

Hal departed the newspaper business and Miami to set up one of the more successful public relations businesses in Manhattan, but he never got printer's ink out of his blood or the sand out of his shoes. I'll miss the man more than I can say, because the real friends you make in a lifetime are not many. He was a top hand with newspapers, PR or anything to which he put his hand, but more important he was a man . . . a man of sincerity, integrity and strength. May he sleep well, and may his fine memory comfort his widow, Marion, and son, Rick. I am proud to have been his friend.

Another friend of many years, golf pro Ross Sobel, will appear on Wednesday's "Today" show and teach Hugh Downs the fundamentals of the great Scotch game. Ross gives lessons and holds clinics on the SS Ariadne.

When civilian Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance retired, he had several medals pinned on his chest, though Vance hadn't been in battle or done a heroic deed. Notice a general with his chest covered with "fruit salad." Most that hardware came from foreign countries, and was for being a general.

In some states the probate of wills has turned into a racket that has milked many an estate dry. Norman Dacey wrote a book called "How to Avoid Probate" designed to keep little people from being rooked. So a judge decided the book was an improper practice of law and banned its sale. Hitler burned any publication that exposed wrong doing in the Third Reich. The Supreme Court should decide if "book burning" techniques by judges is legal.

It probably would be asking the impossible, but has Stokely Carmichael ever considered that Negroes have become a senator, a Supreme Court judge and an astronaut, and that some of the highest paid people in sports and entertainment are black? Has he ever given thought that many at the bottom of the economic pile are there because they are lazy, lack ambition and won't even take the trouble to improve themselves? That goes for both black and white.

Some baseball fans seem to think the New York Mets the worst team the National League has ever known. They don't know the half of it. In 1883 the Philadelphia Phillies won 17 games and lost 81. They added a special touch, too. The Providence team shut them out 28-0. Those records have not been beaten, or even equalled in 84 years. So maybe the Mets aren't really as bad as they have seemed the past few years.

[From the New York Times, July 10, 1967]

HAL LEYSHON 66, PUBLICITY MAN—ACCOUNTS INCLUDED FLORIDA, TRUMAN AND PETRILLO

Hal I. Leyshon, a public-relations consultant who helped develop the images of Florida as a resort, President Harry S. Truman as a choice for election in 1948 and James Caesar Petrillo as "Friendly Jimmy" rather than as the "Czar of Music," died of a heart attack yesterday in Doctors Hospital. He was 66 years old and lived at 45 East 85th Street.

Hal Leyshon & Associates, the public-relations and legislative consultant firm he founded here in 1941, has for the last six years represented the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Leyshon, as editor of The Miami Daily News, directed that newspaper's Pulitzer Prize-winning exposé of venal Miami politics in 1938.

Mr. Leyshon entered public relations on two fronts when the United States declared war in 1941. He established his firm in Rockefeller Center and operated it, in absentia, while serving as a public information officer overseas and in Washington for the Army Air Forces.

He joined the service as a captain and later, as a major, was assigned to Supreme Headquarters shortly before the Normandy in-

vasion. He was released as a lieutenant colonel and resumed active direction of his organization here after V-E Day.

Mr. Leyshon conducted for the Air Power League the national campaign that preceded Congressional adoption of equal status among the services for the Air Force.

He was a consultant to the Democratic National Committee in the 1948 campaign in which President Truman defeated Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. At that time the Leyshon concern was also in the early stages of its long promotional program in behalf of tourism for the State of Florida.

Also in 1948, Mr. Leyshon became public-relations consultant to the American Federation of Musicians and its president, Mr. Petrillo, whose belligerent attitude had made him unpopular with the press and public.

In 1948, the musicians' union gave 15,000 free performances, ranging from symphonies to jazz duets, and Mr. Petrillo became music chairman of President Truman's inaugural.

Concerning his efforts in behalf of the union and its boss, Mr. Leyshon said:

"If you can make a man and his works available to the press of this country on a factual and timely basis, he is certain to get an even break. If newspapermen get the brushoff, they're going to give the brushoff."

BEGAN IN JOURNALISM

Mr. Leyshon was born in Mountain Ash, Ky., and attended Maryville (Tenn.) College.

During the Florida boom of the early nineteen-twenties he became Sunday editor of The Miami News and in 1925 directed publication of what was said to be the world's largest single issue: 604 pages.

Mr. Leyshon was successively the paper's news editor, managing editor and, from 1935 to 1941, editor. In 1938 he directed publication of the series of news stories, covering political malfeasance in Miami, that won for The News a Pulitzer Prize the following year.

During his years in Miami, Mr. Leyshon covered the development of Florida as a burgeoning resort area in many stories published by The New York Times.

Mr. Leyshon and John M. Redding were authors of "Skyways to Berlin," a book of Air Force exploits published in 1943. In 1950, he and Jack Kofoed wrote "Front Page Deadline," the story of a Pulitzer Prize-winning newspaper crusade in the South.

In recent years, Mr. Leyshon's firm continued its work for the Democratic National Committee and was a consultant to the American Red Cross, Trans World Airlines and other clients.

Mr. Leyshon was a member of the Overseas Press Club, the Miami Club, National Press Club and the Welsh Society of St. David's.

Surviving are his widow, the former Marion Pollard, and a son, Hal Richards Leyshon.

A funeral service will be held at 1 P.M. Wednesday at Frank E. Campbell's, Madison Avenue at 81st Street.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, first of all I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader if the reports on the District bills will be available before next Monday. I understand that the gentleman from Oklahoma asked for permission that they have until Saturday night to file reports.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. All I can say is, I hope they will be available. I am sure that the committee will make an effort to have them available to Members. They did not put down the most important bill on the agenda, so I assume that it will not be too difficult to have these reports ready.

Mr. GROSS. I am one of those who expect to be here, and I would like to have the reports and all the information that it is possible to obtain on those bills on Monday.

Mr. ALBERT. I trust and hope and believe that the gentleman will have them before we meet.

Mr. GROSS. Are any of those bills of an emergency nature?

Mr. ALBERT. I do not consider them to be of an emergency nature, but the committee has reported them and asked that we put them down. We do have other business that we have to take care of next week. I think it is the better part of wisdom to finish these bills next week.

Mr. GROSS. What other business? I heard the gentleman say that two or three times. I wonder what the other business is.

Mr. ALBERT. The adjournment resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ALBERT. We must have a quorum here for the purpose of enacting that.

Mr. GROSS. On what date does the gentleman anticipate he will call up the adjournment resolution?

Mr. ALBERT. I hope we can do it Monday, but we have to deal with another body on that matter. If possible, I would like to do it on Monday.

Mr. GROSS. The point I am trying to arrive at is why, if there is to be no serious business next week other than the conference report, which might well have been taken care of tomorrow, and then have an adjournment for a 2-week period rather than 10 days. Are we going through some sort of a gesture as far as holding sessions next week is concerned other than the conference report?

Mr. ALBERT. The conference report will not be brought up next week. The conference report will be brought up on the 12th of September.

Mr. GROSS. Then, all we have is the District bills on Monday, plus the adjournment resolution?

Mr. ALBERT. And the adjournment resolution. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And we are going to stay in session next week for this purpose?

Mr. ALBERT. I would advise the gentleman that it is absolutely necessary to stay in session for the purpose of getting the adjournment resolution passed. This is a matter with which we must deal with the other body.

Mr. GROSS. What period of time will the adjournment resolution be for? For 10 days?

Mr. ALBERT. Approximately, yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to join in wishing the President the best for his birthday, and hope that he has a fine time with his family

H11220

on that day. We are very proud of him in these difficult times. He is a former Member of this House who has been selected for the highest office in the land. We often disagree and we sometimes agree. Nevertheless, we know he is President of the United States, and he has our best wishes on this happy day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no question.

file. nr

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS ON THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION IN GREECE

(Mr. BRADEMÁS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity a few days ago, together with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. KYROS], to visit Greece, and because that country has experienced a significant change in government in recent months, I take this time to make a brief report on my impressions, after a week's stay.

I do not pretend that these comments represent a thorough or exhaustive survey of the present political picture in Greece, for such a survey was not possible. Congressman KYROS and I were in Athens at the invitation of His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos, of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America, for the purpose of attending meetings held there of the Archdiocesan Council of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America. I might say, parenthetically, that during our visit we also had the high privilege of talking in Istanbul to His All Holiness Patriarch Athenagoras I, Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and spiritual leader of Eastern Orthodoxy.

Although I did not undertake an exhaustive survey of the political scene in Greece, I nonetheless had an opportunity to talk to a number of persons representing a wide spectrum of political opinion in Greece, including both persons of the highest level of the present Government and persons very strongly opposed to that Government. Naturally, I talked to members of the American Embassy staff in Athens and I also had the opportunity to meet briefly King Constantine, who is expected to visit the United States shortly.

Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1967, I addressed the House concerning the military coup which took place on April 21, 1967, and which resulted in the overthrow of the Government of Greece shortly before the elections that were

scheduled for late May. I said then that I was deeply distressed by the military coup and that as an American of Greek origin, I was particularly saddened to see the legitimate Government of the birthplace of democracy scrapped by a group of Army officers. I went on to express certain reservations about the political situation in Greece.

FOR EARLIEST POSSIBLE RETURN OF CONSTITUTIONAL DEMOCRACY

I said that I hoped that at the earliest possible moment there would be a return to the processes of constitutional, parliamentary democracy in Greece. I noted the April 26, 1967, statement of King Constantine in which the King declared:

My ardent wish is also for the earliest possible return to the country to parliamentary government.

On April 28, 1967, Secretary of State Dean Rusk also made clear that the U.S. Government officially supports the earliest return of democratic institutions in Greece. As Secretary Rusk said then:

We are now awaiting concrete evidence that the new Greek government will make every effort to reestablish democratic institutions which have been an integral part of Greek political life.

Now I should here note, Mr. Speaker, that there has been established by the new Greek Government a constitutional commission composed of persons eminent in Greek professional and public life who have been charged with the responsibility of revising the present Constitution of Greece. This commission is scheduled to complete its work by November 30, 1967.

The revised constitution is then to be submitted to the present Government for its review and recommendations following which, the Government has stated, a plebiscite will be conducted in the country on the revised constitution.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSION

Obviously, one of the key factors in any consideration of the political future of Greece is the work of this constitutional commission and the implementation of its work. Differing people with whom I spoke in Greece expressed differing views on such questions as whether, in fact, the present military government will allow the constitutional commission to complete its mission. A related question is whether or not, if the commission is permitted to write a revised constitution, the government will allow it to be put into effect within a reasonable period of time and with the free election which have come to be regarded as a at least one of the hallmarks of a genuinely free and democratic and constitutional government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it here important for me to note that leaders at the highest level of the present Government of Greece assured me, in response to my questions, that it should be possible for the constitutional commission to present the Government the revised constitution within the period of time which has been set by the Government for that purpose, that is, 6 months. This would mean that the date for termination of the commission's work would be November 30, 1967.

I was also assured by people of the highest authority in the present Government that all members of the Government are anxious to see the work of the commission progress as rapidly as possible to the point that Greece can return to constitutional rule as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I made clear in these conversations that I was most encouraged to hear this pledge because I was confident that most Members of Congress, most Americans, and most of the people of the free world would like to see Greece return as soon as possible to constitutional forms of government since one of the principal purposes of the Western alliance, of which Greece is a part, is the protection of free and constitutional government.

Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that Members of Congress as well as the President and all those in the executive branch charged with the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy will follow with great interest the efforts of the present government of Greece to carry out this stated intention of seeing a new constitution prepared and put into effect as soon as possible. The progress made on this matter will certainly be a key to the political future of Greece as a member of the alliance of Western democracies.

CONCRETE EVIDENCE

I should here note, Mr. Speaker, that one of the concerns I heard expressed by a number of Greeks of moderate opinion is that, in Secretary Rusk's phrase, if there is no "concrete evidence that the new Greek Government will make every effort to reestablish democratic institutions," there is a serious danger that opposition to the present regime will be built up in such fashion as to lead to violence and a situation which could be of advantage chiefly to the Communists.

Although I was gratified to hear leaders of the present government of Greece assure me of their earnest intention to return the country to constitutional rule, I nonetheless believe it wise for the U.S. Government, which presently has a military aid agreement with Greece, to continue our present suspension of major shipments under this agreement pending a review of this assistance to determine if it is any longer justifiable. In this connection, I note that Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara made the following statement in May of this year to the Greek Minister of Defense, Lt. Gen. Gregory Spandidakis:

I told General Spandidakis that it would be very difficult for us to proceed with our military aid program unless there was an indication that his government did intend to preserve the constitutional guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the important role that Greece plays in NATO and while I believe that our Government should continue to be concerned with the place of Greece in our security arrangements through NATO, I see no compelling reason, at least at this time, to change the policy voiced by Secretary McNamara.

RESTRICTIONS ON FREEDOMS

There is, it should be here stated, considerable difference among the several observers of and participants in Greek

politics with whom I talked about the earnestness of intention of the government to return to constitutional democracy. Censorship of the press now prevails and although the new official in charge of press affairs, himself a long-time newspaper columnist with a distinguished reputation, assured me that there would soon be full press freedom, I saw no signs of this development while I was in Greece and I therefore expressed to this press official a frank skepticism about his prediction.

It is perhaps not surprising that a number of my own conversations with persons formerly active in politics—and I here include people who in the United States would be described as holding moderate to conservative views—were conducted, at their request, behind closed doors.

Mr. Speaker, the present government requires anyone planning to invite more than five persons to his home to secure permission from the police. In this connection, I am sure that most Members of Congress were astonished at the severity of the prison sentence—5 years—imposed a few days ago on a former Foreign Minister of Greece, Evangelos Averoff, for holding a social gathering without a police permit. The fact that the present Prime Minister of Greece, Constantine Kollias, said that his government would recommend a pardon for the former Foreign Minister does not diminish the significance of such an action. I might here note that Mr. Averoff was the Foreign Minister of Greece during the conservative administration of Prime Minister Constantine Karamanlis.

Probably the most disconcerting evidence that there is still a considerable degree of what most people would regard as a characteristic of a police state rather than a democracy is the fact that there are still many political figures under arrest in Greece, either in prison or under house surveillance. This includes some former members of the Greek Parliament of different political parties. I understand that about half of the political prisoners have now been released, but my point still holds true.

If I may summarize my observations, then, Mr. Speaker, the present military regime in Greece has pledged to return the country to constitutional government. My own judgment, on the basis of my observations, is that there is so far little evidence that the Government has taken what Secretary Rusk, to repeat, calls "concrete steps" in this direction or that it intends to do so. I believe that it should be the continuing policy of the U.S. Government to encourage the present regime in Greece to make good on its own stated intentions.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that Greek politics in the months prior to the military coup had been plagued by instability, and I realize as well that there are no easy alternatives to the present situation in Greece. I am confident, however, that most Members of Congress and most of the American people would agree that the presence of a military dictatorship in Greece for any lengthy period of time would be disastrous for the cradle of democracy and would make a mockery of what is after all the principal purpose of the Western alliance—freedom.

PROPOSED NONPROLIFERATION TREATY

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at 10 a.m., this morning, eastern standard time, Ambassador William C. Foster, on behalf of the United States, officially introduced a proposed treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons at the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva. At the same time the representative of the U.S.S.R., Ambassador Alexei Roshchin, introduced a similar treaty on behalf of his country. I have used the word similar because until we have had an opportunity to review the Soviet proposed treaty in detail, we of course cannot be certain that it is identical in all respects to the U.S. proposal.

The proposed treaties introduced this morning represent the culmination of 3½ years of conscientious and difficult negotiations by Ambassador Foster and his able associates in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with representatives of our allies, the so-called neutral nations of the world, and representatives from behind the Iron Curtain. Ambassador Foster and his associates are to be commended for their work. Our Nation as well as all nations of the world owes a debt of gratitude to the representatives of the United States, the representatives of the U.S.S.R., and the representatives of the other nations who have been and are now engaged in the difficult and demanding responsibility of negotiating an acceptable and effective treaty to help prevent further proliferation of nuclear weapons in this dangerous world in which we live.

There is, I believe, a new sense of urgency recognized by both the United States and the U.S.S.R. that any additional entries into the nuclear weapons club must be discouraged. The unexpectedly fast technological accomplishments of the Chinese Communists in developing and testing nuclear and thermonuclear devices, coupled with their rapid development of IRBM and ICBM delivery systems, give greater emphasis to the importance of bringing nuclear weapons under international control. Although there is very little possibility at this time that Communist China will be a signatory to any nonproliferation treaty, it is imperative that we make every effort to bring as many nations as possible into agreement not to further any additional proliferation of nuclear weapons. We must also work toward the day when the people of China can be brought within the family of all nations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the proposed treaty tabled this morning in Geneva. You will note that it contains eight separate articles. One article—article III—has been left blank. The reason is that, whereas the United States and the U.S.S.R. both recognize the necessity for some type of international inspection system, we have not as yet reached agreement as to how this may best be accomplished. During the upcoming sessions of the conference,

we will hopefully negotiate accepted language. The remaining articles are expected to be identical with the proposed treaty tabled by the U.S.S.R. I believe it is most significant that, in these troublesome days when there is such a strong difference of opinion between our country and the U.S.S.R. over Vietnam and other matters, both nations recognize the importance of a nonproliferation agreement and that such a major step is possible between the two.

AUGUST 24, 1967.

DRAFT TREATY ON THE NONPROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The States concluding this Treaty, hereinafter referred to as the "Parties to the Treaty."

Considering the devastation that would be visited upon all mankind by a nuclear war and the consequent need to make every effort to avert the danger of such a war and to take measures to safeguard the security of peoples,

Believing that the proliferation of nuclear weapons would seriously enhance the danger of nuclear war,

In conformity with resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly calling for the conclusion of an agreement on the prevention of wider dissemination of nuclear weapons,

Undertaking to cooperate in facilitating the application of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities,

Expressing their support for research, development and other efforts to further the application, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards system, of the principle of safeguarding effectively the flow of source and special fissionable materials by use of instruments and other techniques at certain strategic points,

Affirming the principle that the benefits or peaceful applications of nuclear technology, including any technological by-products which may be derived by nuclear-weapon States from the development of nuclear explosive devices, should be available for peaceful purposes to all Parties to the Treaty, whether nuclear-weapon or non-nuclear-weapon States,

Convinced that in furtherance of this principle, all Parties to this Treaty are entitled to participate in the fullest possible exchange of scientific information for, and to contribute alone or in cooperation with other States to, the further development of the applications of atomic energy for peaceful purposes,

Declaring their intention that potential benefits from any peaceful applications of nuclear explosions should be available through appropriate international procedures to non-nuclear-weapon States Party to this Treaty on a non-discriminatory basis and that the charge to such Parties for the explosive devices used should be as low as possible and exclude any charge for research and development,

Declaring their intention to achieve at the earliest possible date the cessation of the nuclear arms race,

Urging the cooperation of all States in the attainment of this objective,

Desiring to further the easing of international tension and the strengthening of trust between States in order to facilitate the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons, the liquidation of all their existing stockpiles, and the elimination from national arsenals of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery pursuant to a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control,

Noting that nothing in this Treaty affects the right of any group of States to conclude regional treaties in order to assure the total

August 25, 1967

absence of nuclear weapons in their respective territories,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Each nuclear-weapon State Party to this Treaty undertakes not to transfer to any recipient whatsoever nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly; and not in any way to assist, encourage, or induce any non-nuclear-weapon State to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, or control over such weapons or explosive devices.

ARTICLE II

Each non-nuclear-weapon State Party to this Treaty undertakes not to receive the transfer from any transferor whatsoever of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or of control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly; not to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices; and not to seek or receive any assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

ARTICLE III

(International control)

ARTICLE IV

Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I and II of this Treaty, as well as the right of the Parties to participate in the fullest possible exchange of information for, and to contribute alone or in cooperation with the States to, the further development of the applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

ARTICLE V

1. Any Party to this Treaty may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depository Government which shall circulate it to all Parties to the Treaty. Thereupon, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties to the Treaty, the Depository Governments shall convene a conference, to which they shall invite all the Parties to the Treaty, to consider such an amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the Parties to the Treaty, including the votes of all nuclear-weapon States Party to this Treaty and all other Parties which, on the date the amendment is circulated, are members of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The amendment shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the Parties, including the instruments of ratification of all nuclear-weapon States Party to this Treaty and all other Parties which, on the date the amendment is circulated, are members of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

3. Five years after the entry into force of this Treaty, a conference of Parties to the Treaty shall be held in Geneva, Switzerland, in order to review the operation of this Treaty with a view to assuring that the purposes and provisions of the Treaty are being realized.

ARTICLE VI

1. This Treaty shall be open to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign the Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this Article may accede to it at any time.

2. The Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of _____,

which are hereby designated the Depository Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force after its ratification by all nuclear-weapon States signatory to this Treaty, and _____ other States signatory to this Treaty, and the deposit of their instruments of ratification. For the purposes of this Treaty, a nuclear-weapon State is one which has manufactured and exploded a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device prior to January 1, 1967.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depository Governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification or of accession, the date of the entry into force of this Treaty, and the date of receipt of any requests for convening a conference or other notices.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depository Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE VII

This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration. Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the Treaty and to the United Nations Security Council three months in advance. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events it regards as having jeopardized its supreme interests.

ARTICLE VIII

This Treaty, the English, Russian, French, Spanish and Chinese texts of which are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depository Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depository Governments to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

Done in _____ at _____ this _____ day of _____.

BACKGROUND ON DRAFT NONPROLIFERATION TREATY, AUGUST 24, 1967

The draft nuclear non-proliferation treaty tabled at Geneva today is comprised of a preamble and eight articles.

The draft was worked out between the co-chairmen of the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference, the United States and the Soviet Union, in consultation with their allies. It has been recommended by the U.S. and the Soviet co-chairmen for discussion and negotiation in the ENDC and for the consideration of all governments. Its tabling allows the other participants in the conference, including eight non-aligned nations, to join in working out a final treaty draft which can then be put before other governments, probably at the coming UN General Assembly.

The central core of the draft lies in Articles I and II. Essentially, they would bind nuclear weapon powers not to transfer nuclear weapons to non-nuclear-weapon powers, and the latter not to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons. These undertakings also apply to "other nuclear explosive devices", which would be prohibited because they and the technology of their development are essentially indistinguishable from nuclear weapons.

The treaty deals with what is prohibited, not what is permitted. Thus Articles I and II prohibit any arrangement involving transfer of nuclear weapons, directly or indirectly.

But the treaty does not, for example, prevent NATO consultation and planning for its nuclear defense or the permanent NATO committee established for this purpose since no transfer of nuclear weapons or devices is involved.

The preamble declares the intent of signatories to work for other measures to halt a nuclear arms race, supports the principle of regional nuclear free zones, and expresses the intention to share potential benefits of peaceful explosions without discrimination and to seek reduction of the intrusiveness of physical inspection through development of automated safeguards.

Article III, on safeguards, is left blank in the draft, because all the points at issue have not been resolved in the past several months of discussions. However, the area of agreement on the treaty as a whole is so great that the United States and the Soviet Union believe the present draft should be brought to the consideration of the whole conference, while the co-chairmen continue to seek an acceptable formulation on safeguards.

Presently there are two international systems of safeguards, those of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and of the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM). While the United States has followed a policy of seeking a worldwide safeguards system, it realizes that EURATOM countries wish to maintain the safeguards system they have already established, which they view as an important element of progress towards European unity. The United States, therefore, believes the treaty should include effective, mandatory safeguards administered on a worldwide basis in a way that takes existing EURATOM safeguards into account.

The Soviet Union holds that the treaty should include mandatory safeguards, administered by the IAEA, on all non-nuclear parties. For treaty purposes the Soviets consider administration of safeguards by EURATOM to be "self-inspection", i.e. allies checking on allies.

Article IV would assure non-nuclear-weapon states that the treaty would not impede peaceful nuclear developments, recognizing the right of participants to exchange information and contribute, alone or in cooperation with others, to further development of peaceful applications. Such national development and international cooperation applies to research, production and use as well as to information equipment and materials.

Article V prescribes the procedure for amendments, which would require a majority vote, including those of all parties having nuclear weapons and of parties who are members of the IAEA Board of Governors at the time the amendment is considered. This clause is designed to ensure that amendments desired by the majority have a fair chance of adoption while at the same time preventing amendments lacking wide support among countries having advanced peaceful nuclear programs.

Article V also provides for a review of the operation of the treaty after five years, providing non-weapon states a forum to express any dissatisfaction they feel with progress toward disarmament.

Article VI deals with signatures and entry into force, in language comparable to that of the existing limited test ban treaty. The number of signatures to be required to bring the treaty into force has not been decided. The United States has no specific view on this matter, but believes the number should be large enough to allow the treaty to start achieving its purpose as soon as it enters into force.

Article VI defines nuclear-weapon powers as those possessing such weapons on January 1, 1967. This date was chosen to freeze the number at the present five, by preventing other states from achieving the status of a