we might as well stop thinking about defence if we are dealing with insane people.

However, the danger is that if the U.S. starts building the Star Wars umbrella, or vice versa, the superpower that has not started first in building that umbrella is forced to assume that the enemy's umbrella will work to a fairly large extent, and is forced to fear that the enemy is planning a first strike—because a second strike does not work as well.

That means that should the Americans start building this umbrella first, as they are doing, the Soviets will have to say to themselves "We have to multiply our offensive weapons. This umbrella can stop 99 per cent of our 6,000 land-based warheads. Well, let us double the number. Then the penetration will be double and the Americans will not dare try a first strike." They will say "Let us increase the number of missiles we have on submarines and the Americans will not then try a first strike."

We can reverse the argument. If the Soviets build this umbrella first, the Americans will inevitably multiply the number of offensive missiles they have, so that they can saturate the Soviet Union. That means a new arms race.

It is not a military secret—it has appeared in the *New York Times* and the *Wall Street Journal* and we have had it confirmed to us by Americans we have met—that on several occasions there were accidents. In one of them the commander of NORAD was sitting at his console and he saw the Soviet missiles coming over the Pole; and he did his duty. He scrambled the bombers; he told the land-based missiles to start counting down; and he warned the submarines to fire. Six and a half minutes later it was discovered that it was a faulty silicon chip that had not functioned and had allowed an exercise to come through as if it were a real event. Let us not forget that the Soviet equivalent of that American general sits six and a half minutes flight time from our Pershing missiles in western Germany.

Each weapon is a potential accident. If we multiply the number of weapons that we are aiming at one another, we are multiplying the number of potential accidents. It is not that I trust the Russians. It is not that I think that if we disarmed they would not try to conquer first western Europe and then other parts of the world. The question simply is: Which is the best way to defend ourselves? We live in a world which has been compared to two scorpions in a bottle. We do not want to make either of those scorpions nervous. When one of the two scorpions says "I can nullify your sting by and by," the other scorpion may well sting first. That is the danger, and the danger of accidental release of a constantly increasing number of weapons.

It can be argued—and the French argued very successfully—that all you need is to be able to inflict upon your enemy damage that is unacceptable. I would argue that losing your first 50 cities is unacceptable damage, if you are the leader of the Kremlin or if you are the President of the United States. You go back into the Stone Age—and let us not even think of

nuclear winter, which is quite possible. The radiation effects alone would be enough to destroy future generations.

So it was from the beginning quite open to both sides to restrict themselves to having retaliatory forces that are simply enough to destroy the other's 50 cities. It happens now to be just one submarine. Okay, that might malfunction. So two submarines. Two might malfunction. Let us say four. Four means about 292 warheads on either side. That is below the nuclear winter threshold, and it is a small fraction of the 1.2 million Hiroshimas that are potentially there in the thermonuclear arsenals of the two superpowers.

Starting a new arms race, as the Star Wars Initiative does, is not to increase our safety or the safety of Americans—and thus the Canadians, who will fry along with them. It is to lessen it. It is therefore our duty, as a country, as a member of the human race, to say to the Americans: No, it is not prudent. It is dangerous. It is dangerous for you, our friends, our neighbours. We are your Siamese twins. We love you. We don't want to be anybody else's ally." If there were a winnable war, I would like to see the Americans win it. But there is not a winnable war. I do not want them to create more risks of accidentally bringing about the end of mankind.

Hon. Henry D. Hicks: Honourable senators, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. D. G. Steuart: Before the honourable senator adjourns the debate, perhaps he will permit me to say a few words?

Senator Hicks: Certainly.

Senator Steuart: Honourable senators, I thank Senator Hicks for allowing me to speak. If he then wishes to adjourn the debate, he may do so.

May I say at the outset that I am not an expert on Star Wars. In that context I join Senator Gigantès. He is not an expert on Star Wars. In that context I join Lloyd Axworthy of our Liberal Party, who also is not an expert on Star Wars, but who has had a great deal to say on Star Wars.

In that context I join Pauline Jewett of the NDP, who is also not an expert on Star Wars, but who has had a great deal to say about Star Wars. Then I also join the Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, who also is not an expert on Star Wars but who has a great deal to say about Star Wars.

This whole debate reminds me of 1939, when I was a young man, and there were a great many experts all over Canada speaking about Hitler, Germany, Japan, the new weapons they had, the number of ships, the number of guns, about everything; and the tone of the comments right across Canada, the United States, Great Britain and France was "Maybe if we just don't upset the Germans and the Japanese, they will go away." The two scorpions mentioned by Senator Gigantès were the Americans and the Germans. In fact, there were three at that time, because there were also the Japanese. We said "If we upset them, they will sting each other and we will all die." But it did not work.

Whether we like it or not, there are two sides in this world. There is our side and the American side, and then, of course,