

The original documents are located in Box 24, folder “Nuclear Export Legislation” of the James M. Cannon Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

*Nuclear Export*THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

July 23, 1976

*Glenn
Travis
Jm*

MEMORANDUM FOR: DON OGILVIE
JIM MITCHELL

FROM: *Glenn*
GLENN SCHLEEDE

SUBJECT: MORE JCAE HEARINGS ON NUCLEAR
EXPORT REORGANIZATION

We just received word from the Joint Committee that they have scheduled additional hearings for next Wednesday, July 28, on the nuclear proliferation-export organization issue focusing particularly on S. 1439. Apparently the hearing is in response to another request from Senator Ribicoff that the Joint Committee stop dragging its feet on the Nuclear Export Reorganization Act (S. 1439).

Apparently the JCAE would like to have testimony from ERDA, State, NRC, and possibly ACDA -- but arrangements have not been firmed up and the agencies may not even be aware of the hearings yet.

I assume the objective from the Administration's point-of-view should be:

- ° Reiterate why S. 1439 is not a good idea.
- ° Indicate that the matter of nuclear exports needs to be considered in a much larger policy context than has been considered in S. 1439.

We need to decide this afternoon exactly how the new nuclear policy study will be handled in the hearings -- particularly since Bob Fri will probably be testifying for ERDA. We will be focusing on that this afternoon. One possibility is a response on Monday from Jim Cannon to John Anderson's recent letter, which response could describe the new study.

In the meantime, can OMB take on the job of organizing the agencies to participate in the hearings?

cc: Jim Cannon
Jim Connor

Bob Fri
Dave Elliott

*OK
w/ strong
involvement
Schleede
Jm*

Lucy
Nuclear Exports

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

July 26, 1976

TO:

JIM CANNON

FROM:

Glenn
GLENN SCHLEEDER

FYI



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 27, 1976

Dear John:

Recently, you have expressed your view that greater attention is needed to a number of important nuclear policy matters, including nuclear exports and fuel reprocessing. You have also suggested the possibility of using domestic reprocessing facilities to serve both domestic and foreign needs and to further worldwide efforts to control proliferation.

The matters you have identified are of continuing importance to this Administration and we have taken a number of steps to deal with them, all with the objective of providing safe, clean, economic and properly safeguarded nuclear power here and abroad. We are looking forward to more progress. For example, the passage of the Nuclear Fuel Assurance Act will be an important step toward the expansion of capacity in the United States to produce enriched uranium for nuclear power plants. This will help us maintain the influence associated with the U.S. role as a leading world supplier of nuclear fuel and equipment for peaceful purposes and thus contribute substantially to our non-proliferation objectives.

In addition, the departments and agencies have been examining additional options within their areas of responsibility that might contribute further to the achievement of our nuclear policy objectives. For example, we have been working with foreign nuclear suppliers and customers to strengthen controls against the diversion of nuclear materials. We are also proceeding with actions to resolve remaining questions with respect to domestic reprocessing and nuclear waste management.

Because nuclear policy issues are of such great importance, I believe they should be treated comprehensively. Accordingly, I have recently directed that a special concerted review be undertaken of our various nuclear policy objectives and options, particularly with respect to exports, reprocessing and waste management. In view of your special interest, I


wanted you to know of this decision. The review will involve both domestic and international aspects. All Federal departments and agencies, as well as the policy groups in the Executive Office, that have responsibilities relating to nuclear policy will be involved in the review.

Mr. Robert W. Fri, who normally serves as Deputy Administrator of the Energy Research and Development Administration, has agreed to accept the responsibility for full-time leadership of the review effort. Mr. Fri's appointment to this temporary duty reflects my intent that special attention be given to this comprehensive review of nuclear policy issues.

I expect that the review group will complete the principal part of its work by early fall. If the group concludes that additional actions are warranted, I will review those recommendations carefully and, where appropriate, will follow up with proposals to the Congress.

I look forward to working with you as the review progresses.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Gerald R. Ford". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Gerald" and last name "Ford" clearly distinguishable.

The Honorable John B. Anderson
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

ADMINISTRATION REVIEW OF NUCLEAR POLICY

Question

Rumors (and press stories) are indicating that President Ford has directed a major review of U.S. nuclear policy on a crash basis that has set up a new group in the White House (headed by ERDA Deputy Administrator Bob Fri on a full-time basis) to do the job. Is this true? Will there be a report to the President? Will major new proposals be forthcoming soon?

Answer

Assurance of safe, reliable, and environmentally acceptable nuclear power is a high priority of the national energy program. International policy of the United States further pledges that we shall discourage proliferation of nuclear weapons capability. A number of specific measures have already been taken toward this end.

Nuclear policy is under continuing review. However, the President wishes to evaluate this subject comprehensively, and so has directed a concerted review of our policy objectives and options relating to nuclear matters, including exports, nuclear fuel reprocessing, and waste management. Nuclear policy engages domestic and international responsibilities of several Federal departments and agencies, and advisory bodies to the President, all of whom will be consulted during the review

A review group has been formed, under full-time direction of Robert W. Fri. Mr. Fri normally serves as Deputy Administrator of the Energy Research and Development Administration. His appointment to this temporary duty reflects the President's intent that all affected agencies are fully involved at the highest level.

The interagency review group will report in early fall.

Question

Which agencies will be consulted in this review of nuclear policy?

Answer

Among the departments and agencies with obvious interests in the review are: the Department of State; the Energy Research and Development Administration; the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; the Department of Defense; the Department of Commerce; the Environmental Protection Agency; the Council on Environmental Quality; the Federal Energy Administration; the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and the Department of Interior. Each of them will be consulted. Other agencies may be involved in the review as their interests become known.

Question

Why isn't this study being done by the Energy Resources Council(ERC)?

Answer

The nuclear policy issues covered by the review involve a variety of objectives including but not limited to energy. Because a comprehensive approach is considered necessary, none of the existing policy groups by themselves(e.g., NSC, Domestic Council, EPB or ERC) were ideally suited to conduct the review. However, all the existing policy groups -- as well as the agencies that have some responsibility relating to nuclear policy -- will be involved.

Nuclear Exports

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

August 4, 1976

Teller

TO: JIM CANNON
FROM: GLENN SCHLEED *Glenn*

I was unsuccessful in reaching
Ed Teller by phone.

I am attaching a copy of the
John Anderson letter.

Attachment



Energy

MEETING WITH SCOWCROFT, FRI,
CONNOR, LYNN

Monday, August 30, 1976

4:30 p.m.

Scowcroft's Office

Re: Nuclear Export Legislation





REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

INFORMATION

August 30, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: JIM CANNON
JIM CONNOR
FROM: GLENN SCHLEEDE
SUBJECT: NUCLEAR EXPORT LEGISLATION

There will be an urgent meeting on this subject this afternoon in Brent Scowcroft's office at 4:30 PM to which you and Jim Lynn will be invited. Briefly, the decision needed is on the posture that Administration witnesses (Fri and probably someone from State Department) can take at a hearing tomorrow (probably) held by the House members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The principal problems making the meeting necessary are:

- The failure of three Senate Committees (JCAE, Government Operations, and Foreign Relations) to agree on an export/non-proliferation bill last week is being blamed in large part on the Administration. Senator Pastore has accused us of "stonewalling."
- The bill considered last week (S. 3770) has a number of problems which make it unacceptable to the Executive Branch. Administration witnesses have pointed out the problems and offered to work with the Congress on an acceptable bill but we have not stated clearly what would be acceptable.
- Informing the Congress now as to what we would consider acceptable has the following problems:
 - ° Forces immediate conclusions on subjects still under study by Bob Fri's group.
 - ° May force a decision today on some of these issues (perhaps without the President's involvement -- but that is a matter for consideration at 4:30).
 - ° Our position -- which certainly will be more conservative than that reflected in S. 3770 -- may subject us to additional criticism for not being tough enough.
- John Anderson and Mel Price may introduce another bill today which is more acceptable than S. 3770.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 31, 1976


file
Energy
Nuclear

Dear Mr. Spitzer:

Thank you very much for sending me
The Health Hazards of NOT Going
Nuclear by Petr Beckman and also
a copy of your conference, "Energy
in the Pacific Basin". They are
very interesting.

I am passing them on to Glenn Schleede,
an Associate Director on the Domestic
Council who works in the energy area.
I am sure he will also find them
very interesting.

Best regards,


James M. Cannon
Assistant to the President
for Domestic Affairs

Mr. Arthur Spitzer
Digas Company
9201 West Olympic Boulevard
Beverly Hills, California 90212