

of men and women, of the death or crippling of civilization, as we know it. With the continuation of the nuclear arms race, there is no end in sight except nuclear war. If there is shortsighted concentration on supposed national security interests and prestige, and a refusal to agree to any measure which will check or prevent further expansion of the nuclear armaments race, those who refuse are voting for nuclear war-- nuclear war that may be decades away, but which will surely come.

I wish to draw attention to the sections on the economic and security implications of acquiring nuclear weapons, in the light of our hope that we shall have a non-proliferation treaty open for signature before long. The Secretary-General's report points out the many implications and problems involved in the decision to become a nuclear weapon state and argues strongly against further spread of nuclear weapons.

There is no doubt that the cost in economic terms would be high; an additional annual expenditure of \$170 million dollars a year to develop a modest nuclear armament. Yet, even this estimate should be considered on the low side, since, as the report notes, this figure is derived from a comparison of government expenditures on defence, education and health, and such expenditures are subject to different systems of accounting and rates of currency exchange throughout the world. Furthermore, defence expenditures vary from year to year and proportionally from country to country. I believe we should pay attention not to the bare statistics but to the experts' observations about potential cost. A large number of variable factors indicates that nuclear weapons cost could be much higher than annual expenditure of \$170 million dollars. Some of these variables mentioned in the report are: expected increase in cost in countries lacking highly-developed scientific, technical and industrial capability--probability that possession of unsophisticated nuclear weapons will lead to the demand for sophisticated nuclear weapons--liability of delivery systems to very large overruns in development costs--and relatively greater impact of re-allocation of funds away from peaceful development in developing countries with a relatively low standard of living. It should be noted that the report states that the acquisition of nuclear weapons system could, under certain circumstances, cost in the vicinity of \$800 million to \$900 million dollars annually for a ten-year period of development of the system, rather than \$170 million dollars.

We think it evident that the cost of developing^a nuclear weapons system would be very high for no matter what country, at whatever level of development. But let us suppose that a country decided that the cost was bearable; would development of nuclear weapons necessarily enhance its security?