

HUMPHREY FOR PRESIDENT COMMITTEE  
Suite 740 Roosevelt Hotel  
Washington 9, D. C.  
ADams 2-3411

FOR RELEASE: *on delivery*  
Tuesday ~~1959~~, November 17, 1959

HUMPHREY RENEWS CALL FOR NUCLEAR TEST BAN EXTENSION

IDAHO FALLS, Ida., Nov. 17 -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey today renewed his call for a year's extension of the ban on nuclear testing "so long as good faith negotiations continue" at the Geneva talks.

Declaring in a luncheon talk here that "tremendous pressure" is being exerted on President Eisenhower to let test-suspension expire January 1, Senator Humphrey said "it would be a very great mistake" for the U. S. to resume testing.

"It would turn world opinion against us, and give the Soviet Union a tremendous advantage in the battle for men's minds," the Minnesota Democrat said. "And it would jeopardize a conference which is coming as close to success as any arms control conference has come since the end of the war."

Extension of the ban was first urged by Senator Humphrey in a speech at Pontiac, Mich., on October 10. He was the first of the potential candidates for President to call for extension of the ban. Senator Humphrey is chairman of the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee. He spoke at a meeting of party workers and employees of the atomic energy plant at Arco.

Senator Humphrey paid compliment to Idaho Senator Frank Church, a member of the Disarmament Subcommittee, "for his vision and understanding which have brought new insight to this problem. I join with him in saying we must not let negotiations end in failure."

Although he would extend the ban, Senator Humphrey also said, "I would make it very clear that these temporary extensions will not be extended repeatedly. I would say that one more year will be our limit for suspension without agreement. . . Further, I

(more)

2 - Humphrey

would make it clear immediately that if and when the United States resumes testing, it will under no circumstances conduct tests in the atmosphere -- from ground level to outer space.

Senator Humphrey also urged that the three nuclear powers negotiating at Geneva (U. S., Great Britain and the Soviet Union) set up a test monitoring system under U.N. auspices to check the feasibility of any control arrangement.

"I do not look anxiously for an agreement on stopping nuclear tests merely because I want to eliminate fallout," the Senator declared. "I want to see a world-wide system of guaranteed mutual disarmament. I want to substitute a rational world security system for the present arms race which carries the potential of total world destruction."

"I think a ban on nuclear tests is the most negotiable first step."

Taking issue with claims that the Geneva negotiations have reached a dead end," Senator Humphrey said, "The record does not bear this out. It shows that the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union have agreed on 17 separate items of a draft treaty."

At the same time, he said, the U. S. should exert efforts toward pressing ahead in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy. "We need to achieve breakthroughs in the use of atomic energy for medical purposes and for sources of power and fuel. This will be important to the fuel-deficient areas of the world. Atomic energy also holds the key to the de-salting of sea water for use in arid lands."

000023

SENATOR'S READING COPY

Idaho Falls, Idaho -- November 17, 1959

Natl Reactor Testing Station

USSR  
visit

- Exchanges  
- Education  
- Enthusiasm

The three-power conference on discontinuance of nuclear tests has been in session at Geneva for more than a year.

Many people are telling us that the negotiations have reached a dead end.

17  
The record does not bear this out. It shows that the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union have agreed on 17 separate items of a draft treaty. Indeed, only last week the Soviet Union began to show interest in the Western suggestion for the creation of a technical subcommittee which could iron out some of the most difficult remaining problems.

Test Susp  
Major problems lie ahead. I would be the last to say that they are all solved, or even that a solution is near. But we must leave no stone unturned in our efforts to try to achieve an international test suspension, with effective inspection and control.

President Eisenhower has announced that the United States would suspend all nuclear tests for a year while these negotiations are in progress. The year ended on November 1, but was extended to January 1.

Tremendous pressure is being placed upon President Eisenhower to urge him to announce that we will not extend this ban. The Atomic Energy Commission says we should resume tests as soon as possible.

It would be a very great mistake for the United States to resume testing in January. It would turn world opinion against us,

and give the Soviet Union a tremendous advantage in the battle for men's minds. And it would jeopardize a conference which is coming as close to success as any arms control conference has come since the end of the war.

(more)  
But / Instead of this I would urge the President to announce now, that the United States will extend it for a full second year, so long as good faith negotiations continue.

But / But I would make it very clear that these temporary suspensions will not be extended repeatedly. They should not stretch out into a permanent suspension without any kind of inspection. I would say that two years will be our limit for suspension without agreement, and I would urge that our negotiators at Geneva work hard to achieve an agreement on inspection before the second year ends. Two years is not too long to allow for negotiations, but it is long enough.

Further, I would make it clear immediately, that if and when the United States resumes testing, it will under no circumstances conduct tests in the atmosphere--from ground level to outer space. As many scientists have pointed out, and as your brilliant Senator -- Frank Church -- has pointed out, these tests produce radioactive fallout which is injurious to health at home and abroad. If tests are resumed, they should be conducted under the ground or in outer space.

I want to ~~pay~~ compliment ~~to~~ Senator Church as an invaluable member of the Disarmament Subcommittee. We are all indebted to him for his vision and understanding, which have brought new insight

to this problem. I join with him in saying we must not let negotiations end in failure.

But I do not look anxiously for an agreement on stopping nuclear tests merely because I want to eliminate fallout. I want to see a world-wide system of guaranteed mutual disarmament. I want to substitute a rational world security system for the present arms race which carries the potential of total world destruction.

1st Step! I think a ban on nuclear tests is the most negotiable first step. And I think the achievement of that first step will do a great deal to lessen international tension and to prove to the Russians that they can live with an equitable and fair international inspection system, just as we can.

The main problem at Geneva is the creation of an international inspectorate which will make it possible for both sides to know that the treaty is being observed. Obviously we can make no steps toward disarmament without such assurance. The Russians have resisted inspection for many reasons. One of them is an historic Russian unwillingness to let strangers tour the country and look where they like.

At the moment there is a disagreement between Russian scientists and American scientists on the adequacy of the control system to detect underground explosions. This question might be resolved by a technical discussion between experts, and perhaps a few actual experiments. I am happy to note that the Russians are beginning to show some willingness to discuss this on this basis.

Personally, however, I would want to carry these technical discussions a little further.

Before we can be convinced that any test control arrangement



would work, I think we would have to test it in actual use. For this reason I have urged the State Department that the three nuclear powers at Geneva set up a test monitoring system. This would be for both underground and atmospheric explosions, under U. N. auspices.

I would like to see <sup>Atmospheric</sup> an agreement started by stages rather than no agreement at all. I would start with inspection of explosions that are quite easy to detect, five kilotons and over. An actual test grid would make it possible to tell what the monitoring system will need in the light of actual practice. It will enable us to see exactly what our instruments can identify and what they will not. To what extent can we rely upon our seismograph readings? At the moment we do not know. On occasion we will be unable to tell from instrument readings alone whether an explosion resulted from natural or from artificial causes.

We will then want to go to the site of explosion and conduct an inspection. At present there is no agreement on the ground rules for conducting such on-site inspections. This is what a new scientific conference at Geneva between Soviet and Western scientists must deal with in the near future.

The Russians want to keep the number of such inspections down. The Americans think a large number will be necessary. I think we will never know the answer to this until we set up some inspection stations and actually observe how the system works. We should even cooperate in conducting a few small underground explosions. The Russians ought to cooperate in such an experiment and pursue with us other types of research on this problem.

000000  
000027  
I would be the first to admit that a test ban treaty has many risky aspects. But there are also many risky aspects to doing nothing. I want to see the United States take the lead in eliminating these risks--I want to see us take the initiative in proposing solutions. Let the Russians say "no" if they are untrusting, or afraid, or if they just don't want to stop tests. But let's see the United States take the affirmative position.

Meanwhile the United States should be exerting greater effort toward pressing ahead in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy. We need to achieve breakthroughs in the use of atomic energy for medical purposes and for sources of power and fuel. This will be important to the fuel-deficient areas of the world. Atomic energy also holds the key to the de-salting of sea water for use in arid lands.

I would be the first to admit that a test has already been made. But there are also many risky aspects to doing nothing. I want to see the United States take the lead in eliminating these risks-I want to see us take the initiative in proposing solutions. But the Russians say "no" if they are unimpressed, or afraid, or if they just don't want to stop tests. But let's see the United States take the affirmative position.

Meanwhile the United States should be creating a reactor effort toward pressing ahead in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy. We need a breakthrough in the use of atomic energy for medical purposes and for sources of power and fuel. This will be important to the health and efficient uses of the world. Atomic energy also holds the key to the de-salting of sea water for use in arid lands.

*Diana*

*Shirts*

*Size 15-33*

*or Medium Sport Shirts*





# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)