

Mr. MONDALE

submitted the following resolution; which was

## RESOLUTION

(Insert title of resolution here)

*Resolved,*

A Senate Resolution urging the President to seek an immediate international moratorium on the transfer to non-nuclear weapons countries of nuclear enrichment and reprocessing equipment and technology to permit time for the negotiation of more effective safeguards against the proliferation of nuclear weapons capability.

### Section 1

Whereas the Senate of the United States ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in recognition of the devastation associated with a nuclear war and of the need to make every effort to avert the danger of such a war;

Whereas the parties to the Treaty expressed a common belief that the proliferation of nuclear weapons would seriously increase the danger of nuclear war;

Whereas the United States and other parties to the Treaty pledged to accept specified safeguards regarding the transfer to non-nuclear weapon States of special nuclear materials and facilities for the processing, use, or production of such materials;

Whereas recent events, including the explosion of a nuclear device by India in 1974, the development of a uranium enrichment facility by the Republic of South Africa, and the proposed sales of nuclear enrichment and reprocessing plants to non-nuclear weapon States, cast serious doubts on the ~~adequacy~~ <sup>Scope and Comprehensiveness</sup> of existing safeguards over the proliferation of nuclear weapons capability;

Whereas the Senate of the United States is particularly concerned about the consequences of transactions that could lead to the production of plutonium and other special nuclear materials by non-nuclear weapon States in Latin America, in the Middle East, and in Asia;

Whereas the Senate believes that improved safeguards are urgently needed to prevent the theft or diversion of plutonium and other special nuclear materials to weapons manufacture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved that the Senate of the United States strongly requests and urges the President to seek through the highest level consultations with other suppliers of nuclear equipment and technology an immediate moratorium on the transfer of nuclear enrichment and reprocessing facilities and technology to permit time for the negotiation of an agreement regarding more effective safeguards to substantially reduce the risk of diversion or theft of plutonium and other special nuclear materials to military or other uses that would jeopardize world peace and security.

## Section 2

The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State.

# NEWS RELEASE

*From Senator Walter F.*

## MONDALE

443 OLD SENATE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510  
(202) 224-5641



CONTACT: Ernie Lotito or Jane Wales  
FOR RELEASE JUNE 18

June, 1975

MONDALE URGES SENATE TO OPPOSE SALE BY W. GERMANY AND  
FRANCE OF PLANTS THAT WOULD ENABLE BUYING COUNTRIES TO  
MAKE A-BOMB

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 18--Senator Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) urged the Senate today to express its opposition to the sale by West Germany and France of plants that would give buying countries the ability to produce nuclear weapons.

In introducing his sense of the Senate resolution, Mondale said the sale to non-nuclear weapons countries of complete nuclear fuel cycles -- including plutonium separation equipment -- would represent "a grave danger to world peace.

"This danger is twofold," he said. "First that the purchasing country might divert plutonium from such plants to develop nuclear bombs. And, second that proper safeguards never have been devised to prevent the theft of plutonium from commercial plants by terrorist or criminal elements."

At present, West Germany is negotiating with Brazil to sell that Latin American country such equipment. France is reportedly considering the transfer of similar equipment to Argentina, among other countries.

"I do not want to single out Brazil or Argentina, but their cases provide useful examples," Mondale said. "If either country proceeds in this direction ... extraordinary pressures would be placed on the other not only to follow suit, but also to initiate a nuclear weapons program...

"In my judgment, there is no question of greater importance to the hope of international peace and security in the nuclear era than the consequences of these sales."

Mondale noted that loopholes exist in both the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and in safeguards prescribed by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) that would enable countries to produce nuclear weapons.

"While Brazil in this instance could not take plutonium from the separation plant provided by West Germany to build a nuclear weapon without violating IAEA safeguards, there is nothing in the Nonproliferation Treaty or the current IAEA program to prevent Brazil from duplicating the facility provided by Germany and using the plutonium from the duplicate plant to build explosive devices," he said.

Mondale's resolution also asked the Senate to express its feeling that existing safeguards should be broadened and made more comprehensive, and that President Ford should consult with other government leaders in an effort to obtain an immediate moratorium on such sales until a more effective safeguards program can be developed.

"As a first step," the Minnesota Senator said, "I believe that the Nonproliferation Treaty should be amended to prevent the acquisition of plutonium separation facilities by non-nuclear states, or, at a minimum, to assure any such facilities, whether acquired directly or duplicated from equipment purchased from a nuclear supplying nation, would be subject to IAEA inspection."

###

Nuclear Non-proliferation  
3.11.76 - Post

# Kissinger Bars 'Blackmail' on A-Fuel

By Don Oberdorfer  
Washington Post Staff Writer

Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger yesterday rejected proposals that the United States and the Soviet Union cooperate to halt nuclear weapons proliferation by threatening to shut off atomic fuel to France and West Germany.

Such superpower cooperation, proposed by Chairman Abraham A. Ribicoff (D-Conn.) in a Senate Government Operations Committee hearing, would amount to

U.S. "blackmail" with Soviet concurrence against close NATO allies and thus would have "the gravest foreign policy consequences," Kissinger declared.

The congressional concern arose from fears that the two European nations are facilitating the spread of atomic bomb capabilities throughout the world through their commercial deals. Over U.S. objections that Kissinger described yesterday, France is selling Pakistan a nuclear fuel re-

processing plant capable of producing bomb material, and Germany is selling an even more extensive plant to Brazil.

The United States and the Soviet Union are the only suppliers of enriched uranium, the fuel used by nearly all nuclear reactors now in operation. This monopoly of fuel supplies will continue at least until 1981, according to experts, enabling the two superpowers to enforce their views on

other nuclear production nations by threatening to deny essential fuel.

Kissinger and the lawmakers agreed at yesterday's hearing that the nuclear proliferation problem could dictate the fate of millions of people and ultimately of mankind itself, and that time is running out on important controls. However, Kissinger called for problems to be solved through the existing framework and without rupturing U.S. mili-

See KISSINGER, A2, Col. 7

# Kissinger Bars U.S. 'Blackmail' On Atomic Fuel

**KISSINGER, From A1**

tary alliances, while senators argued for far stronger measures.

"Why don't we go to the United Nations and world opinion on this horrible problem? Isn't it time to go over the heads of the leaders to the people of France and West Germany?" Ribicoff demanded. "I see no reason for the U.S. to continue to be so timid . . ."

Kissinger virtually confirmed reports that France and Germany blocked a U.S. proposal—made in recent sessions of a secret nuclear "suppliers conference"—that would ban export to individual nations of reprocessing plants usable for bomb production.

The United States will try again for the export ban at a suppliers meeting scheduled for June, Kissinger revealed. Commending the Soviet Union for exerting a positive "moral and political influence" in the seven-nation suppliers meetings, Kissinger said he "wouldn't be surprised" if the Russians accept the U.S. proposal.

Others in the seven-nation suppliers group are Britain, Canada and Japan. Kissinger termed the result of the recent secret meetings "a general understanding about restraint" and said the United States will seek to Proceed to "something more binding."

In the meantime the United States has made "representations" to Germany about its deal with Brazil, which could be the basis for the first atomic weapons in Latin America, Kissinger said. He reported that the United States is making "the strongest representations" to France about the Pakistani plant and said the United States may consider unspecified "other steps" if its protests are unheeded.

Kissinger was questioned sharply about the continuing exportation of nuclear fuel to India despite the May, 1974, atomic explosion there which escalated worldwide concern about weapons spread. He defended continued U. S. shipments as in keeping with contractual guarantees as a reliable fuel supplier, and said the U. S. fuel was not to be used to make bombs.

A few hours after Kissinger's appearance—his first major presentation on nuclear export issues—54 members of Congress asked the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to delay planned exportation of 40,000 pounds of enriched uranium fuel to India, pending public hearings on the issue. The members said the fuel would be enough to make 10 Hiroshima-sized bombs.

While senators called for U.S.-Soviet collaboration in the nuclear exportation field, Kissinger expressed doubt that "detente"—which at one point he called "the forbidden word"—could support far-reaching agreements in the current state of U.S.-Soviet strain.

Given Moscow's lead in conventional weapons, Kissinger said, the United States cannot rule out the use of nuclear arms in regional conflicts.



The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 733) was passed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. YOUNG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in line with the previous agreement, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to consideration of Calendar Nos. 502, 503, 505, and 522.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADDITIONAL LAW CLERKS FOR JUDGES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4287) to provide for additional law clerks for the judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment on page 2, beginning with line 3, insert:

Sec. 2. That the District of Columbia Law Revision Commission Act, approved August 21, 1974, is amended as follows:

Section 2(i) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 49-401 (i)), is amended to read as follows:

"The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable. Such personnel shall be appointed without regard to the provision of title 5 of the United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service. The Commission may appoint a Director. Such appointment shall be made without regard to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service. The Director shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission and shall be entitled to receive compensation at the maximum rate as may be established from time to time for grade 16 of the General Schedule in section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code. The Commission may also appoint a General Counsel without regard to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code governing appointments in the competitive service, to serve at the pleasure of the Commission. The General Counsel shall be entitled to receive compensation at the same rate as the Director and shall be responsible solely to the Commission.

"Persons appointed to the staff of the Commission shall be appointed solely on the basis of their ability to perform the duties of the Commission without regard to political party affiliation. Employees of the Commission shall be regarded as employees of the District of Columbia government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

#### JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10035) to establish the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the

Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment on page 2, beginning with line 15, insert:

(c) The portion of section 801 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which precedes subsection (a), is amended by striking out "As used in titles II, III, V, VI, and VII," and inserting in lieu thereof, "As used in titles II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

#### INTERNATIONAL SAFEGUARDS OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS

The resolution (S. Res. 221) urging the President of the United States to take the leadership in seeking international cooperation in strengthening safeguards of nuclear materials, was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President seek the immediate international consideration of strengthening the effectiveness of the International Atomic Energy Agency's safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities and seek intensified cooperation with other nuclear suppliers to insure that most stringent safeguard conditions are applied to the transfer of nuclear equipment and technology to prevent the proliferation of nuclear explosive capability.

Whereas the Senate of the United States ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in recognition of the devastation associated with a nuclear war and of the need to make every effort to avert the danger of such a war;

Whereas the parties to the treaty expressed a common belief that the proliferation of nuclear weapons would seriously increase the danger of nuclear war;

Whereas the United States and other parties to the treaty pledged to accept specified safeguards regarding the transfer to nonnuclear-weapon states of special nuclear materials and facilities for the processing, use, or production of such materials;

Whereas recent events, including the explosion of nuclear devices, the development of uranium enrichment facilities, and the proposed transfer of nuclear enrichment and reprocessing facilities to nonnuclear-weapon states, emphasize the imperative need to increase the scope, comprehensiveness, and effectiveness of international safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities so that there will be no further proliferation of nuclear weapons capability;

Whereas the Senate of the United States is particularly concerned about the consequences of transactions without effective safeguards that could lead to the production of plutonium and other special nuclear materials by nonnuclear-weapon states throughout the world; and

Whereas the Senate is particularly concerned about the proliferation threat posed by the possibility of the development in the near future of a large number of independent national enrichment and reprocessing facilities and therefore believes that the United States should take the lead in securing agreement for the development of regional multinational, rather than national, centers to undertake enrichment and reprocessing activities in order to minimize the spread of technology which could be

used to develop nuclear explosives: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the United States strongly requests and urges the President to seek through the highest level of consultation in the United Nations and with the other leaders of the world community, an intensive cooperative international effort to strengthen and improve both the scope, comprehensiveness, and effectiveness of the international safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities so that there will be a substantial and immediate reduction in the risk of diversion or theft of plutonium and other special nuclear materials to military or other uses that would jeopardize world peace and security; be it further

*Resolved*, That the President seek, through consultation with suppliers of nuclear equipment and technology, their restraint in the transfer of nuclear technology and their cooperation in assuring that such equipment and technology only is transferred to other nations under the most rigorous, prudent, and safeguarded conditions designed to assure that the technology itself is not employed for the production of nuclear explosives; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State.

#### WAIVER UNDER SECTION 303(a) OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF S. 2635

The resolution (S. Res. 322) waiving section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of S. 2635 was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That pursuant to section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the provisions of section 303(a) of such Act are waived with respect to the consideration of S. 2635. Such waiver is necessary because on January 1, 1976, solely as a result of this year's social security increases, one million three hundred twenty-seven thousand one hundred and thirty-six veterans and survivors will sustain pension reductions and another forty-one thousand eight hundred and forty will lose entitlement to pension altogether unless amendments increasing rates and the maximum annual income limitations contained in titles II and IV of S. 2635, become law effective January 1, 1976. As an integral part of the approach to this problem, titles I and III of S. 2635 are designed to restructure totally the current need-based pension program for wartime veterans and survivors effective October 1, 1976, to achieve equitable program objectives more fully and to avoid further problems occasioned by subsequent periodic automatic social security increases. Congress should consider the provisions effective January 1, and October 1, 1976, together to assure uniformity, continuity, and a coordinated effort with respect to the Veterans' Administration pension program. The deferred October 1, 1976, effective date for the new pension program is intended to permit the Veterans' Administration adequate time to implement the provisions of S. 2635.

Such waiver is also necessary to provide veterans, survivors and their families an opportunity for prudent fiscal planning in consideration of the amount of pension they will be entitled to receive during the entire calendar year 1976.

Further, such waiver is necessary to allow the Congress to complete in a timely and logical manner the work regarding veterans and survivors pension reform which the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has carried on

throughout the preceding past two years in good faith and without any intent to circumvent the congressional budget process.

#### ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1975

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to consideration of Calendar No. 485, S. 1136, and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1136) to authorize appropriations for increased investigation and prosecution by the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice of unfair methods of competition, restraints of trade, and other violations of the antitrust laws and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committees on the Judiciary and Commerce, jointly, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Antitrust Enforcement Authorization Act of 1975".

#### DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) This Nation is founded upon and committed to a private enterprise system and a free market economy, in the belief that competition spurs innovation, promotes productivity, prevents the undue concentration of economic, social, and political power, and preserves a free democratic society.

(2) The decline of competition in industries in which oligopoly or monopoly power exists, and the decline of competition caused by State and Federal regulatory policies, have contributed significantly to unemployment, inflation, inefficiency, underutilization of economic capacity, a reduction in exports, and an adverse effect on the balance of payments.

(3) Diminished competition and increased concentration in the marketplace have been important factors in the ineffectiveness of monetary and fiscal policies in reducing the high rates of inflation and unemployment.

(4) The near record rates of inflation and unemployment have caused extreme hardship and dislocation to the American consumer, worker, farmer, and businessman.

(5) Investigations by the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Justice, and the National Commission on Food Marketing, as well as other independent studies, have identified conditions of excessive concentration and other anticompetitive behavior in various industries.

(6) Vigorous and effective enforcement of the antitrust laws, and reduction of monopoly and oligopoly power in the economy, can contribute significantly to reducing prices, unemployment, and inflation, and to preservation of our democratic institutions and personal freedoms.

(7) The lack of adequate antitrust resources has prevented vigorous and effective enforcement of the antitrust laws.

(b) It is the purpose of the Congress in this Act to authorize sufficient appropriations to the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice to support and invigorate effective and expeditious enforcement of the antitrust laws, to facilitate the

restoration and maintenance of competition in the marketplace, to prevent and eliminate monopoly and oligopoly power in the economy, and to improve the antitrust enforcement capability of the States.

#### FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Section 2 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 42) is amended by inserting between the second and third paragraphs of such section the following new paragraph:

"In addition to the other authority conferred by this section, the Commission is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than twenty-five attorney, economist, special expert, and outside counsel positions for its maintaining competition responsibilities. Individuals may be appointed to positions established under this paragraph with out regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates but at rates not in excess of the maximum rate for GS-18, but not less than the minimum rate for GS-16, of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title."

(b) Section 20 of the Federal Trade Commission Act is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before the first sentence, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission in addition to such sums as are authorized by any other provision of law, not to exceed \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976; not to exceed \$6,250,000 for the transition period ending September 30, 1976; not to exceed \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977; and not to exceed \$45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978; such sums to remain available until expended for the purposes authorized by the Antitrust Enforcement Authorization Act of 1975."

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SEC. 4. (a) Chapter 31 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 527. Authorization of appropriations for antitrust enforcement

"(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice in addition to such sums as are authorized by any other provision of law, not to exceed \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976; not to exceed \$6,250,000 for the transition period ending September 30, 1976; not to exceed \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977; and not to exceed \$45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978; such sums to remain available until expended for the purposes authorized by the Antitrust Enforcement Authorization Act of 1975.

"(b) The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than twenty-five attorney, economist, special expert, and outside counsel positions for the Antitrust Division. Individuals may be appointed to positions established under this subsection without regard to the provisions of title 5, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates but at rates not in excess of the maximum rate for GS-18, but not less than the minimum rate for GS-16, of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title."

(b) The analysis of chapter 31 of title 28,

United States Code, is amended by adding immediately below the item relating to section 526 the following new item:

"527. Authorization of appropriations for antitrust enforcement."

#### GRANTS TO STATES FOR ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 5. (a) The Attorney General is authorized to provide assistance and make grants to States which have State plans approved under subsection (c) of this section to improve the antitrust enforcement capability of such State.

(b) The attorney general of any State desiring to receive assistance or a grant under this section shall submit a plan consistent with such basic criteria as the Attorney General may establish under subsection (d) of this section. Such plan shall—

(1) provide for the administration of such plan by the attorney general of such State;

(2) set forth a program for training of State officers and employees to improve the antitrust enforcement capability of such State;

(3) establish such fiscal controls and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disposal of and accounting of Federal funds paid to the State including such funds paid by the State to any agency of such State under this section; and

(4) provide for making such reasonable reports in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and affording such access thereto as the Attorney General may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(c) The Attorney General shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

(d) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section the Attorney General shall, by regulation, prescribe basic criteria for the purpose of establishing equitable distribution of funds received under this section among the States.

(e) Payments under this section shall be made from the allotment to any State which administers a plan approved under this section. Payments to a State under this section may be made in installments, in advance, or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of underpayment or overpayment, and may be made directly to a State or to one or more public agencies designated for this purpose by the State, or to both.

(f) The Comptroller General of the United States or any of his authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records that are pertinent to any grantee under this section.

(g) Whenever the Attorney General, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any State receiving a grant under this section, finds—

(1) that the program for which such grant was made has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this section; or

(2) that in the operation of the program there is failure to comply substantially with any such provision; the Attorney General shall notify such State of his findings and no further payments may be made to such State by the Attorney General until he is satisfied that such noncompliance has been, or will promptly be, corrected. However, the Attorney General may authorize the continuance of payments with respect to any program pursuant to this Act which is being carried out by such State and which is not involved in the noncompliance.

(h) As used in this section the term—

(1) "State" includes each of the several States of the United States, the District of



# Atom Bombs for Sale

By Robert Kleiman

WASHINGTON—At a Moscow conference on nuclear proliferation last summer, the scientist who built Russia's first A-bomb in 1949 turned to an American visitor.

"Do you know Henry DeWolf Smyth?" he asked, speaking of the Princeton physicist who wrote the official, declassified history that told Americans in 1945 how the United States had made the atomic bomb. "At one international meeting," the Russian said, "I shocked Smyth badly."

"Henry," I said, "you helped us very much. Your book was always at my side."

"Impossible," Smyth said. "Everything was in the public domain."

"Henry, Henry," I said, "everything that had to be done might have been done in several different ways. You told us which path to take. When it didn't work, we knew we had simply made some mistake and started again. Public domain, indeed!"

This story was recalled here recently after the disappointing disclosure that West Germany had decided to open talks with Iran on the sale of a multibillion-dollar nuclear industry. Included is a pilot plutonium reprocessing plant capable of making atomic explosives. Ford Administration objections and strenuous Congressional criticism of a \$4 billion German reactor sale to Brazil last year—captured by offering plutonium technology that American companies are forbidden to export—had been expected to deter an early repetition.

Instead, German spokesmen are again advancing the rationalization that the technology for extracting weapons-quality plutonium from spent power reactor fuel rods is in the public domain.

"Public domain" indeed! Three decades after Hiroshima, apart from the five great powers that are permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, only India has exploded a nuclear device. One reason is that the United States and other advanced countries have refused to export plutonium reprocessing plants, which have no commercial use at present.

West Germany became the first to break with this policy. France, which negotiated similar sales to South Korea and Pakistan, later acquiesced in the successful American effort to get South Korea to cancel out. But the Pakistan deal is moving ahead; Iranian officials say they will make a bomb should Pakistan do so.

If this evolution continues, a dozen or more third-world countries may be extracting enough weapons-grade plutonium by the 1990's to make 3,000 Hiroshima-size bombs annually. With seizure and regional wars

possible, the world will be lucky to get through the century without losing a city.

West German and French refusal has blocked American efforts to restore the plutonium embargo through a seven-nation suppliers' agreement. Improved inspection and other safeguards have been achieved. But, as Secretary Kissinger recently warned, there is no safeguard against unilateral abrogation of a peaceful uses agreement once the equipment and technology have been transferred.

The danger does not stem from the export of giant nuclear power reactors, costing as much as \$1 billion each. They are fueled by slightly-enriched uranium, and weapons-grade fissionable material is never present.

Small, pilot plutonium-reprocessing plants, in contrast, sell for a few million dollars and are of little economic importance. But by helping countries seeking the "effortless acquisition of nuclear weapons technology," as the magazine *Der Spiegel* put it, West Germany and France hope to break heavily into the American-dominated nuclear-reactor market.

Unless Washington comes to grips with this issue, posed by powerful political-industrial lobbies in West Germany and France, the American case for a renewed embargo on plutonium-reprocessing and uranium-enrichment technology is unlikely to make any headway at next month's suppliers' meeting.

There is study in Washington of proposals for a market-sharing arrangement. Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut would "guarantee each supplier country a minimum number of reactor sales a year." That would raise complex problems, including waiver of the antitrust laws. But there is a long history of such waivers in fields affecting national security.

Guaranteed deliveries to all of adequate nuclear fuel supplies, preferably through internationalized production of slightly-enriched uranium, would be essential to such a deal.

West Germany and France now depend on American supplies of enriched uranium fuel for their own nuclear reactors and will remain dependent until 1990 on American fuel for the reactors they export. If, offered a fair share of the reactor market, they still reject a renewed plutonium embargo, Senator Ribicoff would cut off their nuclear fuel supplies.

This is a drastic and dangerous proposal. But the question it raises is whether it would not be more dangerous for the United States to go on providing nuclear fuel for export reactors that are accompanied by plutonium technology and a growing threat to American and world security.

Robert Kleiman is a member of the Editorial Board of *The Times*.



Thomas von Randow

# Germany's Anti-Nuclear Movement

Post 6/30/76

Ant

**HAMBURG**—Concern about the safety of nuclear power is not confined to the United States. Here in West Germany, which is striving to promote atomic energy as an alternative to our uncertain reliance on imported oil, the issue is approaching explosive proportions.

A militant minority opposed to the construction of nuclear reactors has been so effective that it is hobbling atomic energy programs—even though, according to opinion surveys, most Germans favor them.

This suggests that we may eventually face energy shortages that would compel the government to im-

---

*Mr. Von Randow writes on science and technology for Die Zeit, the West German weekly.*

---

pose "brown-outs," especially on private households. Such a move would, of course, create serious political liabilities for the country's official establishment.

Should another Middle East conflict curtail our petroleum supply, as it did during the Yom Kippur War of 1973, the situation here could become even more critical.

At the same time, trouble in the field of domestic nuclear development would threaten the German reactor industry, prompting it to seek markets abroad to compensate for a potential loss of outlets at home.

But, as we perceived when our recent negotiations

to sell atomic plants to Iran and Brazil aroused American criticism, the export of nuclear installations could strain our ties to the United States, which is trying to curb the proliferation of atomic know-how.

Thus the nuclear controversy, though local in origin, already appears to be having broad consequences.

West Germany's long-range atomic energy plan is one of the most ambitious on earth. Eleven reactors—including the world's largest located in the Rhine Valley—now produce 5 per cent of the nation's needs. By 1985, if expectations are fulfilled, 50 reactors will be meeting at least 30 per cent of our requirements, placing West Germany second to the United States in peaceful nuclear usage.

Compared to the United States, where atomic plants are dispersed over a large geographical area, the proximity of reactors to people is far greater here. The German government is currently spending \$35 million to assess the risk factor—taking into account as well the possibilities of war and terrorism.

A key question at the moment, however, is whether the overall plan will ever be achieved—or whether it will fall prey to a growing sensitivity known as the "Whyl syndrome."

Situated among the vineyards of Southwest Germany, the town of Whyl was designated some years ago to be the site of a new nuclear power plant. But

before work began, it became the focus for thousands of hostile demonstrators chanting the slogan: "Be active today rather than radioactive tomorrow."

The demonstrators, among them left-wing activists, consumer groups and neighborhood farmers, camped near Whyl for months, resisting police attempts to dislodge them.

Last fall, confronted by the prospect of endless ferment, the federal government sidestepped a decision on the proposed plant by turning responsibility over to the state authorities, which predictably chose to postpone the project.

Since then the Whyl episode has become a symbol of successful citizen action. And elsewhere in the country, no sooner do bulldozers arrive to break ground for new reactors than demonstrators also arrive to prevent building.

The impact of these movements on public opinion is significant. The polls show that 67 per cent of West Germans want faster nuclear development. But in places where plants are scheduled to go up, the opposition often runs to more than 50 per cent.

With all this, I would anticipate slow progress in extending nuclear energy here. It may be, though, that another oil crisis will undermine the anti-atomic factions—which means that conditions might have to become worse before support for nuclear partisans becomes stronger.

6/19/75 Times  
**The Nuclear Threats**

To the Editor:

Reginald Stuart's May 26 news report focuses on recent actions taken by the nuclear industry to "turn the tide of opposition." In the industry's view, the villains are, of course, a relatively few hard-working, dedicated people and their underfunded, loosely organized groups fragmented across the country. However, I suggest that the nuclear industry is confused as to the real nature of its present crisis.

In brief, the nuclear industry, which is responsible for the most hazardous industrial operations known to man, has now become a victim of its own growth. It has become newsworthy, and predictably a lot of the news it generates is unfavorable.

While the nuclear industry attempts to minimize concern regarding the safety of its operations, it cannot deny the vulnerability of its operations to that haunting specter of radioactive disaster. For example, within the short period of five months, over twenty plants were twice officially ordered to shut down for pipe inspections because of leaks discovered in a critical portion of the emergency core cooling system of one plant. These plants accounted then for roughly 50 per cent of our nuclear generating capacity.

If the nuclear industry is successful in achieving its goals, the public and the Congress should recognize that a serious malfunction of a single nuclear plant, anywhere, could promptly and permanently shut down as much as 25 per cent of this country's electrical generating capacity in 1985, and 50 per cent in the year 2000.

Finally, according to Stuart's report, the nuclear industry will argue that "the nation must embrace nuclear power in its program to lessen dependence on foreign fuels." If this argument prevails, our national security and way of life will be compromised—to be held hostage to the nonnegotiable threats of nuclear energy's inexorable and malignant partners.

GEORGE L. WEIL  
Washington, June 2, 1975

## 8 Nations Meeting on A-Exports

By Marilyn Berger

Washington Post Staff Writer

The eight major exporters of nuclear power plants and components are meeting in London to develop new safeguards to prevent purchasers from diverting technology meant for peaceful purposes to the development of nuclear weapons.

The meeting, which is surrounded by unusual secrecy, started yesterday and was to continue today. Even the list of countries attending was not announced, but diplomats of several of the nations represented said the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, Canada, West Germany, Japan and Italy are participating.

The goal is to draw up a convention that would pledge these countries—and, potentially, others who may become major exporters in the future—to place stringent controls on equipment and material sold to other nations.

There has been growing concern that non-nuclear countries will divert material from nuclear power reactors—which are being sold all over the world—to build bombs.

West Germany recently contracted to sell Brazil a full nuclear fuel cycle, including a uranium enrichment plant and a reprocessing plant that can separate plutonium from spent fuel. Both enriched uranium and plutonium can be used to produce nuclear bombs. France is also negotiating the sale of reprocessing plants to South Korea and Pakistan.

Neither Brazil nor Pakistan has signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which would pledge them not to produce nuclear weapons.

In a speech to the United Nations last September, Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger alluded to the concern that exporters, in their competitive zeal to make a sale, would fail to insist on appropriate safeguards.

Kissinger said then that "The United States will shortly offer specific proposals to strengthen safeguards to the other principal supplier

countries."

The London meeting is the second following up on this suggestion. The first was in April.

The United States has developed new instrumentation that can monitor the amount of plutonium present in a reactor and thereby determine whether it has been tampered with.

The conferees were expected to discuss requiring the use of such monitoring equipment in conjunction with reactor sales as well as questions of whether to demand additional pledges from purchasing countries not to divert material to nuclear weapons development.

U.S. officials are worried that the disclosure of the meeting might be embarrassing to some countries, forcing them to drop out of the negotiations.

The participants are vulnerable to accusations that they are ganging up on non-nuclear states to impose controls not only on nuclear weapons but on peaceful facilities.

Meanwhile, Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) introduced a resolution yesterday expressing the opposition of the Senate to the sale of atomic power plants by West Germany and France which would give the purchasing countries the ability to produce atomic weapons.

"This danger is two-fold. The first is that the purchasing country might divert plutonium from such plants to develop nuclear bombs. The second is that proper safeguards have never been devised to prevent the theft of plutonium from commercial plants by terrorist or criminal elements," he said.

### Trudeau Defends Nuclear Exports

Special to The Washington Post

OTTAWA, June 18 — Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, who faces stiff domestic opposition on Canada's forthcoming nuclear sales to Argentina and South Korea, says his government has a moral obligation to share nuclear power with poor countries.

Trudeau told the Canadian Nuclear Association yesterday that Canada must help developing countries "leap frog the industrial revolution and nuclear technology is one of the best ways of doing so. We should be prepared to share our knowledge and good fortune."

Although the Canadian government last year suspended industrial aid to India after that nation exploded a nuclear device with the aid of Canadian technology, Trudeau said he still was proud of Canadian aid to India.



7/23/75 Post

# U.S. Protests Called Too Soft On Brazil Nuclear Acquisition

By Murrey Marder

Washington Post Staff Writer

The United States spoke too softly and ineffectually in opposing West Germany's recent contract to sell Brazil the most advanced nuclear technology, a Senate subcommittee complained yesterday.

Brazil will end up with "a complete nuclear fuel cycle — in other words, the capacity to make nuclear weapons," said Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Arms Control and Security Agreements.

Ford administration witnesses said that starting in February, in discussions with

West Germany, the United States "argued against a sale of this nature." The subject was pursued as recently as last month when West German President Walter Scheel and Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher visited Washington, a State Department official testified.

Nevertheless, Symington said, "the West German government continues to deny that any protests were lodged," and Chancellor Helmut Schmidt has said "there were no protests of any kind."

"I think the central question is whether or not we really made strong protestations," said Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.). The issue,

said Humphrey, is whether the United States "really weighed in" against the West German Brazilian deal, or only "sort blinked [its] eyes."

The recent West German contract would supply Brazil with the most elaborate nuclear technology, including uranium enrichment plant and a reprocessing plant that can separate plutonium from spent fuel. The Westinghouse Electric Corp., Symington said, was prevented by U.S. policy from making the sale which he said means that this country "lost between \$4 to \$6 billion dollars" and "also some 20,000 jobs as well."

George S. Vest, director of the State Department's Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, said the United States began questioning the proposed West German contract in February.

Fred C. Ikle, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and, later, Deputy Secretary of State Robert S. Ingersoll met with West German Ambassador Berndt Von Staden, said Vest, and told him the proposed contract with Brazil "was against our policy." An American technical team went to West Germany in April to express U.S. concern, said Vest, and West Germany "agreed to delay for a while—but that is all."

Abraham S. Friedman, director of the international division of the U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration, said the U.S. technical team had two objectives: to express "very serious concern" about supplying nuclear enrichment and reprocessing capacity to Brazil, and to assure that "what ever was being done be done under the most stringent safeguards that West Germany could apply." In the latter appeal, said Friedman, "the group was successful."

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

7/28/75 Post

## *Penalizing Those Who Spread Nuclear Weapons*

In a recent editorial on "first use" of nuclear weapons, you pointed out that the United States is not selling uranium enrichment or nuclear fuel reprocessing technology to any nations.

You have overlooked, however, the fact that the U.S. is supplying 86% of the nuclear fuel used by West Germany and 60% of that used by France, those two prime offenders in nuclear weapons proliferation.

For the next five years, the U.S. will be in a position to penalize those who foster the spread of nuclear weapons. This country, pre-eminent supplier of reactor fuel, can withhold its fuel from those nations which persist in selling what is in essence nuclear weapon capability to other nations which have

consistently refused to sign the Non-proliferation Treaty.

Moreover, we can withhold nuclear technology from those nations which, like India, develop the atom bomb on their own but refuse comprehensive international safeguards while demanding international handouts.

I have introduced legislation to do this, and am pleased to report that 39 members of Congress have sponsored it with me.

My legislation would permit the President to waive the bans imposed by the act, if he deems it in the national interest to do so and to report 60 days in advance to both Houses of Congress. The President's hands would not, therefore, be tied.

I agree with your editorial comments about the perils of renunciation of "first use," but I am sure you will agree that "non-use" of nuclear weapons is infinitely to be preferred, and that the fewer nations which have nuclear weapons capability, the more likely it is that these weapons will not be used either by small nations or superpowers. I hope that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will act on my measure in the near future, so that the U.S. can exercise promptly the leverage it still has to refrain the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Clarence D. Long,  
Member of Congress (D-Md.)

Washington.

# French Nuclear Spread

By deciding to sell South Korea equipment and technology to produce weapons-grade plutonium, the explosive material for atomic bombs, France has taken mankind a long step toward worldwide spread of nuclear weapons—and ultimate disaster.

For thirty years, the United States and other advanced nuclear countries have refused to sell such equipment. Then West Germany broke ranks in June by agreeing to sell Brazil a similar pilot reprocessing plant.

Apart from the threat to non-proliferation policy—and violation of the spirit of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which both West Germany and France have pledged to honor—the Korean deal poses special dangers.

Divided Korea is the tinder box of Asia, with massive armies of the Communist North and the American-backed South facing each other across the 38th Parallel. North Korean ambitions to reunify the country by force, as was attempted in the 1950-53 war, have been re-awakened by American withdrawal from Indochina. The South Korean nuclear move could provide a pretext for a Northern attack—or lead to the even more dangerous nuclear arming of North Korea, stimulating dormant pressure for nuclear weapons in Japan.

The prolonged efforts of American officials to discourage France and West Germany from their nuclear deals undoubtedly would have had a far better chance of success if Secretary Kissinger and President Ford had not over-pessimistically refused to engage their own personal prestige, and the full influence of the United States, for fear of a profitless crisis with major allies.

After an overly cautious approach to the issue, Secretary of State Kissinger has belatedly underscored the awesome risks involved, when he told the United Nations General Assembly last month: "The greatest single danger of unrestrained nuclear proliferation resides in the spread under national control of reprocessing facilities for the atomic materials in nuclear power plants."

\* \* \*

One urgent need is so step up American efforts to establish multi-national regional nuclear fuel centers. Spent but still radioactive fuel rods could thus be securely stored for possible future use, if reprocessing ever becomes safe and commercially feasible.

More important would be a genuine effort to provide the world with an assured supply of enriched uranium, a far cheaper fuel than plutonium would be even if the breeder reactor proved safe and commercially feasible by the 1990's. Neither this country nor the world can afford further delays in expanding uranium enrichment capacity.

Finally, it is essential that the United States hold firm in its thirty-year policy of refusing to spread nuclear weapons capability around the world, whatever the French and Germans do now. The pressures undoubtedly will be intense. A \$7-billion reactor order from Iran is hung up right now on Washington's insistence that the site and form of plutonium reprocessing, if ever economic, be subject to joint agreement. To hold firm on this position and the American refusal to sell power reactors to Egypt—unless there is a guarantee that the spent fuel rods will be processed abroad—will be difficult unless a more vigorous effort is made to reverse French and West German policy or, at the very least, to obtain assurances that no further such sales will be made.

The alternative is a world of a dozen or more states brandishing their nuclear arsenals within the next decade; in such a circumstance, the threat of nuclear holocaust would be immeasurable.



# Brazil, on Eve of Nuclear Pact, Said to Make Big Uranium Find

Times

By MARVINE HOWE

Special to The New York Times

6/27/78

RIO DE JANEIRO, June 26—Vast new uranium reserves have been discovered in Brazil, it was reported here today on the eve of the signing of the controversial nuclear treaty between Brazil and West Germany.

Brazil has guaranteed West Germany that she has sufficient uranium deposits to meet the requirements of both countries for the duration of the contract, or through 1990, according to O Estado de São Paulo, Brazil's leading newspaper.

The new discoveries were said to be outlined in a secret report by French geologists, who made a 60-day tour of the country's main uranium sites.

O Estado de São Paulo said that the report would be made public after the signing of the nuclear agreement in Bonn.

## Government Is Silent

There was no confirmation or denial of the report from the Brazilian Government, which has kept total silence on the agreement with West Germany except to give assurances that the nuclear facilities will be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Agreement has been widely attacked abroad, particularly in the United States and the Soviet Union, because it involves the sale to Brazil not

only of eight nuclear reactors but also of a uranium enrichment facility, that will enable her to produce nuclear weapons.

Earlier, German officials were reported as having said that the deal with Brazil would give West Germany an independent source of uranium. Brazilian officials and scientists insisted, however, that these assertions were premature and stressed that the country's uranium reserves were largely unknown.

The São Paulo newspaper said that the report by the French geologists contained an extensive assessment of Brazil's uranium reserves and was "very well received by the Germans."

## Bonn Signing Awaited

BONN, June 26 (AP)—Foreign Minister Antonio Azeredo da Silveira of Brazil opened talks with West German officials today as a prelude to the signing tomorrow of a \$4-billion nuclear agreement.

Meanwhile, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt said at a news conference yesterday that he had not heard "a word of criticism" of the agreement from the United States Government. He said the controversy was the work of American companies that wanted to make the sale to Brazil.

# Private Industry Role Urged In Nuclear Fuel Business

## URANIUM, From A1

Nixon administrations, but always ran into opposition from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The most heated opposition came from two California congressmen no longer in the House, Democrat Chet Hollifield and Republican Craig Hosmer.

Hollifield and Hosmer repeatedly raised concerns that the uranium secrets would be leaked outside the United States, that uranium prices would soar once private industry got into the business and that it would concentrate the ownership of energy sources in a few hands.

Hollifield in particular often criticized the plan to allow private industry into the business because it would bring the same companies into uranium enrichment that already dominated oil, natural gas and coal supplies.

What Mr. Ford proposed yesterday was to retain government ownership of the three existing uranium enrichment plants but to let private industry build and operate all future enrichment plants in the United States.

At the moment, two such enrichment plants are contemplated, one in Alabama with the gas diffusion technology used in the government's three plants and another at some unspecified location that would use a relatively untried technology known as gas centrifuge.

The gas diffusion plant would be built first, at a cost of \$3.5 billion and timed to begin operating by 1983. The plant would be built, owned and operated by a consortium called Uranium Enrichment Associates.

The UEA consortium is a joint concern of Bechtel Corp. and Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., which would put up a good part of the \$3.5 billion to construct the gas diffusion plant. The governments of Japan, Iran and West Germany are possible stockholders in the enterprise, more to guarantee themselves enriched uranium than to learn what makes the gas diffusion technology work.

The United States would turn over its gas diffusion technology to UEA to help it build the plant. It would also supply the secret "barriers" that allow gasified uranium to become more and more enriched with the fissionable isotope U-235 that can burn to generate electricity.

In return, the United States would receive a royalty of 3 per cent of the gross business that UEA does. One estimate of the royalty take is \$20 million a year, based on the plant's producing and selling \$660 million worth of enriched uranium every year.

The UEA has already said it would have to raise uranium prices to operate at a profit and stay in business. It has estimated it would sell a uranium fuel load for about \$13

million, compared with the \$9.5 million the government charges today.

At least two companies are already competing to build what promises to be the first of 10 enrichment plants using the gas centrifuge process. One is Union Carbide, the other is the Garrett Corp. Exxon, Westinghouse and General Electric have also mounted efforts to move into the field.

President Ford's decision to allow expansion of the uranium enrichment business comes at a time when U.S. domination of the uranium export business is being threatened. The Soviet Union has sold enriched uranium to Italy, Spain and West Germany. France is expanding its enrichment plant, South Africa is building one and West Germany is negotiating the sale of one to Brazil.

## Bishop's Credentials

Agence France-Presse

WINDHOEK, Namibia, June 26—South African airport officials confiscated today the credentials of the Rev. Edward Morrow, the Anglican churchman appointed to replace the exiled Bishop Richard Wood of Namibia, Morrow said.

The alleged incident, denied by the Interior Department, occurred a few hours after Bishop Wood's wife, Cathy, was flown to Johannesburg after her arrest for refusing to obey a deportation order.

# Ford Urges A-Fuel Role For Industry

By Thomas O'Toole  
Washington Post Staff Writer

President Ford asked Congress yesterday to let private industry into the nuclear fuel business, a move that would end a 30-year government monopoly that began with the birth of the atomic bomb.

The President sent Congress a six-page proposal to allow private industry the rights and the technology to build uranium enrichment plants, factories that process uranium ore into the kind of fuel that can be burned to make electricity in atomic power plants around the world.

In his message to Congress, Mr. Ford pledged that the technology to enrich uranium would remain a secret not to be shared with foreign nations. He also pledged that the enriched uranium exported abroad would remain subject to safeguards and export controls, but insisted the time had come to turn the business of enriching the uranium fuel over to U.S. industry.

"A number of compelling reasons argue for private ownership of uranium enrichment plants," the President told Congress. "The market for nuclear fuel is predominantly in the private sector. The process of uranium enrichment is clearly industrial in nature."

Just how Congress will react to the proposal is unclear right now, but chances of its acceptance and passage are much better than they have been at any time in the past decade.

The idea of turning uranium enrichment over to private industry has been fostered by the Kennedy, Johnson and

See URANIUM, A8, Col. 6

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The bill (H.R. 4723) authorizing appropriations to the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1976, having been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, was signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) on August 2, 1975.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Heiting, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Vice President laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

## CAPITALIZATION OF THE RURAL TELEPHONE BANK—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report on the status of capitalization of the Rural Telephone Bank, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The message is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to Section 406 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to make a report, on or before July 1, 1975, to the President for transmittal to the Congress on the status of capitalization of the Rural Telephone Bank by the United States.

The report of the Secretary is enclosed.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 3, 1975.

## REPORT ON THE PREVENTION OF UNAUTHORIZED DISSEMINATION OR USE OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report concerning actions to be taken by the United States to prevent the unauthorized dissemination or use of nuclear materials, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The message is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, I am submitting the following report concerning actions to be taken by the United States to strengthen international procedures of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to prevent the unauthorized dissemination or use of nuclear materials.

The Act requires that a reasonable amount of the funds authorized for the IAEA as technical assistance should be used to improve such safeguards. The \$200,000 program outlined in this report in conjunction with other U.S. programs, will support the task of assessing, influencing and strengthening these preventive procedures.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 3, 1975.

## APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

A message from the President of the United States stated that he had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions, as follows:

On July 31, 1975:

S.J. Res. 41. A joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Thomas J. Watson, Jr., as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. John Nicholas Brown as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

On August 5, 1975:

S. 555. A act to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

S.J. Res. 23. A joint resolution to restore posthumously full rights of citizenship to Gen. R. E. Lee.

On August 9, 1975:

S. 409. An act to increase the authorization for the Council on Wage and Price Stability, and to extend the duration of such Council.

S. 1531. A act to designate the Mountain Park Reservoir, Oklahoma, as the Tom Steed Reservoir.

S. 1716. An act to authorize appropriations to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and section 305 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

S. 2073. An act to authorize the American Indian Policy Review Commission to accept voluntary contributions of services, and for other purposes.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6674) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1976, and the period of July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training student loans, and for other purposes; requests a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. PRICE, Mr. HEBERT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. SPENCE were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

## ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on August 2, 1975, he presented the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 409. An act to increase the authorization for the Council on Wage and Price Stability, to extend the duration of such Council;

S. 1531. A act to designate the Mountain Park Reservoir, Okla., as the Tom Steed Reservoir;

S. 1716. An act to authorize appropriations to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and section 305 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, and for other purposes; and

S. 2073. An act to authorize the American Indian Policy Review Commission to accept voluntary contributions of services, and for other purposes.

On August 28, 1975, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1849) an act to extend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act.

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

## REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force transmitting, pursuant to law, the Air Force Report on experimental, developmental and research contracts of \$50,000 or more, by company, covering the period January 1, 1975 through June 30, 1975 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION BY THE AIR FORCE RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense notifying the Congress, pursuant to law, of a proposed construction project to be undertaken for the Air Force Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Department of Defense Procurement from Small and Other Business Firms for July 1974-May 1975 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

## REPORT OF THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator of General Services transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning borrowing authority covering the period July 1, 1974 through September 30, 1974 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

## REPORT OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the evaluation of the United States Railway Association Final System Plan (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

## REPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of Environmental Protection Agency transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the dumping permit program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.





# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers 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)