VINE: I hate to use the word "status quo", because there will be some slight changes on the U.S. side, and some slight changes on the American side, as close to

the status quo as we can get, basically, consistent with both American and

Canadian law, with the imperatives of conservation on both sides.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Head, did "Human Rights" come up in today's discussion; and could you summarize the discussion on that yesterday?

MR. HEAD: It did not come up today.

To summarize what went on yesterday would repeat what I went through at some length yesterday. But, simply that--in an attempt to be very brief about it--the President yesterday, did ask the Prime Minister for his views on the question of Human Rights; the importance that the President obviously attaches to this question in other Countries; and sought the Prime Minister's views on how best this kind of issue could be dealt with in the World community. The Prime Minister's response was that Canada, on the whole, had followed the more quiet approach. He admitted -- I think it is fair to say -- that the success of that approach was not as great as we should have liked it to have been. The President did not ask the Prime Minister -- nor did the Prime Minister reply -- in terms either in praise or criticism of the techniques that President Carter has introduced. He did, however, enthusiastically encourage him to continue the attention that he is paying to this issue and

pledged his own continued support of it. the President.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Could I get Mr. Brzezinski to add his comments on yesterday's discussion about Human Rights?

DR. BRZEZINSKI: Well, I would say that, in substance, what Mr. Head said is right.

I would add that I did not feel that there was too much of a divergence between the two men. They were talking about a problem concerning which they both entertained strong feelings.

What President Carter stressed was the notion that his commitment to the question of Human Rights is one of principle. It is not a tactic! It is not a tactic directed at any one particular set of Countries, or at any one particular Country.

It is not only a principle, but it is also a reflection, perhaps, of a further evolution in the general condition of mankind -- namely, a step forward towards the assertion -- on a universal scale -- of certain basic rights and, therefore, as such, something to be welcomed, from a historical perspective.

None of that precludes quiet publicity, -- quiet efforts to improve conditions; but the public assertion of such principle is fully consonant with our conditions, and with the general condition of mankind as we find it today.

I felt that, on these fundamentals, there was basic

agreement between the Prime Minister and the President.

Both expressed their view that this is an issue which should be treated in a wider context; which should not be focussed specifically on this or that Country, but should be viewed as a generalized principle to which all Nations, in one way or another, should aspire.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Dr. Brzezinski, with all of this talk about new neighborliness in Ottawa and Washington, is Washington going easy on the Canadian government, now, because of the Quebec situation?

Do you expect the mood to change at some point in the future?

DR. BRZEZINSKI: No. I don't think so.

I think what the emphasis on our friendship reflects is, in addition to its traditional character, a basic recognition of the fact that on this hemisphere -- in this northern part of the hemisphere -- the three Nations -- at least three Nations -- with all the differences -- cultural, political, both in terms of the past and of the future -- have to coexist on an amicable basis, and that we all gain from mutual respect, from mutual respect in our differences; from mutual respect for our independence. It is a very deliberate effort to assert that principle as the foundation stone, and as the point of departure for U.S. foreign policy.

It was a very deliberate choice, made quite some time

ago. The first official acts of the new Carter Administration would be focussed in a tangible way on the reassertion of the primacy of our friendship with Canada, and on our friendship with Mexico.

So it is not the response to the Quebec problem, But it is a reflection of a very basic recognition of what we are, where we are, and why it is in our mutual interest -- and consonant with our values and beliefs -- that we really emphasize our friendship.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Which Government suggested that this session this afternoon should be on a background basis?

I was just wondering if you could give us some guidance on what it is that either of you gentlemen said, where the national security would have been impaired had you been quoted by me.

MR. BRZEZINSKI: I could not care less if it was background, or it wasn't, frankly.

(Laughter)

Someone else is volunteering to explain it, and when somebody volunteers for a task like this, I gladly yield!

(Laughter)

MR. POWELL: You have all been wondering why I am here!

Well, the reason that it is on "background" is that,

under the Canadian system, Mr. Head is not an elected Official and, therefore, he cannot answer questions in Parliament and, therefore, he does not speak on the record in these kinds of sessions.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: I thought he spoke on the record yesterday.

I thought I saw him quoted by name on the wire yesterday.

MR. BRZEZINSKI: There is no point, really, in getting in an argument over this.

We were all terribly enthused over this relationship.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Whoever you are!

(Laughter)

MR. POWELL: We have time for two more questions.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: May I direct a question to the White House spokesman, please?

We were told -- at least, we read in the Press -- that Mr. Speaker O'Neil sent word to the White House that he would just as soon dispense with these addresses to Congress by visiting Heads of State.

I wonder if this one by Prime Minister Trudeau will be the last; or whether the White House has any comment on this state of affairs?

MR. BRZEZINSKI: No. We are expecting word momentarily

from Speaker O'Neil that he would like to have an address like that once a week from now on!

(Laughter)

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Was there a discussion of an International Arctic Policy?

MR. HEAD: No. He covered the World in kind of a broad tour zone yesterday but he somehow left the Arctic out.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: What about U.S. relations with Cuba?

MR. HEAD: That was discussed.

(Simultaneous questions)

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Could you characterize the United States view? I know you had strong views-- prior to the change in Government--on Southern Africa.

MR. HEAD: I still have strong views!

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Could you suggest which direction-- and if Canada has any part in it?

MR. HEAD: Our policy has been, is, and will be, that we are in favor of majority rule. We are going to use our good offices in order to insure that the transition to majority rule in Southern Africa is made peacefully and effectively.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Dr. Brzezinski, what was said about Cuba?

DR. BRZEZINSKI: We had an exchange of views on the subject of Cuba, and the Prime Minister enlightened us with regard to his views about Cuba; with regard to the conversations that he has had with senior Cuban officials.

He gave us his analysis of the Cuban situation, and the President, essentially, was asking questions and trying to get a sense of how the Prime Minister assesses the problem.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Dr. Brzezinski, on the subject of Quebec, could you tell us how seriously you -- as National Security Advisor -- view the threat in Quebec in terms of American interests, or in terms of a coercive sort of suppression tactics; and, also, whether you feel -- given the limited amount of discussion there seems to have been -- whether the Prime Minister's visit really added anything to the Administration's understanding of it?

DR. BRZEZINSKI: I am sure the Prime Minister's visit has added a great deal to our understanding of this problem--both specifically and, in a larger context, of the importance to us of a vital and strong Canadian confederation.

We are quite confident that the Canadian people will work out their problems on their own, without any further comments from us.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Dr. Brzezinski, what was mentioned about the Economic Summit, and what the Carter

government would like to see discussed at Rambouillet III?

DR. BRZEZINSKI: Well, there was a discussion of the International Summit.

MR. HEAD: We like Puerto Rico, too!

DR. BRZEZINSKI: There was a discussion of the International Summit, which will have on its agenda the vital economic and the critical political issues that concern the key advance in industrial societies. Essentially, we reviewed what these issues might be; and we had a preliminary exchange of views on what some of the substantive positions might be in regard to major problems, such as the North/South relationship, and so forth.

There was, again, an exploratory and preparatory exchange of views, but one to which we attach a great deal of importance, especially since we ~~we~~ ^{-- as you know --} have been interested in Canada taking part in this Summit exercise.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Can you tell us what President Carter said about the Pipeline; and the urgency for it?

MR. BRZEZINSKI: I think Mr. Head covered that very well.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Head said there was a relatively small "window of time" for making the decision this summer.

Why is there such a relatively small window of time?

MR. BRZEZINSKI: That is his window, not mine!

MR. HEAD: It is a combination of several events.

From our point of view, the timing in which the two Canadian reports will be in -- the Berger Report, and the National Energy Board Report.

Secondly, the constraints of a time sense on the President by the Alaskan Natural Gas Act, which tells him that some decision must be taken by September 1 and, if it is not available to him, then he must return to Congress to ask for a 90-day postponement.

On the Canadian side, we are very much aware of the severity of the current winter, both in Canada and the United States.

We are also very much aware and supportive of President Carter's acts in moving quickly on vital issues.

We would like to be in a position not to embarrass him by removing from his decision, Canadian options, simply through default. We don't like taking decisions by default.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Has it been agreed, by all sides, Mr. Head, that Canada will take part in the Summit?

If not, what is the cause of the delay?

MR. HEAD: I am not aware of any difficulty at all in our taking part. It has been an assumption, since Puerto Rico, that Canada would be a full-fledged Member of the next

round. No information has come to me from any official source that would indicate that that is not the case. We are confidentially preparing, now, to attend.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Ivan, was there any discussion on the operation of the Seaway?

MR. HEAD: The Prime Minister indicated that we have, in Canada, introduced -- with relative success -- spotty success, you might say -- using the pay principle here and there.

(Laughter)

We have indicated to the United States government that, under the St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty, we would like to talk to them about the toll situation. It is the Canadian view, and it is the public view, and has been known for some time, that the tolls on the Canadian side are not meeting our expenses; and we want to chat with him about it, and see what can be done.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: When will they take place, Mr. Head?

MR. HEAD: Those discussions?

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Yes.

MR. HEAD: They are probably taking place now!

MR. VINE: Some preliminary discussions have already taken place between our two Governments. I think probably in the next few weeks, those talks will go on.

These were not discussed today. In fact, we are quite prepared in principle to go ahead and talk about the problem on the Great St. Lawrence Seaway. I expect those talks will go forward with no difficulty in the near future.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: How soon will we have an answer?

MR. VINE: An answer on what?

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Whether we are going to proceed with the pay - as - we - use; and whether it is going to be economically feasible for Canada in the long run.

MR. VINE: I cannot predict that, at this time. That depends entirely on the notions that are put forward and negotiated. We do not expect that there will be an answer tomorrow, but there will be, I expect, in the course of the next two or three months.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Could I ask one question about the rules?

Does Dr. Brzezinski's statement that he does not care if he is quoted by name, or not, lift the embargoes?

DR. BRZEZINSKI: I did not say that!

I did not say that!

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Is there any change in the ground rules because of what you said?

DR. BRZEZINSKI: I just play it by rules; I don't set them.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Is there any reason why we could not attribute to Dr. Brzezinski, on the one side, and

Senior Committee Officials on the other, since they are --

MR. SCHECHTER: We agreed on the rules and we will stick with those rules.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: We did not agree on the rules!

MR. SCHECHTER: Those are the rules.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Just one last question.

Mr. Vine, I am wondering when the State Department will deem it satisfactory to manage Canadian affairs under, perhaps, the Assistant Secretary of Inter-American Affairs-- rather than European Affairs.

We are dealing in hemispheric terms. The United States is committed historically to the Inter-American System.

Canada is hemispheric.

Surely there should be a reassessment of where we stand.

MR. VINE: That is a declaration, not a "question"!

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: We are not European. We are hemispheric. Why, in the State Department, do we come under this jurisdiction?

MR. VINE: There are historic reasons for it. I don't think there is any particular reason--other than internal management.

MR. SCHECHTER: Could I just make one brief correction?

The meeting between the President and Prime Minister

Trudeau and Secretary Vance was from 3:20 to 3:30 in the Oval Office. And then, the participants met from 3:30 to 4:15 in the Cabinet Room.

(Whereupon, the Press Background Briefing was concluded.)

CA1
EA980
77V36
V.3
DOCS

THE CANADIAN EMBASSY

WASHINGTON, D.C.

VISIT OF

PRIME MINISTER PIERRE ELLIOTT TRUDEAU

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT

Date FEB 23 1977



MILLER COLUMBIAN REPORTING SERVICE

Official Reporter

927 FIFTEENTH ST., N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005

THE CANADIAN EMBASSY

Washington, D.C.

The National Press Club
National Press Building
Washington, D.C.

WEDNESDAY, February 23, 1977

PRESS CONFERENCE

- By -

THE HONOURABLE PIERRE ELLIOTT TRUDEAU
PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

ATTENDING, AT THE ROSTRUM:

THE HONOURABLE J. H. WARREN,
Ambassador to the United States

JOHN CHARPENTIER,
Office of the Prime Minister

- with -

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

-o0o-

LIBRARY DEPT. OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES

43-230-451

THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Washington, D.C.

The National Press Club
National Press Building
Washington, D.C.

WEDNESDAY, February 22, 1951

THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB
NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C.

LIBRARY DEPT. OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES

MR. FARRELL: Good morning.

I am Robert Farrell, President of the National Press Club.

We are pleased, Mr. Prime Minister, that you are giving your only press conference--during your State visit here--in our club.

The ground rules for questioning are simple, and have been requested by the Prime Minister's Office.

In order to give our visiting Canadian colleagues a fair crack at their Prime Minister, we will attempt to alternate questions between Canadian and non-Canadian journalists. Mr. John Charpentier, of the Prime Minister's Office will hand-designate the Canadians; and I have been asked to do the same for the non-Canadians.

Canada--being a bi-lingual Country -- questions may be put either in English or in French, and simultaneous translation has been provided.

Let's take the first question from the Canadians.

.....(Due to technical difficulties, the French translation in English was not accomplished over the public address system.)

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, have you discussed with the President--or will you discuss with the President-- the Arctic Gas Pipeline proposal?

What is your position on that?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Well, we discussed-- not

particularly-that proposal -- the Arctic Gas Fund -- but we looked at the various alternatives including the Alcan route. There was a great interest, on the part of the President, of our attitude regarding Pipelines. I was as forthcoming as I could be--in the strictures of the present situation.

Canadians generally--and certainly our Government--want to be as helpful to the Americans as we can, in this particular aspect. That is what our visit is all about. That is what friendship is all about.

After all, it is American gas, to American consumers, and we don't want to be dogs in the manger about this.

I reminded the President -- which he knew, I am sure -- that we have pipelines through the United States, serving Canadian territory, and -- other things being equal -- we want to be as forthcoming as the Americans.

The President knows that there are some problems which have to be solved -- problems which are, also, familiar to Americans -- environmental problems, and native-right problems, and rather complicated economic consequences of a vast injection of capital into Canada -- investment capital into Canada.

These are problems which are being studied, now, by the National Energy Board, and by a Royal Commission headed by Judge Berger. So, until these report, the Government will not even be -- even legally -- in a position to reject

or accept any proposition. Our National Energy Board has to make recommendation on their plans before that Board, before the Government can act.

We are expecting those reports in the first half of this year.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, we were told that, after reading your speech, Mr. Carter asked about it; and then you and he discussed it privately for about ten minutes.

Could you tell us the kind of response you got from him?

Did he express concern over the possible secession of Quebec?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: He expressed interest in my views on the situation in Canada in general, and Quebec in particular, but he was not particularly volunteering any American point of view beyond a very general statement that he has made publicly.

Naturally, the Americans are looking to the North for a Country with stability and duration. I think they are properly sensitive about interfering into our internal political problems, and that seems to characterize the attitude of the President.

It is quite clear that, if asked a preference, the Administration would prefer to see a strong, united Canada.

But beyond that, I think that -- quite properly -- they are not expressing points of view. They are just expressing interest.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Supplementary to this, it has been characterized by some of the Press here this morning that an independent Quebec would be a graver threat to the United States than the Cuban Missile crisis. * x * x * x * x * x * x * x * x (Inaudible)

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: No. I would not think it would be much more grave than the Cuban Missile crisis. But, subjectively engaged in, it would be of a different nature.

There was no such expression of particular concern.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, as a Buffalo New York correspondent, I would be very much interested if you have anything new to tell us about the "Border television war" -- so-called.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: I don't have anything new.

I don't know if you are alluding to any over-night or recent-week developments -- but there are none.

You know the basis of the policy.

You know the decision of the Government to suspend certain aspects of the application of it until the problem is negotiated and, perhaps, alternatives found. But the basic is desire of Canadians to have a cultural environment in which Canadian artists and broadcasters and media people would

have an environment in which they could express their creativity. But this is still the reality. I alluded to that--
 about it--
 or I spoke rather directly/in my speech to Congress about it.

We are a small Country, in comparative terms. We don't want to be lost in the North American Continent and lose our identity. So we will always be protecting our cultural environment-- asserting its ability to exist in a certain way.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Does this mean that you will continue to delete commercials on that aspect of it?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Well, we did suspend the application of this policy, as you know.

If you are asking me about recent developments, there are no recent developments.

The aims of the policy are still the same, but the application of it has been suspended, at the request of our American friends, so that we can work out some alternatives-- if there are any to be worked out. But there is no new development in that regard.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, I have taken from President Carter's rating of the significance or insignificance of separatism and your own reception in Congress, that the political attitude here in Washington is not one of neutrality, but strong sympathy for your attempt to preserve confederation.

When an American smiles at me, I like to look at that

smile with shrewdness. I wonder whether you feel that there is going to be a price to pay for that; whether it is going to be more difficult for you-in the future-to bargain strongly with what the Americans say on an issue like the Arctic Gas Pipeline.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: I-naturally-cannot speak for the Americans but, if I were an American, I would be extremely favorable to the unity of Canada. I would not want to see-- under any circumstances--the separation of an important part of Canada and the eventual breaking up of that Country north of the United States.

Once again, I think they are showing proper restraint in not interfering in our internal affairs, but from a purely political point of view, I think the worst that could happen to the United States would be a break-up of Canada.

And I don't think that we are doing them a favor by keeping it together. I think it must be in their very obvious interest as a Country -- as a Nation -- politically--that Canada remain united.

I could see that businessmen -- financial interests -- might have different approaches as, from the strict point of view of business, I suppose you can argue whether you can do business with anyone.

I am quite certain that, as a political judgement, it could only be bad for the stability of this Continent, if

Canada broke up.

So, as I say, I don't think they can send us an I.O.U. if we work to hold it together.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, how serious is Canada's objection and protest to the Garrison Diversion Project?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: It is extremely serious!

We have been sending notes and making our presentations to the United States for -- what is it? A year now? Perhaps longer. A couple of years?

It is not that our judgement has been closed on that, but it seemed obvious to us that the proceeding of the project would have adverse environmental effects in Canada -- particularly Manitoba. And, because that was the case, we kept making representations that the thing be more thoroughly and objectively studied. And it is as a result of that, that the IJC set up a committee to study the environmental consequences of the Garrison, and that report came down on our side and said that the Canadians are right to be concerned--if it proceeds in the present way. There will be deleterious effects in Canadian waters, and so on.

So that report is now before the International Joint Commission; and we are confident that our case not only will be heard objectively, but we are confident that--having been shown (to be) right this far in our affairs--that the IJC will

uphold the Canadian position.

I am prepared to say that we will respect the I.J.C. decision -- as I am sure the American Government will, too -- and we are very grateful that President Carter and his Administration have taken steps to at least suspend the Lone-tree Reservoir, at least until the I.J.C. has studied the report and brought down a decision. And we are very grateful for that.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Are you referring to the report of June?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: I am referring to the report that they will make after hearings on the present report. The report is from a committee -- a study group committee -- through the IJC. The I.J.C. next month, I believe, is going to have public hearings on the basis of this report--of their expert advice--and, then, the I.J.C. will make a decision.

(Question-and-answer in French which, due to technical difficulties, was not translated.)

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, what sense of urgency do you place on the renewal of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, and the increase in St. Lawrence Seaway tolls; and to what extent, if any, did the subjects come up in your conversations with the President?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Both of them came up.

They came up in the context of on-going management of our bi-lateral relations, and they came up very much in a matter-of-fact way.

On the first point, the Great Lakes Water Agreement is up for review for the five-year period; and we just urged that that review be undertaken in the spirit in which the original Treaty was signed. That is one of belief in the environmental concerns, and one of the desire of both Countries to make steady progress. And we pointed out that, since the original signature of the Treaty, there have been new developments of an adverse nature in environmental concern. I mean new industries--new technologies-- and that it was urgent that the review not be merely pro forma, but that we seek not merely to continue the Agreement, but that we seek to improve it-- if possible. And there was no counter representation to this. It seemed to correspond to the will of the American Administration. On the second point you asked about --

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: The increase in Seaway tolls.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: That is mainly on the Welland section of the Seaway. I did make personal representation to the President that we would want this to be reviewed. The Seaway has been a losing proposition -- a heavily losing one -- and Canadians -- at least in this regard -- are hopeful that the user-pay concept will be introduced. But we are bound by Treaty. I would say that this is one of the most important

joint works of mankind, and we are not anxious to go our "own way" on this. We hope to persuade the Americans that the tolls should be reviewed -- at least in the Welland section -- and we hope that we will convince them that it would be fair and probably more economical, in fair and economic terms, that tolls more approximate to the cost be borne by the user, And this includes the St. Lawrence section, also.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, President Carter's spokesman said that he is prepared to make relations with Mexico and Canada the foundation stone of U.S. foreign policy.

Are you prepared to make Canada/U.S. relations the foundation stone of your foreign policy and, if so, is that the end of your more broadly based "third option" in foreign policy?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Well, "yes" to the first question; and "no" to the second. "Yes and "no".

(Laughter)

I don't know if you want a "supplementary"-or an explanation to that but there is no contradiction in our mind-- that our relationship with the United States should be the most important of all of our foreign relations-- external relations. That seems obvious -- and, certainly, it is off to a great start with the Carter Administration!

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: When you say a "good start",
Sir; it has been going on for a long time.

(with)

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Not/the Carter Administration.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Is it going to be a lot
warmer, and closer, under the Carter Administration than
it has been?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Well, I was never of the
theory that it has not been "warm" and "close." It has certainly
been close; and it has been effective.

I repeated to President Carter yesterday that, from
the Canada/U.S. point of view, we had found that Presidents
Ford and Nixon -- to mention only those who were there in
my time -- had been very fair-minded and equitable in their
dealings with Canada; and there has been a real desire
on the part of those two previous Administrations to have
friendly relations with Canada.

That is one of the reasons why, in my meeting with
President Carter, we did not have a whole backlog of
difficult questions to solve. We had a couple of difficult
ones which had only arisen in very recent times.

If things had been so close and distant, as your
question seems to imply, it would have been likely that,
yesterday, we would have spent all of our time trying to
solve these questions--which we did not!

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: What do you think of the U.S. Agriculture Department Secretary's proposal for a Canadian/U.S. common market on wheat?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Well, I have not heard of the proposal. Have you, Jay?

AMBASSADOR WARREN: No.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: We believe in commodity agreements which can put the producer and consumer interests together; and that is the way we have always acted in the International Wheat Agreements, -- in the Grain Agreements. And we certainly will be working actively now, in that direction: -- to have a Wheat Agreement which will be effective and fair, both to consumers and producers.

A common market, to the extent that it would mean that we would sell each other our wheat -- I don't see how it would apply.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: I believe he was applying it more to price fixing to selling.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Well, if he was alluding to the International Wheat Agreement which, in the past several years, has not had a set price in it, we would agree very much with the desirability of having a price set in it; and one which, I repeat, would be fair not only to producers, but to consumers. We think it is very important to work

in that direction.

We regret that the last one did not arrive at a figure.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, we were told yesterday, by the President's spokesman, that the 'chemistry' between yourself and President Carter was "just great".

I wonder if I could ask you for your assessment of President Carter--having met him for the first time.

How do you feel he is?

How would you assess his interests.

Secondly, did you have an opportunity to discuss, with him, the speech in Congress after you made it?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: On the second part of the question, the answer is "No". The President indicated some interest in the speech, and some desire of reading it; but the next time I see him, I won't ask him if he did.

(Laughter)

On the first part of the question, I found the meetings extremely congenial; the rapport very direct; very frank; very candid -- almost modest in tone. And it did create a very good conduit for exchange and discussion.

Certainly, the point of view expressed on the African situation, and on other international problems, was one of trying to join together in a greater understanding.

There was no effort made by the President to -- sort of say, "We are the leading Country, and you will follow".

There was a genuine exchange of ideas and an interest one in the other-of the approach of the other Administration.

I also was delighted to see the articulateness of the man; and that questions are not approached just on an ad hoc basis and, "We will solve this problem; we will solve that problem; if there is a contradiction between them, we won't worry about it."

There seems to be a visible desire to have American foreign and national policy based on a set of principles and directions which I think are very good, and it is probably easier, at the outset of an Administration, to bring in consistent directions to one's policies. But, certainly, it is quite visible that the desire of the President is to have an American set of policies which are coherent and consistent-- and based on certain principles.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, as you know, Mr. Levesque recently went to New York to try to assure -- reassure -- businessmen that investing in Canada was not such a bad idea.

Well, a day or so later, Wall Street retaliated -- listened to his views--and a day or so later, Quebec bonds were downgraded.

I wonder what you can do, or what you are willing to do

to assure these businessmen that there is reasonable safety in investing in Canada--expressed--not only in view of the Quebec situation--but in view of the growth of an economic nationalistic trend in the past five years.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: The two questions are not completely related. I will try to answer the two parts of the question.

On the first part of the question, there is nothing I can do beyond express my very strong belief that Canada will not separate. It is, to me, as obvious as anything can be, that the future of Canada--in the foreseeable future, will be one of a strong, united, Country.

My enjoinder to businessmen is not to be frightened by Mr. Levesque's speech or by any of his Ministers' speeches.

On the contrary, I believe if businessmen -- American or otherwise -- act as though Quebec will separate, they will bring a lot of hardships to Canada and to Quebec. And in a sense, it is that kind of a statement, though, that would be an assistance to separatists.

If they can say, "Well, even American businessmen think we are going to separate", it supports their thesis that separation is inevitable--which we don't believe! I don't think that American businessmen or Government officials should even be "tempted" to think that that is a possibility!

On the second part of the question: obviously, any

lack of confidence in Quebec might reflect itself in lack of confidence in Canada as a whole. If one thinks that Quebec is going to separate, then one thinks that Canada is going to be a weak Country. But, because I oppose the one, I should think that the second won't follow.

On Canadian nationalism: I guess it is an argument that one can only answer by explaining what we are doing.

We are welcoming foreign investment with, I would say, very open arms. The only difference now, with the ^{before} policy / my Government, is that when investors want to come in of a certain size, they are asked -- they are screened. They are asked a very direct question: What significant benefit will this investment bring to Canada?

If the investor says, "None" -- and if you can't prove any, then we say: "What is the point of investing? It may be good for you, but it is not good for us; so thank you very much."

The percentage of investors who have been screened and prevented from coming in is less than 15% -- I think. In other words: 85% plus continue investing as before.

Hopefully, Canadians are getting a better deal out of it. That is the nature of our policy. An investor -- now -- cannot just come in and, with his credit, borrow from Canadian banks, use Canadian savings, shall we say, to take over Canadian enterprise and, then, either close it down -- or not

improve it--in order to clear the market for himself.

Now, he has to show that he is bringing; either more jobs, or better technology, or greater advantage to the consumers, and so on. If he does that, he is welcome.

This applies not only to Americans, but to investors from any other Country.

So we stand by that policy! We think it is very easy to understand--particularly on the part of the American investors, who control more than 60% of our manufacturing industry; 75% of our petroleum and gas industries; and, I guess, 90% of our automobile industry, and so on.

So Canada has a tie which is very heavily dominated from the United States, and we don't want it to go any further.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, yesterday in your speech, you mentioned that you were prepared to make accommodations and revisions to see that Canada does not become a factored Country.

I wonder if you could be a bit more specific--and tell us some of the accommodations you will make.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Yes, but here, you are asking me to state, really, my Government's approach to national unity. It may not be the approach shared by the other parties, and I don't exclude that there will be a contest-- a political contest-- as it should exist, between various groups in Canada

which want to keep the Country united.

Our policy, essentially -- and it began under Mr. Pearson's regime--and it continued under mine -- our policy is essentially to say to Quebec-ers:

"You want to be a French speaking province, or society, or geographical entity. That is fine with us. It is just as natural that Quebec operate in French as that Ontario operate in English."

Then we go on to say, "But the Government of Canada is the Government of all Canadians, and it must be able to deal with its citizens in either of these two official languages. And, because of that, we brought in the language policy which compels the Federal government, as it were, to have the capability of dealing with its citizens in either official language."

Now, the difficulty which I was alluding to in my speech yesterday is that these two realities have not been totally accepted by all Canadians.

English Canadians are -- I don't think that, historically, they have been prepared to accept the French fact as something which would permeate the Federal government.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: I think you sort of misunderstand me.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: I guess I do.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: I understand the bilingual policy.

I wonder if you plan to go further than that, to make accommodations.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: I repeat. My accommodation is to get Canada to accept our policy -- our language policy -- and our approach to the French fact--and to get it accepted.

It is obvious from the events of just last Spring-- of the Traffic Controllers -- the Air Traffic Controllers -- and the Pilot strike that the French fact is not accepted,

What I was, essentially, saying in my various speeches in the past couple of months is that, in a sense, this election of a separatist government will force Canadians to be mature; will force Canadians to make a mature choice of the Country as it is -- not as it was 100 years ago, or more -- and accepting the Country as it is. Here, I kept repeating that what I say means for English Canada. They have to accept the French reality as part of Canada. And then you get into my language policy.

And for French Canada, that means accepting that Ottawa is their government, and not only Quebec City as their government; and that Ottawa can speak for French Canada in every area within Federal jurisdiction just as much as Ottawa can speak for Newfoundland, or British Columbia, in every area within Federal jurisdiction. And many Quebec-ers

have not accepted that. They feel, somehow, the Federal government is not truly a representative of Quebec interests. I say we have to make sure that the institution and the policies are just as representative of any part of Canada.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, in view of the genuine warm expressions of cooperation between you and President Carter and in view, also, of the many critical problems that face this hemisphere, I wonder why Canada does not now join the Organization of American States?

PRIME MINISTER: I should hand this to my Foreign Minister, here, of External Affairs!

We have had this question under review, I suppose, for many, many years now. The difference between now and before is that our understanding is that the Members of the Organization of American States, themselves, are not sure about its future.

I made a tour, last year, of three Latin American Countries; and I got three different opinions.

One Country was telling me to "stay out" of the organization; the other was telling me to "get in"; and the other was telling me to "wait and see."

So I believe that the association--the organization--is in the process of revision; of reviewing its aims and purposes; and we are interested observers in it.

I don't think, at this time, we can contribute in a

positive way by being any further in it. We are members, I think, of four of its organizations or associations. We are permanent observers, and that is it.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, before we left Ottawa, External Affairs Minister Jamieson said that Canada might be able to play an "honest broker" role -- in a number of areas in the World-for the United States. He specifically mentioned South Africa.

I was trying to get him to, perhaps, delve in the possibility of Cuba -- perhaps even Peking.

Did this ever come up in your discussions with President Carter?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Certainly not the role of what you call "honest broker"!

I don't think President Carter would want us to carry messages, or "do" things for him. But, in a sense -- I am sure this is what Mr. Jamieson was talking about -- in the sense that we, perhaps, have a greater understanding of some of these, probably, because we are inside of them, either through the Commonwealth--in the whole Southern African problem--or through the fact that we have never interrupted our relations with Cuba; the fact that we have established them with the Peking People's Republic of China some years ago.

Naturally, the Carter Administration is interested in getting our point of view; and we did agree that, on these

subjects -- particularly the African questions -- we would keep in very close liaison because, once again, through the Commonwealth and through our long association with three of the four leading Presidents in the conflict around Rhodesia, we have had /very good and friendly relations.

So, in this sense, we believe exchanges between the President and myself were helpful to both of us.

I was able to get their view of things; and they were able to get mine.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Did the President give you any indication that he would make any initiatives on Cuba in the near future?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: The President did not indicate to me that he would.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, you indicated some rather horrendous consequences for a separatist Quebec.

I would like to know what they would be, in your judgement--in terms of North American defense.

You indicate why Americans would not raise some of these questions. I would like to hear a Canadian view on the defense question.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Well, I certainly won't say, "No comment"; but I really don't want to involve myself

speculation on this hypothetical question. I don't think separation is going to happen, so I am not expending much mental energy asking myself, "What will happen when we separate", and, "What will the Americans do", and "What will other World powers do?"

As I say: It is not going to happen, so I don't have any contingency plans on that. I said, very clearly, if the impossible happens, I won't be around to assist in its happening; and I intend being around for a while. So I don't think it is going to happen.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, can you explain for us exactly what was decided, between you and the ^{of} President, on the question/International problems--particularly as they apply to the Interim Agreement?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: What, exactly, transpired?

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Yes. We were told yesterday that an Interim Agreement had been formed.

I would like you to explain exactly what that means.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: It is kind of technical, but I think the simplest way of saying it is that an Interim Agreement was reached because of the imminence of the 200-mile limit adopted by the Americans. I think the deadline is the first of March. We brought it in, in the first of January. So we had very few days to make sure there would not be a

"cod war" between us. And very positive results were obtained in every area except one, And the positive results were that we would forebear -- at least until the end of this year, and--regardless of our new proclamation of the 200-mile limit -- we would continue more or less with the status quo ante, while the two Administrations work towards a more accurate definition of the line on the East Coast. or some way of ascertaining what that line should be.

The same thing on the West Coast.

There was one area of difficulty which had not been solved; and that was the area of salmon fishing on the West Coast. Yesterday, after a great deal of work on the part of our Ambassadors, and Officials, and Ministers--and, I think, with some pressure coming from the President and myself, accomodation was reached, also, on the salmon.

It is distinctly an Interim Agreement to forebear and not to insist on imposing each of our theses on the other before the first of March, and, in other words, not to start throwing other personnel on the waters, just because the problem has not been solved.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, regarding the possible Pipeline Route through Canada, you mentioned the issue of environmental and native claims.

Do you anticipate that those can be settled, so our

Government can make a final decision within, say, one year? Or is it likely to be longer than one year before Canada can give the Government a final answer?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: We realize that we have to give you a final answer -- whatever it be -- before the end of the year. The President's deadlines-- I believe even the ultimate ones -- will expire at the end of the geographical year and, likely, they will expire before. So we realize that giving you no answer is an answer, in a sense and, if there is no pipeline from Canada, I suppose there is the El Paso route which is the one that the Americans would go for.

It is a more costly one for you, and it has certain disadvantages for Canada, too, and, therefore, we are very aware of the time strictures, and we will have to give you an answer at whatever deadline the President feels he has -- likely one in September.

So there will be an answer, and I hope it will be in line with the friendship of our Countries, and one which is to the advantage of both Countries.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: Mr. Prime Minister, a moment ago -- in answer to Doug Small's question about the choice--you mentioned that Canadians will have to make a mature choice with respect to the accomodation of the Quebec problem.

Jim, on the other hand, was saying: "You cannot

convince Quebec to stay in, unless the rest of Canada wants Quebec to stay in."

How and when will the Canadians be asked to -- and be able to -- make that "mature choice"?

How will that be done?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: I think it will, essentially, be shown in the understanding expressed by English Canada of the reality of the French fact.

I don't think any one event -- for instance, the referendum -- will be needed to show that. I think a different attitude and a different understanding towards either our policies as a Liberal government, towards one Canada, or the policies of the opposition -- which would be acceptable, too -- will be the test of it.

I don't think we can ignore the question.

I don't think we can continue to say, "Well, it is not going to happen", and we can conduct ourselves as though separation was not even a remote possibility."

I am really answering you that there is not going to be one event, to my knowledge, which will sort of crystalize the acceptance by English Canada of the French fact.

If I had to signal any one event, it would be an event like the Air Traffic Controllers, or the Air Pilots

strike. If too many negative evidences of this kind are given to Quebec-ers--that the French language is not acceptable to the rest of Canada-- even in Quebec air space--then I think we have begun, seriously, to lose the battle.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS: But, sir, the Quebecers will make their views known in one single event--which will be a referendum or a plebiscite.

What opportunity will you either engineer, or try to foster for Canada, to make a choice at a given moment in history?

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: Well, the only reason that Quebec-ers are asked to express their choice in a referendum is that they were brought to elect a separatist government. This is not the case in the rest of Canada. Nobody in Canada--in any of the other Provinces -- certainly not at the Federal level -- believes in separation of any part of Canada. Therefore, I don't think we should be called upon, in a specific way, to say, "We want Canada to be united."

I think it is through our collective will--it is through our will as a nation--that we will keep the nation alive. And that is expressed in many ways!

It is expressed by the day-to-day events that I have discussed. It is expressed by choice you make of the Federal government; of the policies it applies; and that is the only answer I can give.

I don't mean that it would not be conceivable to have a national referendum in Canada, asking them if they want Quebec to stay. But I don't see any advantage in asking that question at this time--unless Quebec should suddenly have doubts about whether the rest of Canada wants them in, and they want to know what the rest of Canada thinks. But I don't see Mr. Levesque's government asking that question and, at this point, it is not a technique that I need to envisage.

Canadians want Canada united and, to keep it united, we have to make sure that Quebec feels that it is better off within Canada than outside of Canada. And in order to feel better within Canada than outside, there have to be certain adjustments -- that I was talking about -- through the cultural, linguistic reality of the French speaking society in Canada.

(Whereupon, the Press Conference was concluded.)

LIBRARY E A/BIBLIOTHEQUE A E

3 5036 20024342 9

DATE DUE	

~~SEP 09 2009~~


60984 81800

