

NDP member Pauline Jewett pursued the question of research, suggesting that "...very frequently the President [of the United States] refers to research as if it included testing and development - indeed, everything short of deployment of SDI."¹⁴ Mr. Clark replied:

If what you are asking me to do,...is suggest it is our view that the United States Administration is now in breach, or is contemplating a breach, of its obligations under the ABM Treaty, no, I do not think that is the case.¹⁵

In the House of Commons, Mr. Johnston asked Mr. Clark about reports that Secretary of State Shultz said the allies should not be criticizing the broad interpretation and asked Mr. Clark to confirm that he had sent a letter to Mr. Shultz on this issue. Mr. Clark responded:

I can confirm that I have written to the US Secretary of State indicating the very grave importance Canada places on the US continuing to adhere to a restrictive interpretation of the ABM Treaty.¹⁶

Liberal member Donald Johnston called upon the Government to make it clear to Mr. Nitze that Canada supported the restrictive interpretation of the Treaty. He stated:

There is no need for a reinterpretation of that treaty. Although it was signed only by the two superpowers, it is not a private contract to be nit-picked by lawyers in the Kremlin and the White House simply to provide new interpretations which would permit the extensive testing of this new defensive system.¹⁷

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Commons Debates, 13 Feb. 1987, p. 3409.

¹⁷ Commons Debates, 4 Mar. 1987, p. 3799.