

Administration of Donald J. Trump, 2025

Remarks on Signing a Memorandum on Reciprocal Trade and Tariffs and an Exchange With Reporters

February 13, 2025

The President. Okay. Thank you very much.

Will, let's go.

White House Staff Secretary William O. Scharf. A couple of things for your signature today, sir. First, this is a slate of nominees to the President's Intelligence Advisory Board.

The President. Okay. All great people.

Staff Secretary Scharf. Yes, sir.

The President. Very good. Thank you.

[*At this point, the President signed the nominations document.*]

Do you want to read the names?

Staff Secretary Scharf. I can if you'd like, sir.

The President. Go ahead, please.

Staff Secretary Scharf. First, the Chairman will be Devin Gerald Nunes, and the—the members of the—of the board will be Scott Glabe, Amaryllis Fox Kennedy, Brad Wenstrup, Katie Miller, Wayne Berman, Reince Priebus, Robert O'Brien, Joshua Lobel, Sander Gerber, Jeremy Katz, and Thomas Hicks, Jr.

The President. Okay. Good. All good.

Staff Secretary Scharf. Next, sir, we have a Presidential memorandum for your attention entitled "Reciprocal Trade and Tariffs." This memorandum will reshape American trade policy, with the guiding principle being that our tariffs and our treatment of other countries should be reciprocal based on their treatment of us.

It charges your Secretary of Commerce, your U.S. Trade Representative, and other Cabinet Secretaries to pursue that policy vigorously and to develop trade policies in accordance with it.

The President. That's good. Well, we'll sign that. And before we do, I think I'll mention that some numbers have come out. And as you know, we're looking for waste, fraud, and abuse. And this just came out from the Government Accountability Office, and they're pretty staggering numbers.

The Federal Government loses as much as \$521 billion in fraud every single year. That's what Elon is working so hard on with his group of almost 100 geniuses. In 2023, there was an estimated \$236 billion in improper payments made. And they think that number is very low—should be much higher—\$236 billion.

This is why we're doing what we're doing. This is why I campaigned so hard and discussed this so much. And since 2003, there have been \$2.7 trillion in improper payments, meaning payments that went to the wrong people or payments that shouldn't have been made.

According to the Economic Policy Innovation Center—very respected—in 2024, there was an estimated \$162 billion in improper payments.

Earned income tax credit—this is having to do with earned income tax credit. It was \$15.9 billion. Having to do with food stamps—improper—\$10.5 billion in improper payments. Restaurant revitalization fund: \$8.7 billion. Supplemental security income: \$6.5 billion. This is all bad stuff, bad payments—fraud, largely fraud. Unemployment insurance: \$5.6 billion.

According to House Ways and Means in 2024, Social Security, disability insurance, and survivors insurance program sent an estimated \$8.3 billion in improper payments, including \$6.5 billion in overpayments, where they overpaid.

So these are staggering numbers, and it's been going on for a long time. And we're finding a lot of it. And those numbers are minimal. They're really minimal. Those are numbers that have been proven, so you can imagine what the real number is.

But we're going to make America rich again, and that's a good place to start. But here's really the place to start, because we're talking now about reciprocal tariffs.

And on trade, I have decided, for purposes of fairness, that I will charge a reciprocal tariff—meaning whatever countries charge the United States of America, we will charge them. No more, no less.

In other words, they charge us a tax or tariff, and we charge them the exact same tax or tariff. Very simple. Nobody knows what that number is unless you go by the individual country. You can see what it is.

If you go to the individual country and you look at what they're charging us, in almost all cases, they're charging us vastly more than we charge them. But those days are over.

For purposes of this United States policy, which is a big one, we will consider countries that use the VAT—system—you know, you hear about a VAT tax all the time—the VAT system—which is far more punitive, actually, than a tariff—similar but more punitive—to be similar, so that the way we're going to look at it, we're going to call it a tariff, because they use that as a way of getting away from the tariff and the designation of tariff, but it's essentially similar or the same thing.

So a VAT tax will be viewed as a tariff. The—certain areas of Europe do it. To put it mildly, they have about a 20 percent VAT tax. Sending merchandise, product, or anything by any other name through another country for purposes of unfairly harming America will not be accepted.

In addition, we will make a provision for subsidies provided by countries in order to take economic advantage of the United States—which a lot of countries do, including our allies. Our allies, many cases, are worse than our enemies in this, having to do with trade. And this has been going a long—that's why we have a \$36 trillion amount of money that we owe. We owe \$36 trillion, but that'll come down rapidly.

Likewise, provisions will be made for nonmonetary—tariffs. And a nonmonetary—that's where they charge and they do things that aren't—there's no dollar amount, but they make it impossible for you to do business.

They do tests on cars, like dropping a bowling ball on the hood of a car. And if the—if the hood doesn't withstand it—which no hood would, except for an Army tank—then they say, "I'm sorry, you can't sell your car into a certain country." That's a nonmonetary tariff.

So this is in order to take economic advantage. Likewise, the provisions for the nonmonetary tariffs and trade barriers that some countries charge—and most countries, many countries have something to that effect, in order to keep our product out of their domain—or if they do not even let the U.S. businesses operate.

So, in some countries, they just won't let us even operate there. They charge us a lot, but they won't even let us go in. And the—we have many of them.

And what our Secretary of Commerce, standing right behind me, Howard Lutnick—what he's going to be doing is he's going to come up with a number that's an equivalent number to that.

But in many countries—not too many, but quite a few—they don't let us do business. They effectively don't let us do business. So, we're going to put a number on that that is a fair number.

We're able to accurately determine the cost of these nonmonetary trade barriers, and we'll be able to do that very accurately, I think. It's fair to all. No other country can complain. And in some cases, if a country feels that the United States would be getting too high a tariff, all they have to do is reduce or terminate their tariff against us, in which case we're going to pay the same thing. There is no tariff.

So, if they have a tariff and then they complain that this is too high, all they have to do is reduce their tariff or not charge it. I think there'll be certain countries—it's already happened. I believe I heard that the EU today or yesterday lowered the tariff on their cars to 2.5 percent because that's what we charge. And they lowered it from 10 percent, but it was really much higher than 10 percent. But 10 percent to 2.5. That's already happened.

That's a big win. We've been after that to happen for many years, but it never happened. But nobody did anything about it, sitting in this lovely chair.

So there are no tariffs if you manufacture or build your product in the United States. So, if you build your product in the United States, there are no tariffs. Nothing. You don't have to worry about it. It doesn't exist.

A lot of companies will come back to the United States to build their product, make their product in the United States, because there will be no tariff. Nothing.

For many years, the U.S. has been treated unfairly by other countries, both friend and foe. This system will immediately bring fairness and prosperity back into the previously complex and unfair system of trade.

We had a very unfair system to us. Everybody took advantage of the United States, and we paid a big price for it.

America has helped many countries throughout the years at great financial cost. It is now time that these countries remember what we've done for them and treat us fairly. We want a level playing field for all American workers. We want a level playing field for the United States of America.

I've instructed my Secretary of State, my Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of the Treasury, and the United States Trade Representative to do all the necessary work to deliver reciprocity—in other words, reciprocal—reciprocity to our system of trade.

So we're going to have a reciprocal tax. Whatever they charge, we charge. If they don't let us in, we're going to determine a value for that. But overall, it's going to be a very simple system. Whatever they charge, we charge, so nobody can complain. I don't think anybody can complain.

And I'm going to sign this, and the numbers are going to be very fair but staggering. They're going to be large but very fair. And this should have been done years ago.

And I did it in a different form with tariffs and taxes on China. We took in hundreds of billions of dollars. No other President, as you know, ever took in 10 cents. But that was a few countries. That wasn't what we're doing now. Now we're doing it with every country.

So this is every country. And essentially, when they treat us fairly, we treat them fairly. It's a very fair way of doing it. And I don't know that it's ever been done before, but that's the way—I'd like to ask Secretary of Commerce to say a few words, please. Howard.

Secretary of Commerce Howard W. Lutnick. So reciprocal tariffs sound fair, but when you understand how brutally unfair the world's trading has been since we opened ourselves up after World War II. Right? We tried to export the power of our economy to rebuild the world. And what happened since then is everyone else has taken advantage of us.

Some countries, like the VAT—that the President spoke about—20 percent on everything we sell, just casually. And when they sell to us, of course, they drop that 20 right away.

So it's sort of an export subsidy, if you will. So we are going to address each country one by one. But here's the key: They'll get an invitation to trade with the greatest consumer economy in the world, and in exchange for trading with the greatest consumer economy in the world, you have to treat us the way we're going to treat you. It's going to be the same. But no more inviting bad people to the party.

So what the President spoke about with Mexico and Canada is we gave them the greatest invitation ever, right? "You are a neighbor. You are our friend. Trade for free with us."

And what did they do? China came in, right? Steel done by India. Aluminum done by Australia. You have Australian aluminum mines operating at 90 percent and U.S. aluminum mines and—aluminum production, 50 percent. We're going out of business, and they're using Canada to come in.

So the President is keenly aware, keenly focused on changing this model. We will be fair to each country, but no inviting any other country in.

The President. And, Kevin, can you say a few words please?

National Economic Council Director Kevin A. Hassett. Oh, sure, sir.

The President. Kevin Hassett.

Director Hassett. Yes. One of the things that we noticed, sir, when you asked us to look into the numbers was that last year, U.S. companies paid foreign governments \$370 billion in tax. And then we, in the U.S., asked them to pay us tax for what they did, and the U.S. gathered \$57 billion. And so, we paid them \$370 billion and—and they paid us \$57 billion.

And when people say, "Oh, you're doing this tariff thing. How could you do that? Why would you do that? It's so unfair." Let's—think about this. They have three-quarters of world GDP. We have one quarter of world GDP. And we're paying them \$370 billion and, and they're paying us \$57 billion.

The President. It's amazing. Yes. It's amazing.

Director Hassett. Thank you, sir.

The President. Well, it's big, big numbers.

Mr. Trade Rep, would you like to say something? Congratulations, by the way. I watched you 2 days ago on television, and you did fantastically.

U.S. Trade Representative-designate L. Jamieson Greer. Thank you, sir.

The President. Congratulations.

Ambassador-designate Greer. Thank you. You make it easy for me, Mr. President.

We have a trillion-dollar deficit coming out of the last administration. We can't have that anymore. We've had 60,000 factories lost during the period of globalization. All of these things have harmed our workers. They've harmed our farmers. They've harmed our families and our communities. And that stops—stops right now.

We're going to look at everything. We'll certainly look at the tariffs, but we're also going to look at subsidies. We're going to look at taxes that are discriminatory. We're going to look at fake anti-trust regimes in other countries that try to regulate our companies—our competitive companies. We're going to look at all these things, and we're going to figure out exactly what we should be charging other countries.

The President. Right. Thank you.

And it won't be complicated. It's going to be very easy. Big numbers too. Very. The biggest you've ever seen.

Peter, go ahead, please.

Senior Counselor for Trade and Manufacturing Peter K. Navarro. Yes, sir.

Tariffs are bad around the world. They're higher than we have. But tell you what: The nonmonetary barriers that are imposed on us are even worse. And President Trump has been right to single out, for example, the VAT tax—the value-added tax.

There's a reason why Germany sells eight more cars than everyone we sell them, and it's not American craftsmanship, it's not American design; it's simply the unfair trade practices. And that VAT is a killer. It's a hidden tariff. It's also—as Secretary Lutnick said, it's a hidden export subsidy.

There's about a \$20,000 differential between when we try to sell them a car and they sell us a car, and that's going to stop with this man.

The President. Well, I want to say that, actually, tariffs are good. *[Laughter]* Tariffs are great, actually. And the problem is we didn't charge them and everyone else did. They charged us, but we didn't charge them because we were generous or foolish or stupid, or all of the above.

So this is one of the biggest, I think, economic bills ever signed. I think it's probably the biggest in terms of what it represents.

Now this doesn't include what we did a few days ago with steel and aluminum. That's over and above this. Cars will be over and above this. Look at what's coming shortly.

If you take a look at the chips and the various things in that world, that universe, that'll be over and above it. Also, pharmaceuticals will be over and above.

So those elements will be over and above. Otherwise, this is covering pretty much everything. And it's going to be great for the United States and fair for the world. I mean, it's the most fair you can do. You can—we could charge just a flat tariff. And that would be, in many ways, easier, but you could make a case that that wouldn't be fair to other countries. This is fair.

Remember, whatever they charge, we charge. So, whatever they charge us, we charge them. And they charge us nothing, we charge them nothing. And it really works out well. And we'd be very happy to have nothing and nothing. We wouldn't have any tariffs at all.

But to me, it's—it's something that I'm very proudly doing. It should have been done many, many years ago, and we're doing it now. We're doing it very late because we were very foolish, very foolish—as a country, very foolish. And we're doing it now.

[The President signed the memorandum.]

Oh, that's a good one. [*Laughter*]

Q. Mr. President, you won the White House in part because of high inflation. If your tariffs make prices go up——

The President. Excuse me, we haven't asked you to speak yet, please. All right?

Okay. Go ahead, please.

Q. You won the White House in part——

The President. Go ahead, please. Go ahead, be—go ahead, please.

India-U.S. Trade Relations

Q. Mr. President, you are meeting Prime Minister Modi of India this afternoon.

The President. Yes.

Q. What kind of trade and tariff relationship would you like to have with India? And what's your vision for India-U.S. relationship?

The President. Well, yes, India traditionally is the highest—just about the highest tariffed country. They charge more tariffs than any other country. And I mean, we'll be talking about that. But, again, whatever they charge us, we're charging them. So it works out very well. It's very—it's a beautiful, simple system, and we don't have to worry about, "Gee, we're charging too much or too little."

But traditionally, India is right at the top of the pack, pretty much. There are a couple of smaller countries that are actually more. But India is a very, very—they—they charge tremendous tariffs.

I remember when Harley Davidson couldn't sell their motorbikes into India because of the fact that India—the tax was so high, the tariff was so high. And Harley was forced to build—I guess they built; I don't know—that was a while ago—but I think they built a factory in India in order to avoid paying the tariffs.

And that's what people can do with us. They can build a factory here, a plant or whatever it might be here, and that includes the medical, that includes cars, that includes chips and semiconductors, that includes everything. If you build here, you have no tariffs whatsoever. And I think that's what's going to happen. I think our country is going to be flooded with jobs.

[*Several reporters began asking questions at once.*]

U.S. Trade Policy/Tariffs

Q. What should consumers expect? Are prices going to go up short term, long term, medium term?

The President. Well, not necessarily. I mean, not necessarily. But I'll tell you what will go up is jobs. The jobs will go up tremendously. We're going to have great jobs, jobs for everybody.

This is something that should have been done many years ago. China did it. I mean, China did it at a level that probably nobody has ever seen before.

If you manufactured a car, you couldn't send it into China, the tariff was so high. So, everybody went and they built in China. It was no big secret.

So we're going to see. But it's going to mean tremendous amounts of jobs. And ultimately, prices will stay the same, go down. But we're going to have a very dynamic country.

[*Several reporters spoke at once.*]

U.S. Trade Policy/Tariffs

Q. But if prices go up——

Q. Do you expect——

Q. If prices go up, Mr. President——

The President. Yes.

Q. ——because of these tariffs, who do you think voters should hold responsible?

The President. Oh, I think what's going to go up is jobs are going to go up, and prices could go up somewhat short term, but prices will also go down. And I think the farmers are going to be helped by this very much, because product is being dumped into our country, and our farmers are getting hurt very badly by the last administration.

The last administration hated our farmers, like at a level that I've never seen before. I think our farmers are going to be helped. Jobs are going to be helped, but our farmers are going to be helped. Our manufacturers are going to be helped.

And again, if somebody wants to come in, including the car companies—if they want to come in and build car plants, they'll do it without tariffs. And therefore, prices won't go up. There could be some short-term disturbance, but long term, it's going to make our country a fortune.

Inflation

Q. So, Americans should prepare for some short-term pain, possibly?

The President. No, you said that. I didn't say that, you know?

Q. Well, if the prices go up and that affects them.

The President. We'll see what happens. Nobody really knows what is going to happen, other than we know that jobs are going to be produced at levels that we haven't seen before. We know that—we think interest rates are going to ultimately be coming down because of things that happen, and they go hand in hand with the tariffs.

But we think that—we think that the prices for some things, many things—it could be all things—will go down—ultimately will go down.

U.S. Trade Policy/Tariffs

Q. Mr. President, could you explain the timeline here, sir? There's a period of time for a review, a report: 180 days.

The President. Sure.

Q. What's the earliest date that you think tariffs will actually be implemented and executed?

The President. Well, I would say—maybe I'll ask Howard to answer that, because he's going to be the one that's implementing. What do you think?

Secretary Lutnick. Our studies should be all complete by April 1. So, we'll hand the President the opportunity to start on April 2 if he wants. So I think we'll be ready to go——

The President. Pretty close.

Secretary Lutnick. ——on April 1, and we'll hand it to the President, and he'll make his decisions.

But remember, if they drop their tariffs, prices for Americans are coming down. Our production is going up, and our costs are going down. Remember, it's a two-way street. That's why it's called reciprocal.

National Debt

Q. And have you spoken to any American CEOs directly about this? Are they calling you and asking for——

The President. I have. I've spoken to many, and——

Q. ——exemptions, for example?

The President. ——many love it. And they say this is going to be the thing that makes our country really prosperous again and this is going to what—be what pays down the \$36 trillion in debt and all the other things.

And this is going to be—this is an amazing day. This—I think this is going to be a very big day and in a very positive way for our country.

Yes, please.

European Union/Canada

Q. Mr. President, you've talked about the VAT and the EU before, and your—your concerns with how the EU treats you. Do you have a number in mind—of the European Union, do you have an idea where that number is going to land?

The President. Well, what they are now is they have a 20-percent VAT tax, which we're considering to be similar or the same as the tariff, plus they charge lots of fees.

And, you know, they're doing something else. European Union has been very tough on our companies. They sued Apple. They sued Google. They sued Facebook. They sued many other companies. And they're American companies, and the kind of numbers are staggering.

And the court system over there is not very good to our companies. If you know that Apple had to pay, I think, \$16 billion in a penalty—a court case that was really shocking, because most people thought they would have won that court case—people that watched it. So they've been very tough.

Airlines have called me up, and they said, "Could you help us with Europe because they're charging us so many different fees?" I got a call from the head of American, United, and other airlines saying, "Every time we land a plane, we get just absolutely killed by the European Union." And so they haven't been—treated us good.

You know, we think European Union is wonderful. We all love Europe. We love our—the countries in Europe, but European Union has been absolutely brutal on trade.

Canada has been very bad to us on trade, but now Canada is going to have to start paying up. And Canada has been tough on the military because they don't have a very—they have a very low military cost. They think we're going to, you know, protect them with our military, which is unfair.

So Canada is going to be a very interesting situation, because, you know, we just don't need their product, and yet, they survive off the fact that we're—you know, we do 95 percent of what they do.

And Canada is just absolutely—I say it and sometimes people smile and sometimes they say, "Great idea"—but Canada would—their taxes would come down greatly, their security would go up greatly. Amazing things happen to Canada.

And really, Canada, in this particular—why would we pay \$200 billion a year in subsidies to Canada when they're not a State? You do that for a State, but you don't do that for somebody else's country. So I think Canada is going to be a very serious contender to be our 51st State.

[Several reporters spoke at once.]

Canada-U.S. Trade Relations

Q. How are negotiations going with Canada? There was obviously a delay in implementing——

The President. Well——

Q. ——those tariffs.

The President. ——I spoke to Governor Trudeau on numerous occasions—[laughter]—and we'll see what happens. But it just sets up so good for them.

Look, the people would pay much less tax than they're paying right now. They'd have perfect military protection. They don't have any military protection because they essentially—because—and you take a look at what's going on out there: You have Russian ships, you have China ships—you have Chinese ships, you have a lot of ships out there, and, you know, people are in danger. This is a different world today. It's a different world. They need our protection.

Yes.

White House Senior Adviser Elon R. Musk

Q. You mentioned Elon Musk and the efforts that he's undertaking with your authority.

The President. Yes.

Q. You granted him new authority this week. Will he secure any new Government contracts while he is working on DOGE for you?

The President. No, not if—not if there's a conflict. If there's no conflict, I guess, what difference does it make? But we won't let him do any of the—anything having to do with the conflict.

Q. Are you personally checking to make sure there's no conflicts of interest?

The President. Yes, I am. Yes.

Q. That's—he answers to you?

The President. Sure. He does. I——

Q. Mr. President——

The President. First of all, he wouldn't do it. And second of all, we're not going to let him do anything where there's a conflict of interest.

European Union/North Atlantic Treaty Organization

Q. Mr. President, your negotiations with the EU are—you know, there's—there's just discussions ongoing already. How quickly do you expect that you'll hear back from them——

The President. I don't know. I——

Q. —about any of these other measures?

The President. I can't tell you. Yes.

The EU has been very nasty. I—it's just been—they haven't treated us properly. Look, we were great to them on NATO. Essentially, it's a similar group of countries. When I came in my first term, I raised their fees. I mean, they were not paying. We were paying for almost—in my opinion, almost all of NATO. And now, you know, I—I had the bad moment with the press where the press said, "Well, does this mean you won't protect them?" And I said, "I won't protect them if they're not paying."

But because I said that, the Secretary General, as you know, said it was the greatest thing he's ever seen because the money came pouring in, and—but they don't treat us right on trade. They don't treat us right on the military either.

I mean, if you look at Ukraine, we're in for probably \$200 billion more than Europe. Why are we in for more than Europe? We're in for more than Europe. I mean, think of it—or NATO—I mean, that's—just call it NATO because Canada is in.

By the way, Canada is just about the lowest payer, also, just be—you know, they shouldn't be. They are just about the lowest payer in NATO, in addition to everything else. So Canada has really been taking advantage of—and if they had to pay just something modestly fair, they wouldn't be able to succeed as a country. And that's why—that's why I—I feel they have to become a State.

Yes, ma'am.

Q. You've been—you've been very critical of—

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. Is it your expectation that partners will offer major concessions and that you actually don't end up applying those tariffs?

The President. No, I think that a lot of them will stay the same, and whatever they pay, I'll pay. I mean, we'll—we'll have—we'll have a lot of them stay the same.

I think some—look, I heard they—as an example, EU lowered their tax on cars down to the exact same amount that—they were much higher. They were approximately five times higher, and they lowered them down to the exact tax that we're charging. That took place, like, yesterday or the day before.

Is that a correct statement?

Ambassador-designate Greer. I think it's pending.

The President. I think so. Yes.

Tariffs

Q. Do you expect any exemptions or waivers?

The President. I don't expect that. No, this is a simple system, and there wouldn't be any. And in the case of Apple, I gave them a waiver, an exemption in my first term because Samsung was in South Korea, and Samsung didn't have to pay the tax because it was a tax on China. And Apple makes a lot of their product in China. So I did that because it wouldn't have been fair, but now this applies to everybody across the board.

This is a much simpler way of doing it, a much better way.

[Several reporters spoke at once.]

Russia

Q. You had that major call yesterday with President Putin of Russia.

The President. Yes.

Ukraine/President Volodymyr Zelenskyy of Ukraine

Q. President Zelenskyy responded today, basically saying any agreements they won't accept unless they're made with Ukraine. Will Ukraine have a seat at that table for those negotiations, in your view?

The President. Of course, they would. I mean, they're part of it. We would have Ukraine. We'd have Russia, and we'll have other people involved too—a lot of people, a lot of—a lot of forks in the—a lot of forks in this game. I'll tell you what, this is a very interesting situation.

But the Ukraine war has to end. The young people are being killed at levels that nobody's seen since World War II, and it's a ridiculous war, and it has to end.

We had a good talk with President Putin. I had a good talk with President Zelenskyy—very good talk. And somebody said, oh, I should have called Zelenskyy first. I don't think so. I mean, we have to find out whether or not Russia wants to make a deal. I know that Zelenskyy wants to make a deal because he told me that. But I now know that Russia wants to make a deal.

Ukraine/President Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin of Russia

Q. Did you ask Secretary Hegseth to walk back his comments yesterday, saying Ukraine won't join NATO and won't go back to pre-2014 borders——

The President. No.

Q. ——because those are——

The President. No.

Q. ——bargaining chips you could use?

The President. No, I didn't. Somebody told me to, but I thought his comments were good yesterday, and they're probably good today. They're a little bit softer, perhaps, but I thought his comments from——

Q. Is that at your direction?

The President. I thought his comments yesterday were pretty accurate.

Q. Mr. President——

The President. I don't see any way that a country in Russia's position could allow them—just in their position—could allow them to join NATO. I don't see that happening.

Q. Mr. President, are——

The President. And long before President Putin, Russia was very strong on the fact that—I believe that's the reason the war started, because Biden went out and said that they could join NATO, and he shouldn't have said that. As soon as he said that, I said: "You know what? You're going to have a war now." And I was right about that. That—this is a war that would have never happened if I were President.

Q. But you don't think it's—you think it's President Biden's fault, not President Putin? I mean, he's the one who invaded.

The President. I think Biden is incompetent. And I think when he said that they could join NATO, I thought that was a very stupid thing to say. I thought when he said, "Well, it depends if

it's a minor incursion"—in other words, it's okay if Russia does a minor incursion—I thought that was a very foolish thing to say.

Q. Mr. President, on auto——

Q. Would Elon Musk——

The President. Those things got it started.

Q. On MAHA——

The President. The other thing that got it started was how badly Milley and these stupid people—the bad generals—how badly they did with Afghanistan. I was going to pull out, but we were pulling out with dignity and strength, and we were going to take our equipment with us and everything else. They are—I mean, what they're doing is—what they did with that—I think Putin looked at that mess, and he said: "Wow, this is a great time. I'm going to go in."

But what—what the Americans said—I'm not blaming Americans, but I will say what they said had a big influence on his deciding to go in.

Yes.

White House Senior Adviser Elon R. Musk/Tariffs

Q. When Elon Musk met with Prime Minister Modi earlier today, did he do so as an American CEO, or did he do so as a representative of the U.S. Government?

The President. Are you talking about me?

Q. No, Elon Musk earlier today——

The President. Oh, Elon? I don't know. He——

Q. ——met with Prime Minister Modi——

The President. They met, and I assume——

Q. So is that as a CEO, or is that——

The President. ——he wants to do business in India.

Q. ——or is that as a government official?

The President. But India is a very hard place to do business in because of the tariffs. They—they have the highest tariffs, just about, in the world, and it's a hard place to do business.

No, I would imagine he met possibly because, you know, he's running a company. He's—he's doing this as a—as something that he's felt strongly about for a long time, because he sees what's happening and he sees how the country is really being hurt badly by all of the fraud, waste, and abuse.

Yes.

Q. On automotive——

Q. So how does Modi know whether he's meeting with a CEO or meeting with a representative of your Government?

The President. Well, he's meeting with me in a little while, so I'm going to ask him that question. All right? I'll ask him that question.

Yes.

U.S. Automobile Industry/Tariffs

Q. On auto tariffs, what should we expect, sir? You mentioned obviously steel and aluminum and pharmaceuticals. What are you thinking about auto tariffs? You haven't talked about that as much.

The President. I think autos are coming soon. I think they're all coming, more or less, at the same time, and it's not going to be——

Q. And would that——would——

The President. ——a big shock to the system. But——

Q. Would that apply to every country?

The President. What it's going to do is it's going to bring pharmaceuticals back to our country. Much more important than the money. It's a lot of money, but it's going to bring pharmaceuticals back to our country. It's going to bring chips back to our country. It's going to bring automobile—we're going to do a lot more automobile manufacturing in our country.

You know, when I did this—when I announced this during the campaign, they were going to build the largest car plant in the world in Mexico. It was almost under construction. It was just starting. And when they heard me make that statement—and they thought I was going to win the election, actually—it was a few months before the election itself. China was building the car plant. It was going to be the largest in the world. They immediately stopped construction. You can see the foundation is there. They immediately stopped when they heard I was doing this.

That would have destroyed Detroit. It would have destroyed Michigan. This plant would have taken up more than almost the whole State built, and it would have—I—it would have been very destructive.

When they heard me speak, and they said, "Wow, if he gets in, we're going to—we're going to lose our shirt," so they stopped building. That's the impact that tariffs have.

Again, you know, I say it, and I say it loudly. It's the most beautiful word. But now I say religion, love, and a couple of other things are more beautiful, because I got in a lot of problem with the fake news when they said, "Oh, other things are more important." God is more important. But these are the words. But I would say it's number four or five. [*Laughter*] To me, it's the most beautiful.

And I'll tell you what I think. Really, "reciprocal tariffs," those two words—reciprocal—reciprocal makes tariffs really fair.

Reciprocal Tariffs

Q. And all—this would be on all countries?

Q. Mr. President——

Q. There would be no exemptions, right? It would be all auto imports?

The President. No. We're not looking to do any exemptions, no, because——

Q. On autos?

The President. You don't need to. With reciprocal, you don't need to.

[*Several reporters spoke at once.*]

Q. Any update on TikTok and how that's——

The President. Who are you with?

Q. Mr. President, Gavin Kliger just arrived at the IRS——

The President. Who are you with?

Q. Fox Radio.

The President. Oh.

TikTok

Q. Do you—do you have any update on the TikTok negotiations and, kind of, like——

The President. Yes, we have a lot people——

Q. ——that timeline is running out, isn't it?

The President. —well, I have 90 days from about 2 weeks ago, right? And I'm sure it can be extended, but let's see. I don't think you'll need to.

We have a lot of people interested in TikTok, and I hope to be able to make a deal. I think it would be good. You know, people have learned it's very popular, and we'll have to probably get approval from China to do it, but we have a lot of people that are interested—a lot of people. I think China will be interested, because it's to their benefit too.

So I look forward to that. But we have a lot of people that are interested in TikTok. Quite a few.

[*Several reporters spoke at once.*]

Internal Revenue Service

Q. Mr. President, DOGE workers arrived today—Gavin Kliger and others arrived today at the IRS. Do you expect to close the IRS, or what are you expecting to happen?

The President. No, I don't expect it, but——

Q. You've talked about the ERS.

Secretary Lutnick. Someday. Someday. [*Laughter*]

The President. ——I think—that the Internal Revenue Service will be looked at, like everybody else. Just about everybody's going to be looked at. So it's—they're doing a hell of a job. It's an amazing job they're doing. And you know, that force is building. These—I call it the force of super geniuses. But it's building.

And you know, they go up and they talk to some of the people about certain deals, and the people get all tongue-tied. They can't talk, because these people get it. They're very smart people. We need smart people.

Yes.

Q. On tariffs, sir.

[*Several reporters spoke at once.*]

Q. On tariffs, sir.

The President. Yes. Brian [Brian Glenn, Real America's Voice].

U.S. Steel Industry

Q. Yes, sir. Mr. President, I know that during the campaign, it was huge in Pennsylvania as far as bringing back manufacturing.

The President. Right.

Q. Have you talked to any CEOs since the tariffs were announced on steel and aluminum? What's the feedback from those guys?

The President. They are in love with it. As you know, in Pennsylvania, U.S. Steel is through the roof. They're all through the roof. That's why I didn't want U.S. Steel to make a deal with Japan or anybody else. I think it's going to do great.

But I think maybe more than anybody else, the steel companies and aluminum companies, they're in love with what's happened. And this will eventually be the car companies, the chip companies. We have to have chips made in this country. Right now we—everything is made in Taiwan, practically—almost all of it, a little bit in South Korea. But everything, almost all of it, is made in Taiwan. And we want it to be made—we want those companies to come to our country, in all due respect.

You know, they took—they took the business away. Taiwan took our chip business away. We had Intel. We had these great companies that did so well, and it was taken from us. And we want that business back. We want it back in the United States. And if they don't bring it back, we're not going to be very happy.

Q. And you mentioned the pharmaceuticals——

Q. Sir, on tariffs. Are you——

The President. Yes. Brian.

Q. Pharmaceuticals as well. In China, that's national security to bring that back.

The President. And other places. Yes, China and other places. We want to get the pharmaceutical and drug business back into the United States, where it should be. Right?

U.S. Trade Policy

Q. Sir, on tariffs, are you concerned that the countries that would be most affected, like India, would just shift their trading to China?

The President. No, I'm not concerned about anything, really. I mean, I'm just doing what's fair. This is a very fair thing. This should have been done a long time ago.

I would have done it, but then COVID hit. I was getting ready to do this years ago in first term. We had the most successful economy in history, and then COVID hit, and I was—this was going to be the—the thing that I was most waiting to do.

But it was awfully hard to do this with Italy and France and Spain and these—all those people were dying, and then we put tariffs on.

Q. On these negotiations.

The President. See, I have a—I have a big heart.

Q. Mr. President——

President Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin of Russia

Q. Sir, on Ukraine, when Putin says that he really wants peace, do you believe him?

The President. Yes, I do. I believe he wants peace. I believe that President Putin, when I spoke to him yesterday—I mean, I know him very well. Yes, I think he wants peace. I think he would tell me if he didn't.

Q. Do you trust him?

The President. I think he'd—I'd like to see peace.

Ukraine

Q. Do you trust President Putin?

The President. I believe that—yes, I believe that he would like to see something happen. I trust him on this subject. I think he'd like to see something happen.

I think it could have happened a long time ago. I think Biden—number one, it shouldn't have started, but it did. And now all those cities are knocked down. They're like demolition sites.

Q. But Putin knocked them down.

The President. All those beautiful golden towers are knocked down. There's nothing going to replace them. But much more importantly, you lost millions of people—a lot of soldiers, but you lost millions of people.

When they knocked down those cities—and they're all laying down on the side; they're lying down just in ashes and all crumbled-up concrete—they literally look like a world-class demolition site. And many of them—almost all of them, but many of them—and this should have been done by Biden years ago. This should have never been allowed to happen. I know he's a friend of yours.

Q. But couldn't Putin just withdraw his troops today?

The President. He's a friend of CNN. *[Laughter]* That's why nobody watches CNN anymore, because they have no—no credibility.

Q. On China, sir.

[Several reporters spoke at once.]

The President. Who else? Yes, please.

TikTok/2024 Presidential Election

Q. On China, sir. If you can find a buyer in the United States for TikTok, do you think Xi Jinping will authorize the sale of it, or will he——

The President. I think so. I'm going to make it worthwhile for China to do it. I think so. I mean, I got to know TikTok, because during the election, I ended up with 36-percent higher than my opponent with youth. Okay? That never happened before. I——

Q. But what's in it for Xi Jinping, sir?

The President. I beat—you know, that's always been a Democrat thing—youth. It became a Trump thing. And I think TikTok—I think Joe Rogan was a part of it. Some of the great people that I did interviews with were a part of it. But I think that TikTok—TikTok was a—I think it was a big part.

Look, as you know, we were up by 36 percent with youth. The Republican was never up with youth. And I focused on TikTok, and I found it to be amazing, actually, and very fair.

And I think the image of TikTok is different than it was before the election. I think people saw it, and they view it as a positive, not a negative.

Q. But isn't that all the reason why Xi Jinping——

The President. I think it will be——

Q. ——wouldn't sell?

The President. ——to China's advantage to have the deal be made. Yes.

Tariffs

Q. How much money do you think you'll raise from tariffs on an annual basis?

The President. That's the most interesting question. I think it'll be a staggering amount. It will be the external—I call it the external revenue service. That was a name that was devised by a few of us, but it's—I think it's going to be a staggering amount.

Q. We've heard the number \$1 trillion floated in meetings with Senators.

The President. Oh, I don't know. I don't—

Q. Is that a number you've thought of?

The President. I don't know. But already the Senate is saying, "Well, wait a minute." You know, they're looking at some of the numbers, and they're saying: "Whoa. This is"—look, we want to—I say America first. I say make America great again. That's what we're doing. This is—I think it's the most important thing I've signed. I've signed some very important things. Right to Try was so important. I mean, a lot of important things: Space Force, the biggest tax cuts in history. You know, this could be one of the most important things that we've ever signed.

Russia/U.S. Diplomatic Efforts

Q. And do you expect the Russians and President Putin to attend the summit in Saudi Arabia?

The President. Eventually, yes.

Q. Yes.

The President. Not quite yet. It's a little early.

They're having a meeting in Munich tomorrow. Russia is going to be there with our people. Ukraine is also invited, by the way. I'm not sure exactly who's going to be there from any country. But high-level people from Russia, from Ukraine, and from the United States going to be there.

Q. What's your message to Wall Street about the tariffs, sir?

Russia/Group of Seven (G-7) Nations

Q. Do you want to add Russia back to the G-7, sir?

The President. I'd love to have them back. I think it was a mistake to throw them out. Look, it's not a question of liking Russia or not liking Russia. It was the G-8, and, you know, I've—I said: "What are you doing? You guys—all you talk about is Russia, and you—they should be sitting at the table."

I think Putin would love to be back. Obama and a couple of other people made a mistake, and they got Russia out. It's very possible that if that was the G-8, you wouldn't have had the problem with Ukraine. And if I was President, you definitely wouldn't have had the problem with Ukraine. Russia would have never attacked Ukraine. But—

Q. Can I ask you one on—

The President. But you ask a very good question—the G-8. It used to be the G-8, and then these people threw them out. And I was arguing with Trudeau and with—with—numerous of the people. Actually, Prime Minister Abe, a great man from Japan, agreed with me a 100 percent, and some of the others did too.

But I got there, it was the G-7, as you know. They—they had already been terminated. I think it would have been very helpful and it still would be helpful to have Russia be a part of that mix.

Q. So they——

Q. Russia——

The President. And I think if they were, I don't think you would have had the problem that you have right now.

[Several reporters spoke at once.]

Q. Russia is not a part of the G-20.

Q. They kicked them out, of course, because—they kicked them out, of course, because they illegally annexed Crimea. I mean, how would you have responded if Russia invaded or took over——

The President. Well, you know——

Q. ——land that wasn't theirs?

The President. ——took Crimea during Obama.

Q. Twenty-fourteen.

The President. They took—they took—well, now they're looking to take the whole thing. Then they took a big chunk of land and people, as you know, during Bush. And now they're trying to take the whole thing during Biden. You know, the only one that didn't give them anything is Trump. They never took anything with Trump—nothing, not two inches of property, of—of land.

But they had—Crimea was Obama, and then Bush gave them a lot, you remember. And then, in fact, this is a sort of a standard little phrase—and Biden is giving them everything, because this is a war that shouldn't have been had. And the only one that didn't give him anything is Trump. It's just the way is.

[Several reporters spoke at once.]

Tariffs/2024 Presidential Election

Q. What's your message to Wall Street about these tariffs, sir? There's been some nervousness on Wall Street about the impact——

The President. I don't think so. I mean, there hasn't been very much, and I think it's going to make the United States stronger. And in many ways, it could make other countries stronger too.

You know, other countries want to have a strong United States. They want to have a strong America. And I think it's going to make us very, very strong—much stronger.

And we have a lot of work we're doing on the military. Our military—already, I've authorized some contracts to be built that are very substantial. We're building the greatest equipment to do it. We have the greatest military equipment in the world. We're building it.

At some point, when things settle down, I'm going to meet with China and I'm going to meet with Russia—in particular, those two—and I'm going to say: "There's no reason for us to be spending almost a trillion dollars on military. There's no reason for you to be spending \$400 billion." China is going to be at \$400 billion. We're at a trillion—we're going to be at close to a trillion.

Q. If Elon Musk——

The President. And I'm going to say, "We can settle this on—we can spend this on other things. We don't have to spend this on military, because"—and I'm going to be meeting with China. You know, we were trying to de-escalate nuclear. And I was in a position where Russia had agreed and China had agreed we were going to start, and then we had a rigged election, so that never took place.

But this one was too big to rig. We won by so much that it was too big to rig.

Russia/China

Q. You want to do the China meeting in the United States? Or would you travel to China for that?

The President. For what?

Q. The China meeting. Would you do that here or there?

The President. I tell people all the time, you know, the question is: "Who's going to have the first meeting? Where you're going to"—I say this to Putin, to President Xi. I say to everybody. It never bothered me. You know, I'm willing to say, "I'll go first." It doesn't matter. It's the end result that counts, so it doesn't make any difference.

Q. When do you want to have a conversation about global defense spending? You, China, Russia.

The President. Well, I'd like to have that—as soon as things settle down, I'm going to have that conference, primarily with China and Russia, because those are the two that—that really are out there. And we're going to have them spend a lot less money, and we're going to spend a lot less money.

And I know they're going to do it.

Q. Do you see that happening——

The President. They agreed to it.

We were talking about—denuclearize, and President Putin and I agreed that we were going to do it in a very big way.

There's no reason for us to be building brandnew nuclear weapons. We already have so many, you could destroy the world 50 times over—100 times over.

And here we are building new nuclear weapons, and they're building nuclear weapons, and China is building new nuclear weapons. And China is trying to catch up, because, you know, they're very substantially behind, but within 5 or 6 years, they'll be even. And we're all spending a lot of money that we could be spending on other things that are actually, hopefully, much more productive.

Hopefully, there'll never be a time when we need those weapons. If there's ever a time when we need nuclear weapons, like the kind of weapons that we're building and that Russia has and that China has to a lesser extent but will have—that's going to be a very sad day. That's going to be probably oblivion.

Q. Do you see that as separate conversations——

Q. Do you see that as a trilateral negotiation?

Q. ——or do you see one giant summit with you, Xi Jinping, and Vladimir Putin?

The President. Yes, I could see that. Let things calm down a little bit.

You know, when I left, we had no Middle East problem. We had no Russia going into Ukraine. They never would have done it. Putin never would have done it. And I came back, and we got, like, the whole world is blowing up.

So, when we straighten it all out, then I want to have—one of the first meetings I want to have is with President Xi of China, President Putin of Russia. And I want to say, "Let's cut our military budget in half." And we can do that—and I think we——

[Several reporters spoke at once.]

——and I think we'll be able to do it.

Government Spending Reductions

Q. If Elon Musk identifies wasteful spending in the Defense Department, Defense contractors, and the like, are you willing to go after that spending as well? That's been traditionally——

The President. Oh, yes. We have to go—we have to go—waste, fraud, and abuse, yes. And we're doing that.

Russia/China

Q. You know, I'm just wondering about your conversations on defense spending. Would you want to do that as a trilateral, or would you use the existing body that also already includes China and Russia, the G-20?

The President. No, I—no, it's the people. It's President Putin, President Xi. I don't need bodies. I don't need anything. It's people. It's all about people. It's about relationship and people. And you know, I've had a good relationship with President Putin. I've had a good relationship with President Xi. It's about people.

And I think when things straighten out, which I hope will be in the not-too-distant future, the meeting I want to have first is a meeting with China and a meeting with Russia on slowing down, stopping, and reducing nuclear weapons, in particular, and also on not having to spend the kind of money we're all spending on weapons—military weapons, generally.

Q. I think my question is: Would you have those meetings separately with each of those leaders, or would you try to bring them all together?

Russia/China/2024 Presidential Election

The President. Both. You start off separately, and—yes. That's what was happening. I was dealing with President Putin. We had, really, an understanding where we were going to denuclearize—what a beautiful term that is, right?—"denuclearize." What a great thing if we could do that. And, well, we were going to. He really liked the idea, and so did I. And we had then called China, and China was very open to it. And then the COVID hit, and then we had a rigged election.

Q. Sir——

The President. But now there's no rigged election. Now we have an election that was too big to rig. That's what—my whole theme was "too big to rig." And they tried, but they didn't pull it off.

Q. Sir, as part of the reciprocal tariffs, would you also direct agencies to study the impact they would have on prices in the U.S.?

The President. No, there's nothing to study. There's nothing to study. It's going to go well. You—the United States is going to become a very, very strong economic—economically—country.

Yes.

Tariffs

Q. Mr. President, in the past, you have spoken against BRICS. India is part of BRICS. Do you want to dismantle BRICS? Or you want to be—U.S. want to be part of the BRICS?

The President. I don't care, but BRICS is—was put there for a bad purpose, and most of those people don't want—they don't even want to talk about it now. They're afraid to talk about it, because I told them, if—if they want to play games with the dollar, then they're going to be hit with a 100-percent tariff the day they mention that they want to do it. And they will come back and say, "We beg you—we beg you not to do this."

BRICS is dead since I mentioned that.

Q. But what——

The President. BRICS died the minute I mentioned that.

And I know—I remember when Obama and—Biden, in particular, I guess he said that, "Oh, they have us over a barrel." They don't have us over a barrel. We have them over a barrel.

If BRICS wants to play games, those countries won't trade with us, we won't trade with them, and if any trading gets through, it will be 100-percent tariff at least.

Q. On your Cabinet, sir.

Q. What will be your——

The President. And you know what? When they hear that, what do you think they're going to do? They're going to say, "Look what happened to BRICS." They don't even want to talk about it. They don't—they don't even want to admit that they were a member of BRICS. That's what's happened.

Q. How soon will you lift the sanctions on Russia, sir?

Senator A. Mitchell McConnell/Secretary of Health and Human Services Robert F. Kennedy, Jr./Senate Confirmation Process

Q. On you Cabinet, sir. We saw Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., get confirmed. He's going to come in here and be sworn in.

Mitch McConnell has now voted against several of your nominees. He voted against RFK Jr. as the next Health Secretary, citing conspiracy theories. What's your reaction to that?

The President. Well, I feel sorry for Mitch. And I was one of the people that led—he couldn't—he wanted to go to the end, and he wanted to stay leader. He wasn't—he's not equipped, mentally. He wasn't equipped 10 years ago, mentally, in my opinion. He let the Republican Party go to hell. If I didn't come along, the Republican Party wouldn't even exist right now. Mitch McConnell never really had it.

He had an ability to raise money because of his position as leader, which anybody could do. You could do it even, and that's saying a lot. But the fact is that he raised money, and he gave a lot of money to Senators. And so he had a little loyalty based on the fact that, as leader, you can raise a lot of money.

Senators would call me, and they say: "He wants to give me \$20-, \$25 million. Can I take it?" I'd say, "Take the money. Take the money."

But he—so he engendered a certain amount of—I don't even call it loyalty. He, you know, was able to get votes.

But I was the one that got him to drop out of the leadership position, so he can't love me. But he's not voting against Bobby. He's voting against me. But that's all right.

He endorsed me. You know, Mitch—do you know that Mitch endorsed me, right?

Q. Well, he did have polio, and he——

The President. You think that was easy?

What?

Q. He had polio, obviously, and he cited the vaccines as why.

The President. I don't know—I don't know anything about "he about polio." "He had polio."

Q. Are you doubting that he had polio?

The President. I have no idea if he had polio. All I can tell you about him is that he shouldn't have been leader. He knows that. He voted against Bobby. He votes against almost everything now. He's a, you know, very bitter guy.

And we have a very strong party, and he's almost not even really a very powerful member in it. I'd say he's not a power—he's lost his power, and it's affected his vote. And, you know, it's one of those things.

But in the meantime, Bobby did great. Got more votes than anybody thought. And I think he's going to do phenomenally—just phenomenally in that position. And everybody else, likewise, did well—not only well, they got more votes than anybody thought. Tulsi—look at how she did. She did great.

Marco got 99 votes. How about that? Marco got—Marco got 99 votes.

And Marco—by the way, I have to tell you, Marco Rubio has done a fantastic job. He's been a great Secretary of State. They're all doing great.

But we're going to have a swearing in today. And maybe we're going to have a second one, because I hear we have a couple of them coming up. And the man behind me is doing a fantastic job, the Secretary of Commerce. And I think you're going to see something very big come from—from today's signing. I think this is going to be a very important signing. Okay?

U.S. Steel Corporation

Q. On U.S. Steel, sir, may I ask very quickly? You said you'd meet with the head of that company and the Japanese company——

The President. Yes, U.S. Steel is going to be here. A lot of the steel companies are coming. I think steel companies—they love what's happening to them. We saved it. If I didn't do the tariffs from my first term, you wouldn't have one steel company here. You wouldn't have one steel. There wouldn't be a steel company alive in the United States.

And right now they're going to be thriving. They're doing very well, but they're going to be thriving.

Q. Are you still planning——

The President. They're going to be coming out. People are going to want to buy those steel companies like crazy.

Q. Are you still planning to mediate talks between Nippon Steel and U.S. Steel?

The President. Yes, I don't know. I think U.S. Steel, right now, has all the power. The tariffs have given U.S. Steel a new lease on life. Okay?

Thank you all very much. Thank you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:35 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Scott K.H. Bessent; Robert D. Isom, chief executive officer, American Airlines Group, Inc.; Scott Kirby, chief executive officer, United Airlines, Inc.; Prime Minister Justin P.J. Trudeau of Canada; Secretary General Mark Rutte of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; Secretary of Defense Peter B. Hegseth; former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Mark A. Milley, USA (Ret.); comedian and podcaster Joseph J. Rogan; former Presidents Barack Obama, George W. Bush, and Joseph R. Biden Jr.; and Director of National Intelligence Tulsi Gabbard. Reporters referred to Gavin Kliger, staff member, U.S. Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) Service; David B. Burrett, chief executive officer, U.S. Steel; and Eiji Hashimoto, chairman and chief executive officer, Nippon Steel Corp. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the audio was incomplete. The transcript was released by the Office of Communications on February 14.

Categories: Addresses and Remarks : Reciprocal trade and tariffs, signing the memorandum; Interviews With the News Media : Exchanges with reporters, White House.

Locations: Washington, DC.

Names: Bessent, Scott K.H.; Biden, Joseph R., Jr.; Bush, George W.; Gabbard, Tulsi; Greer, Jamieson L.; Hassett, Kevin A.; Isom, Robert A.; Kennedy, Robert F., Jr.; Kirby, Scott; Lutnick, Howard W.; McConnell, A. Mitchell; Milley, Mark A.; Modi, Narendra; Musk, Elon R.; Navarro, Peter K.; Obama, Barack; Putin, Vladimir Vladimirovich; Rogan, Joe; Rubio, Marco A.; Rutte, Mark; Scharf, William O.; Xi Jinping; Zelenskyy, Volodymyr.

Subjects: 2024 Presidential election; Afghanistan, withdrawal of U.S. military forces; Automobile industry, strengthening efforts; Canada, trade with U.S.; China, President; China, trade with U.S.; COVID-19 pandemic; Director of National Intelligence; European Union, trade with U.S.; Federal deficit and debt; Government Accountability Office; Group of Seven (G-7) nations; India, Prime Minister; India, trade with U.S.; Inflation; Internal Revenue Service; Job creation and growth; Manufacturing industry, domestic investment; National Economic Council; North Atlantic Treaty Organization; Nuclear disarmament, international efforts; President's Intelligence Advisory Board; Russia, conflict in Ukraine; Russia, President; Secretary of Commerce; Secretary of Health and Human Services; Secretary of State; Secretary of the Treasury; Senate confirmation process; Senior Counselor for Trade and Manufacturing; Tax Code reform; TikTok; U.S. DOGE Service; U.S. military readiness, improvement efforts; U.S. Space Force; U.S. Steel Corp.; U.S. tariffs on imports, adjustment; Ukraine, President; Ukraine, Russian invasion and airstrikes; Ukraine, U.S. assistance; White House Senior Adviser; White House Staff Secretary.

DCPD Number: DCPD202500259.