

and the Government responded that they "would continue to press both the United States and the Soviet Union to maintain the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty until an updated treaty is in place".¹ In a statement to the House of Commons, Secretary of State, Joe Clark outlined this position further. He said:

Our interest in Canada is to ensure strict adherence to that Treaty, and continued respect by both sides for the integrity of this fundamental arms control document.²

Addressing the question of what limits the Treaty places on research into ABM systems Mr. Clark stated:

Its text [the ABM Treaty] does not refer directly to research, although the private negotiating record of either side may mention research. The agreement on what precisely is intended in that Treaty is for these two Governments which are the parties to the agreement to work out.³

In response to questioning in the House of Commons as to the Canadian position on how the ABM Treaty limits research, Mr. Clark reiterated the idea that it was up to the two parties to that Treaty to come to an agreement:

...that is an issue, a disagreement between the two parties signatory to the ABM Treaty. ...there is a written treaty that makes no reference to research, and...there might be private documents in the hands of both the Soviet Union and the United States which might elaborate on other agreements that they made with respect to research. Only they can know that. All that we can ask is that the integrity of the ABM Treaty be respected and that there be a strict adherence to it. That is the position of the Government of Canada.⁴

¹ DEA Canada's International Relations, Dec. 1986, p. 47.

² Commons Debates, 21 Oct. 1986, pp. 553-4.

³ Ibid., p. 553.

⁴ Ibid., p. 581.