

The original documents are located in Box 46, folder “1975/06/11 - Senator Pastore” 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 Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

5PM - Presidential Meeting
Sen. Pastore, Max Friedersdorf
Jim Cannon
URANIUM ENRICHMENT

Wednesday, June 11, 1975

JL Conutter




THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 11, 1975

MEETING WITH SENATOR PASTORE

Wednesday, June 11, 1975
5:00 p.m. (10 minutes)
The Oval Office

From: Jim Cannon 

I. PURPOSE

Senator Pastore is coming down to discuss uranium enrichment.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS AND PRESS PLAN

A. Background

This meeting will provide you an opportunity to discuss the alternatives on uranium enrichment policy and seek Senator Pastore's advice.

B. Participants

Senator John O. Pastore
Max Friedersdorf
Jim Cannon

C. Press Plan

Meeting to be announced but no press photo coverage.

III. TALKING POINTS

See Tab A for talking points on uranium enrichment.

See Tab B for background information on two subjects the Senator could raise:

- Breeder reactor
- Price-Anderson

TAB A

URANIUM ENRICHMENT

Senator Pastore feels that the only way to proceed expeditiously with added U.S. uranium enrichment capacity is with Federal funding. He also feels that privatization will run into serious opposition in the Senate and believes that you should meet with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to get members' views.

You may wish to:

- . Agree that the U.S. must make a commitment to expand its uranium enrichment capacity and to do so in a way that will give potential foreign customers reason to have confidence that the U.S. will be a reliable supplier.
- . Indicate your intention of sitting down with all or some members of the Joint Committee to discuss the matter.
- . That you believe that arrangements may be possible, with Congressional approval, to achieve the objective of assured capacity and the highly desirable objective of having private industry build and operate the plants that will provide that capacity. Further, that you will want to describe the proposed arrangements to him in more detail over the next few days--before you submit your proposal to the Congress

B

LIQUID METAL FAST BREEDER REACTOR (LMFBR)

This is a long-term, \$10 billion program to develop by the early 1990's, an improved nuclear reactor which will extend our commercially useable uranium resources for hundreds of years. Press stories following last week-end's energy meeting at Camp David speculated that ERDA intends to recommend major cutbacks in the FY 76 funding for this program.

Your FY 76 budget calls for a funding level of \$480 million. We expect that Dr. Seamans will request a reduction (and reprogramming into other energy R&D projects) of approximately 10% (about \$43 million). This reduction is not because of any policy decision to downgrade the breeder reactor but rather results from a reduction in the need for funds because of delays in the program caused by licensing and other problems.

A letter is being prepared from Dr. Seamans to the appropriate appropriations committees, explaining the proposed cutback.

PRICE-ANDERSON LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation would extend the effective date of the present law which, in effect, indemnifies with public funds the nuclear industry against claims for damages in the event of a nuclear accident.

Similar legislation was passed by the Congress last year, but you vetoed it because of an unconstitutional provision which would have permitted the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Congress to further consider, after your signature, whether the bill should ever become effective. Senator Pastore strongly urged you to sign the bill and work out the constitutional problem later.

In your veto message, you pointed out the necessity for having this legislation and stated that you would resubmit and support a new bill without the unconstitutional provision.

A redrafted Price-Anderson bill is being circulated within the Administration for final clearance and will be ready for submission very shortly. It appears likely that the anti-nuclear forces will make a determined effort to defeat this bill.