

We took account of that and secured from the President of the United States through the direct intervention of the Prime Minister at the Summit the affirmations that were stated by both leaders.

* * *

● (1140)

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NICARAGUA—CANADIAN POSITION—PRIME MINISTER'S DISCUSSIONS WITH UNITED STATES PRESIDENT

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Saint-Henri-Westmount): Mr. Speaker, with all respect to the Secretary of State, I am sure you would like to know, as we would, what actually transpired at the meeting at which the Secretary of State was not present. Let me ask the Prime Minister, after what he considers his triumph in convincing President Reagan that acid rain is a problem, did he try to convince the President that the Nicaraguan policy is also a problem, and did he tell the President that Canada is firmly opposed to military aid to the Contras? I know the Secretary of State was not there so I would like to hear the answer from the Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I never said that the results of the acid rain discussions were a triumph. They just appear to be a triumph given the lack of action by the Liberals over five years. That is the difference.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: What we said was that there was very serious and substantial progress made and that they will—

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Just a giant step.

Mr. Mulroney: Our Liberal friends are mortified by their own record, as they should be, and I know—

Mr. Broadbent: Right.

Mr. Mulroney: The Leader of the NDP agrees. This is a rare day.

Mr. Broadbent: It's my birthday.

Mr. Mulroney: It is his birthday now.

This is solid and steady progress. This is a problem that has developed over many decades and is not going to be cured over night, but we have now in hand a mechanism that will deal with it—

Mr. Johnston: Nicaragua is the question.

Mr. Mulroney: He would like to hear from me on Nicaragua.

Mr. Johnston: That was the question.

Oral Questions

Mr. Mulroney: The answer is that I, of course, raised Canada's position on Nicaragua with the President and with Secretary Shultz and others in Washington.

* * *

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

BOUNDARY WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs. It is reported in this weeks *Maclean's* that the Minister cut a backroom deal with George Shultz on the voyage of the *Polar Sea* through Canada's Arctic and in fact in Washington agreed on the terms for such a voyage three months in advance. Having perhaps not been entirely candid with Canadians about the *Polar Sea* incident, how can British Columbians find any reason to trust that the Government has not already cut a deal on the AB Line, the Beaufort Sea and the Strait of Juan de Fuca, in the interests of the United States?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for asking that question because it provides me with the opportunity to place on the record the fact that the report in *Maclean's* magazine was totally false. With regard to the concerns of the Nishka people, the other day I had the opportunity, as the Hon. Member knows, to meet with representatives of the Nishka people who are concerned about their traditional rights to offshore British Columbia. I found it to be a very valuable conversation, and I think they found it reassuring.

OBJECT OF DISCUSSIONS

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, the article in *Maclean's* is not an editorial. It quotes Canadian officials. I wonder if the Minister would explain to the House why he and the B.C. Government are discussing the movement of West Coast Canada-U.S. boundaries like the AB Line. Does not the axiom "if it isn't broken, don't fix it" hold in the case of Canada's sovereign boundaries?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is often difficult to know if opinions put forward in *Maclean's* magazines are stories or opinions. Whatever they are, this one was false.

With regard to why we are discussing with the Government of British Columbia whether or not it would be useful for us to discuss with the United States a negotiation to bring clarity to a situation about which there is now dispute, it is precisely because clarity is better than a lack of clarity. I made it very clear on several occasions that if it is not in Canada's interests to enter into those negotiations, we will not do so. If, once in those negotiations, we will not do so. If, once in those negotiations, it is not in Canada's interests to conclude an agreement, we will not conclude an agreement.