

Treaty. Furthermore, not only did our External Affairs Minister correctly stress the restrictive interpretation and correctly point out that Mr. Shultz, in disagreement with some other U.S. officials, had taken this restrictive interpretation, since the two key members of the U.S. delegation who in fact negotiated the ABM Treaty have confirmed that the intent and wording of the ABM Treaty was to exclude the development and testing of systems like star wars. Mr. Gerard Smith and Mr. John Rhinelander, two principals of the team that the Americans had negotiating the ABM Treaty, are saying that that treaty prohibits quite categorically the development and testing of a star wars type system. That is precisely what President Reagan was insisting upon as the United States, right at Reykjavik.

In today's statement the Secretary of State for External Affairs made no reference whatsoever to this crucial point, which is the nub of the issue. Why is the Secretary of State for External Affairs avoiding the central question? It is one matter to go and talk about the precise limits of research, but it is quite another to miss the key point, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs has done.

Not many weeks ago he was quite happy to talk in specific reference to the ABM Treaty and a restrictive definition. Now he has shifted ground entirely and says that what is at issue and what must be talked about, according to the Secretary of State, are: "the limits on permissible research which now has become the issue". Surely such a narrow discussion as "the limits on permissible research" is now described as the issue only because the United States administration has refused to back away from insisting on its right to test and deploy the star wars system. Instead of forthrightly criticizing the Reagan administration for this, the Secretary of State for External Affairs is now helping them get the focus away from their desire to violate the ABM Treaty. I say to the Minister that this is unacceptable to the people of Canada and unacceptable to all those who want independent nations to work toward disarmament at this point in world history.

Surely Canada must show some real independence in this matter. We must be telling the Reagan administration that it is wrong. The Secretary of State for External Affairs says: "It is not a question of saying yes or no to SDI but of finding a way of managing the research on defensive systems in which both sides are engaged". With respect, I say to the Minister that he is wrong. It is a matter of saying no to SDI, whether it is developed in the Soviet Union or the United States. The ABM Treaty was quite specifically designed to avoid the development of new technologies for this kind of weapons system. It is time that we put an end to this kind of lunacy in the world and we have an obligation to say so.

What seems to be clearly involved in the pursuit of the Reagan administration—not the American people—is the scuttling of the ABM Treaty. The Minister talked about looking at these new grounds for discussion and new grounds for agreement. I ask him, what use can a new agreement be if

we stand by and watch either one of the superpowers undermine existing agreements? We have now a rather fragile instrument in the world in this field and that is the ABM Treaty. We have an obligation as a nation not to stand back and let the superpowers do whatever they will. We must exercise our influence with dispassion, with care and with intelligence, and that means when one of them is clearly wrong we should say they are wrong. When one of them is taking steps which could seriously jeopardize the development of peace, we should be saying so.

● (1140)

I want to say in this context that the Right Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau—despite all those other particular matters about which my Party and I disagreed with him—had an appropriate sense of the role that Canada could play. He, along with Olaf Palme, the Prime Minister of India and the President of Mexico, had shown remarkable independence in criticizing both the United States and the Soviet Union when they were wrong. I wish we had that kind of independent thought functioning in foreign policy, especially on disarmament, today.

I urge the Secretary of State for External Affairs to think carefully about what he has said, note that he missed the essence of the problem, reconsider his policy and start showing some independence which could have some concrete results leading to disarmament in this world of ours.

* * *

NATIONAL ANTHEM ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-232, an Act to amend the National Anthem Act.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the Hon. Member have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Crosby: Mr. Speaker, this Bill to amend the National Anthem Act remedies a situation which has existed in the words of our National Anthem "O Canada" since it was first approved by the Parliament of Canada, particularly the reference to "all our sons" which leaves out a very important sex in our society. This amendment would eliminate those words "all our sons" and replace them with the words "all of us", thereby eliminating the sexist reference in our National Anthem.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.