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The President: It is very nice to have you here, Mr. Prime Minister.

Kissinger: I told the President we should let you rearrange the furniture, to reciprocate [what happened when President Nixon visited Ottawa in April 1972].

Trudeau: Well, it was an improvement.

President: I was with a group of parliamentarians as part of a Canadian-US Parliamentarian group. I got to know many members of the Senate and Parliament. When I became Minority Leader I had to drop it.
Trudeau: Our longevity is not high, but there still may be a few around.

President: We have had some problems in that regard.

Trudeau: Like our by-elections.

President: You had good elections.

Trudeau: Yes, but we had a tough 18-month period. It was tough, and our relations weren't dealt with as closely as they should have. You also had your problems.

President: I am looking forward to working with you. I will run again and I think the pendulum will swing back. I think with some progress we can turn things around not only within the United States but in a way which will benefit the world.

We think our relations with the Alliance have improved after a rocky year or two. We want to make our relations as firm as possible. I met with your Ambassador the day I entered office. I am committed to the continuity of our foreign policy. I was fortunate to have worked with Henry on some of the tough chores of 1971, '72 and '73, so we have worked closely.

**The President's Trip to Far East and Vladivostok**

My trip abroad was criticized by some here, but in the long run it will have significant benefits. Japan is interesting. A President had never been able to go there, and there were threats of violence. The Japanese did a superb job and the fears didn't materialize. It was good to see Tanaka. It is a consensus government there; so I saw many of the leaders. And I think all were pleased with the visit. They were interested in food exports and I said there would be no export controls. They were interested in energy and we promised to work closely.

With regard to South Korea -- if I hadn't gone, it would have been misunderstood by both North and South Korea.

Trudeau: Is that the first time an American President had been to Korea?
President: No. Johnson and Eisenhower both went there.

Kissinger: Johnson went when he couldn't go to Japan.

President: Then I went to Vladivostok. Brezhnev was the only one of the Soviets who had ever been there before. I think the SALT agreement will be signed and will be approved by Congress and the people. There is some criticism by the Left that the numbers are too high and from the right from those who haven't embraced detente. Both sides will be limited to 2400 strategic delivery vehicles. The limit of 2400 applies to ICBMs, SLBMs and heavy bombers, as well as other strategic delivery vehicles that might be deployed in the future, such as land-based ICBMs or ICBMs dropped from airplanes. Both sides will also be limited to 1320 missiles equipped with MIRVs. It has put a cap on the programs that would otherwise be implemented.

Kissinger: This ceiling is below their present forces by about 150. They are working on land-mobiles--and now these will have to come out of their hide. It doesn't make any real difference whether we are at 2,400, 2,200, 2,000, or 1,800--the capacity to destroy the world remains. For the first time the superpowers have stopped the quantitative race. The quality race continues but no one argues that quality alone can give strategic superiority. It takes a combination of quantity and quality. This was a critical agreement. Once an equal ceiling is agreed, it is easier to reduce, because the quest for strategic superiority is over. This is far below the capability of the Soviet forces. SALT I was a good stop-gap but SALT II was the turning point of the arms race.

Trudeau: We consider the agreement a marked success. It was very well received by the Government and the people. The principle of equality is important.

President: Unlike SALT I, where there was some disagreement within the government, there is unanimity here -- and I suspect over there.

Kissinger: We have had indications of Soviet military grumbling about the exclusion of Forward Based Systems.

President: That was a big concession. They no longer ask for compensation for FBS and British and French systems.

MacEachen: Why was Brezhnev willing to make such an agreement?
Kissinger: With Watergate aside, the Soviets didn't know what would follow Nixon. Now they have a potential six-year President. The President's past record is such that he could plausibly go for an arms race. They really have a stake in detente -- and to defuse people like Jackson. Finally, any serious student of the subject realizes a difference of a few numbers involves no difference.

Trudeau: Was this proposal like what was discussed last summer?

Kissinger: Last summer we gave them higher aggregates, in return for us having a higher MIRV figure. They almost took it--and we are glad he didn't. It could have divided the country explaining the asymmetry. Also, the five-year limit would cause difficulty.

Last summer Brezhnev had two generals with him at Oreanda. I could predict when they would jump up behind Brezhnev to complain about some concession he was about to make--it was exactly at the point when our generals would have jumped up if they had been sitting there.

Trudeau: Does this reveal something of the balance of power in the Soviet Union if he had to use such tactics? May I ask you also about CSCE?

President: It came up. Gromyko spent a long time going over the details. I thought that I understood it, but I will let Dr. Kissinger go through the details.

Kissinger: There is this excruciating debate between the Soviet and German positions. One says that "the principles should be equally valid," and the other says "the principles should be equally observed." We went over all the Basket III issues. We said we would make a serious negotiation, but we didn't discuss the content of the negotiation.

Trudeau: That is our assumption. But we heard from the Soviet Union that you may be not so concerned on the details.

Kissinger: It didn't come up that way. They wanted a June conclusion. We talked about early April for completion of the second phase.

Trudeau: That is interesting. They obviously want the appearance without giving anything.
President: Is that schedule okay?

Trudeau: Yes. We were thinking of June, but April would be okay.

Kissinger: Frankly, the longer it goes on, the more responsibly they will behave—if we can blame you. [Laughter]

Trudeau: That's fine. We have been very firm about insisting on freedom of movement. As long as they don't think they can just wear us down.

Kissinger: I was not being serious. Canada has not been mentioned.

Energy Cooperation

Trudeau: I am grateful for this briefing. On Japan, I guess they won't give the economic leadership the world needs. It is apparent the EC won't, so it is up to the United States. We want you to know we think that that leadership is important. There is no substitute for strong leadership, economic and military, and we look to you.

President: We want to work together with our allies, you and Western Europe. We all recognize the oil prices require us to get the consumers together. We don't rule out the possibility of getting together with producers, but we think we must get the consumers together first. Secretary Kissinger laid it out in his Chicago speech. We are pleased with the success of the IEA. We think we need the $25 billion facility so we can handle the petrodollar problem if we are going to deal with the problem.

Trudeau: You know of our support in general for that. I suppose there are measures we might talk about. You have made clear you don't want confrontation, but we fear the counter-cartel idea. We rejected that on sulphur, iron ore, and copper. We think the world will be better off if the consumers and producers talk with each other rather than confront each other. Some Europeans fear that you are seeking a confrontation. We think that if the consumers get together first they will be stronger than the producers. If we bind together tightly and tell the producers we are on a collision course, given their history, we may be on a collision course. Maybe you do want a head-on collision. I would like your views.
**President:** We would prefer it without a tightly knit head-to-head confrontation. But if we find the problem magnified, with further price increases, and if the financial aspects continue to worsen, we may have to tighten the consensus to prevent a catastrophe.

**Trudeau:** I speak in confidence, but Giscard used pretty much the same language as you did. He thinks you are on a confrontation course. But he said the same as you if they insisted on raising the prices. I think your views this way are the same. But in this period he thinks you want too tight a group. We are in between.

**President:** I was impressed with the willingness of Japan not to lead but to support us.

**Trudeau:** After going behind our back last year.

**Kissinger:** We don't seek a confrontation. But if the consumers are not unified, a conference will only result in the sort of bilateral discussions that are already going on now. The President asked me to speak in Chicago to give the consumers the sense that they can master their destinies. If they are constantly confronted with the consequences of decisions made elsewhere, the confidence of the West will constantly erode. We have good relations with Iran and Saudia Arabia. The French are exaggerating our position.

**Trudeau:** Because they don't like you.

**President:** Fortunately the producers do. The Middle East was discussed in Vladivostok. We want to continue the step-by-step process. We can go to Geneva at some time, but not now.

**MacEachen:** Turner and the Government are concerned about trying to support the multilateral organizations in recycling while the private systems are doing some of it. We tend to want to use the multilateral systems like the IMF. That would tend to involve the producers more directly.

**Kissinger:** You know we don't agree with that at all.

**MacEachen:** Why?

**Kissinger:** There are two problems -- the developed and the least developed countries. With the underdeveloped it is the way to go. With developed countries, they have to take steps themselves, and also they can't become dependent on decisions made elsewhere.
The producers will eventually seek the political benefits of their position. The developed world needs to feel they can master their own destinies.

Trudeau: Yes, unless they face 25% unemployment.

Kissinger: Of course, but we don't think it will come to that. We think it can be done in the developed countries without an increase in unemployment or protective unilateral moves. We made clear in Japan that conservation shouldn't be at the expense of growth.

President: This is why we are pushing voluntarism.

Trudeau: We will go that way too. I can't argue Turner's point. I'll let him talk to Simon.

President: I have been importuned by the Northern Tier states whose refineries buy Canadian crude exports. They asked me to raise it with you. I see your problem -- you have your needs and considerations. Any tempering you can do will be appreciated.

Trudeau: I am having breakfast with some of them; I expect it to be raised. On January 1 we will go down to 800,000 barrels per day. The additional proposal -- which isn't policy -- which I must discuss with you and provinces -- is to go down to 650,000 in July. Perhaps the provinces won't want to shut in that 150,000 but would rather sell. We know the problems of the refineries -- we understand their need is 650,000 and that they will get even with our additional plan. Of course, on next January 1 there would be a further cutback.

We would hope the companies would find ways to reallocate. There are some complicated formulas which I can't explain. I guess if the worst came, we could give you more in exchange for something. A while back, you asked that more not be sent in.

Frankly, it is a political problem. The Canadians know you have more than we have. You have Project Independence. We know we will be short in less than 10 years.

President: I appreciate hearing your views on this. These are some helpful congressmen who raised this, and I wanted to express their concern.
Trudeau: You stopped exporting years ago. Our reserves are not what we thought they were. Why? Because we have been producing at a capacity to supply you. Who knows what decisions will be made? What arguments will I get?

Porter: They will say the refineries were built specifically for this oil. It is we asked that no more come in, but informally it did increase.

Trudeau: What would an American do in our situation? On price, we are selling you oil at the same price we bring it in. There is no reason we should make a gift to the Americans. But the oil supply is embarrassing, but I can't see any other way.

MacEachen: Our decision resulted from a study of our reserves by our regulatory advisory board. Under law we can't export more than the board says is surplus. Another point is we have had criticism at home that our conservation hasn't been severe enough — that we should have cut back faster.

President: One benefit of getting the consumers together is to expand alternative sources of energy. Project Independence needs to be more vigorous. It won't give us self-sufficiency by 1980. It is a good program, but it won't make that date. Our research would be shared with that group. If we can expand research in other energies, we can do more, but not by 1980. I think this can be an added incentive for cooperation.

Trudeau: I think under IEA there is a trigger. If a shortage gets to—what—70%, sharing does start, and we of course would then supply the Mid-West refineries. By 1982 there will be a gap, even with tar sands. We are very willing to cooperate.

President: This will be a bipartisan group tomorrow.

Trudeau: What else will they bring up?

Defense Issues

President: I think we should discuss security. I think NATO is vitally important to peace. We have elements wanting us to withdraw forces.
They want to turn inward. We will keep the forces there in the absence of an agreement in MBFR. The British are thinking of a $10 billion reduction, but they said it would be in areas other than NATO. I hope they exempt NATO.

Trudeau: We don't intend pulling out of NATO. It is our third priority: Canada, North America, NATO. Next year's budget is 11.2% above this year's. We think it is better than any other's, but admittedly from a smaller base. In this economic climate, we think this expansion is proof that we are not trying to renege on NATO. We have increased our effort in NORAD and peacekeeping.

President: You have done a fine job in peacekeeping.

Trudeau: I'm glad to hear that.

President: It is very important.

Trudeau: I am very pleased. The aim of our review is to give us the best for our defense dollar -- mobile forces, repairing dams, etcetera. We want to discuss with you your strategic concepts. How important is having an ASW effort as compared to surveillance only? Also the role you see for strategic bombers. Incidentally, the possible procurement of ASW patrol aircraft would help reduce the imbalance that Nixon and Kissinger discussed -- from $500 to $50 million.

We have no intention of pulling out of NATO or NORAD.

President: I am glad to hear that. Sometime I would like to hear how you managed to unify the services. Not that we could do it, but I would like to hear about it.

Economic Policy

Trudeau: We see that you think your economy is softening. We are so dependent on you. Could you talk about this a bit?

President: When I came in, we were in a very serious inflation. We came up with a plan which initially focused on inflation but recognized that the danger signals wouldn't let us put the clamps on too hard. The one million barrels a day conservation the economists said
would add to our downturn problem. We now are analyzing whether we should shift our emphasis. The auto industry has plunged. That industry depends so much on consumer attitude. But we feel we must get inflation down from 12% to 7 or 8% by the summer. If we can get it to 8% we are doing well. If we don't undercut this too much by stimulative measures, we think the recessive influences will be over by next summer or fall. If Congress panics and turns on the spigot, all the good we have done will be down the drain. We hope to keep a steady course and, depending on the next statistics...we are not frozen, but we don't want to panic.

Trudeau: I assume that price and wage controls are not anticipated now?

President: I have no plans for that. Congress may make a move to give me the control authority so they can wash their hands of it—but labor won't buy that now.

Trudeau: We don't plan on going in that direction, but if you move, we would have to consider it. We are trying to do about the same as you. We are stimulating housing, and the consumers are still confident. That leads to automotive imports. As far as our auto agreement is concerned, two years ago we said we had an accidental year. I think our experts should get together and look over the automotive industry over the long run.

On trade in general, we don't have much to do, because our private sectors do most of it. We have the biggest trade of any two countries—it is 66% free trade and with the trade bill, it will go to 88%.

President: Any influence you have with our Senators will help. We are hopeful, but time is running out. The Jewish immigration issue is worked out. Now one problem is non-germane amendments. I think we have a 75% chance of an acceptable bill by adjournment.

Trudeau: We wish you well because we need to get on with the negotiations. On tourism—another message for Kissinger—our last budget goes in the direction we said we would. American tourists spend $1.2 billion and Canadians spend $1.0 billion.

I want to mention beef. We think we were right, but our officials are talking and I am confident they will resolve it.
President: I hope they are making every effort.

Trudeau: I will concede the appearance of what we did was bad, but I think we were right on the substance.

President: I'll be frank. We had a political problem.

Trudeau: We did too. I would say we almost asked for it.

Environmental Cooperation

On environmental matters. I see the clock....

President: Go ahead.

Trudeau: There are several irritants. We won't resolve them here, but our ministers should be told to work on it. The most serious is your Garrison Diversion Project in North Dakota, and its effect on Canada.

President: I am not an expert on that.

Trudeau: We see your experience with Mexico.

Porter: We know your fears, but have said we would not change the quality of the water.

MacEachen: I don't see how you can deliver on the content.

Porter: We will work with you.

President: We are slow on many things but we don't want to move out on inadequate treatment plants, but we will keep our commitment.

Trudeau: I'm glad to hear that.

President: Our major problem is technical.

Trudeau: Let me raise a couple of other items, just to say I mentioned them. [He mentioned the Skadjet (?) Valley project and the Juan de Fuca Straits.]
President: We will move cautiously.

Trudeau: People are very worried about big oil spills. It would badly influence our people.

President: I would like to mention our joint park efforts. Morton asked if we couldn't move more rapidly.

Trudeau: I'm all with him. If there is a slowdown on our part, we will take care of it.

President: It would give us a chance for an announcement for future get-togethers.

Trudeau: At dinner I will bend your ear on cultural identity and economic identity—the Canadian "third option" of more Canadian control over its destiny.
P: What have you been doing here, Mr. Amsden?

C: I have been discussing some matters with the British.
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5. Can see that can bring thing but we don't want to move on until treatment plans, but we will keep our contact.

6. Glad to hear that.

7. Can make just as technical.

8. Just to say. mentioned at S budget selling? 

9. We will communicate.

10. Thank you very much about joining efforts. It would badly influence our people.

11. I would like to maintain joint effort. Unless we could do more rapidly.

12. I will within. Program our one joint, we will take care of. (Armus?)

13. If would give us a chance for announcement for future joint efforts.


15. Option of more Canadian control on.