CONFIDENTIAL

cc Sir M Palliser
Sir R. Armstrong

Canada

EXTRACT FROM

PRIME MINISTER'S MEETING WITH MR. PIERRE TRUDEAU, PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA - 11.30 AM, 25 JUNE 1980

Subject filed on Canada
Visits of Mr Trudeau
ADL 14/80

Present:

| | |
|---|---|
| Prime Minister | Mr. Pierre Trudeau |
| Mr. Nicholas Ridley | Mrs. Jean Wadds |
| Sir John Ford | Mr. H. Breau |
| Mr. M.O'D.B. Alexander | Mr. P.M. Pitfield |
| Mr. B.R. Berry | Mr. K. Goldschlag |
| | Mr. L.A.H. Smith |
| | Mr. R. Fowler |

Introduction

The Prime Minister welcomed Mr. Trudeau and said it was good of him to find time to call in before his return to Canada. The Prime Minister and Mr. Trudeau agreed that they would discuss any bilateral questions first, before going on to more general questions.

Patriation of the Constitution

The Prime Minister asked Mr. Trudeau whether the British Government was going to have to enact legislation or not. Mr. Trudeau replied that, as the Prime Minister had got straight to the point, he would try and answer her similarly. He said that he could not give a time as this would depend on work throughout the summer and the results of the conference scheduled for September. If remarkable progress had been made by then, and a unanimous decision had been reached - which, he said, was unlikely - they might decide to work on or to set a deadline of spring or early summer next year. If things did not go well, for example if there were further disagreements with Mr. Levesque, there might be more delay.

Mr. Trudeau said that he could not, at this moment, predict any course of action. But it was not inconceivable that the Canadians would be taking steps towards patriation. He said that he had given a clear undertaking to Quebec and to the other

/provincial

CONFIDENTIAL

provincial premiers to unblock the log jam. They had to move on. He did not wish to give the Quebeckers and others the opportunity to say that he could not obtain any agreement, that they would be stuck for another five years with separatist tendencies or that there were reasons for holding another Referendum. Mr. Trudeau said he was determined on movement, and sooner or later the British North America Act would have to be amended.

Mr. Ridley said that in his view HMG, if asked, would have no choice but to enact the required legislation. Mr. Trudeau asked whether the Minister was hinting that this was what Britain would like to do. The Prime Minister said that HMG did not want to be accused of interfering in any way. HMG could help; and if, for example, queues of Indians knocked on the door of No.10, the answer would be that it was for Canada to decide her future and not HMG. It would of course make it easier for HMG if Canada was united in its approach. Mr. Trudeau replied that HMG would be accused of interfering whichever way things went: as for unanimity, he said that that could be forgotten. The provinces would want to be heard and one or more of them would say they were not getting what they wanted.

The Prime Minister said that her line would be that whether or not the request was with the agreement of all the provinces, a request to patriate would be agreed if it was the wish of the Government of Canada. Mr. Trudeau agreed and expressed the view that HMG would have no choice in the matter. The Prime Minister reiterated that she hoped that she would not have masses of people lobbying in front of No.10. Mr. Trudeau said that he did not want to cause the UK any problems - he would try to make things as easy as possible. He meant to unite Canadians if possible. But he recognised that he might in fact make things worse. He could foresee that Quebec, and perhaps other provinces, would not go along with what he wanted. The greater the degree of support he got the less time it would take to get the measures agreed.

Mr. Ridley pointed out that it was important to get it across in Canada that HMG had no intention of interfering in what was

/Canada's

Canada's internal affair. If protest groups lobbied and publicity was given to them, this should not be misinterpreted as interference. The Prime Minister reiterated that she could not see groups, Indians or others; it was not a matter for her, but for Canada, although she would not wish to be accused of being totally rigid.

Mr. Trudeau agreed that this was the right attitude. If provinces tried to get access to HMG, they had no locus standi. It was important not to encourage speculation about what would happen in this or that situation. He intended to proceed on the basis that unanimity would be achieved. The Prime Minister said that she would avoid answering hypothetical questions about what might happen if the request for patriation was not unanimous. If there were any questions, the answer would be that HMG had not been approached about the problem; that this was a matter for the elected Government of Canada; and that it was apparent the Canadian Prime Minister was trying to achieve consensus in his country on the subject.

Anglo/Canadian Air Talks

Mr. Ridley said that the talks in Ottawa last week, in which HMG had been negotiating with the Canadians over Air Canada's monopoly on air services into Western Canada, had broken down again. The UK negotiators had been withdrawn at the weekend of 21/22 June. HMG hoped that the two sides could get together again soon. Mr. Trudeau said he was unaware of the breakdown. Sir John Ford described the background to the problem since Mr. Trudeau and his colleagues appeared to be unfamiliar with the details.

The Prime Minister said it was important that negotiations should be restarted in the interests of freer trade. Mr. Trudeau said that he would take this message home with him. He was not really conscious of the problem. He wondered whether letting British Airways into the West Coast would open the floodgates for other airlines. He undertook to familiarise himself with the issues and either get the talks restarted or explain, if positions were too

far apart, why the Canadians did not feel able to continue. It was agreed that, in principle, both sides would look for ways to re-open the talks as soon as possible.

Venice Summit

The Prime Minister asked Mr. Trudeau for his impressions. Mr. Trudeau said he was pleased and a bit surprised by the leaders' willingness to discuss political issues. Economic talks were important and had in the past helped to limit disarray among the participants in tackling economic problems. Perhaps the political talks would have the same result. Although each country had different answers to questions such as the Olympics, at least airing the difficulties avoided the differences becoming unmanageable. No-one had considered the break-up of the alliance. Discussion of the post-Afghanistan situation made it less likely that divergent solutions to the problem would be adopted. His general impression was good. Was the Prime Minister more pessimistic?

The Prime Minister said that she and Herr Schmidt had been keen to have the political discussion. For the first time since the Forties a totally independent country had been invaded by Russia. Western strategy post-Afghanistan had been strengthened at Venice. The pressure needed to be kept up on the non-aligned countries. This had been agreed.

But the Heads of Government had not got down to as much detail as she would have liked. What could be done if, for example, Pakistan or Turkey or Saudi Arabia fell apart? The world was full of trouble spots. There were two world ideologies and the free world should be putting its case much more strongly. It was clear that the detailed planning and discussion of how to manage world crises could not be carried out in the atmosphere of a Venice Summit, when the leaders were hounded all the time by journalists etc. She was disappointed that they had not been able to get to grips with details, but perhaps in the circumstances not much more could have been done. There was always the danger of leaks and misinformation.

/Mr. Trudeau