

## Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DISCUSSION OF EXPORT MATTER (Closed to Public Attendance)

March 8, 1979

Pages 1 - 49

Prepared by: C. H. Brown Office of the Secretary

2 4 . 1	
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	
4	Discussion of Export Matter
5	(Closed to Public Attendance)
6	
7	
8	Chairman's Conference Room 1717 H Street, N.W. Washington, D. C.
9	Thursday, March 8, 1979
10	Indisday, March 6, 19 9
11	
12	The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 2:40 p.
13	Joseph Hendrie, Chairman of the Commission, presiding.
14	PRESENT:
15	Chairman Hendrie
16	Commissioner Gilinsky Commissioner Kennedy
17	Commissioner Bradford Commissioner Ahearne
18	ALSO PRESENT:
19	L. Gossick
20	J. Hoyle J. Shea
21	G. Oplinger J. Becker
22	R. Burnett M. Peterson
23	J. Dunn Lee T. Sherr
24	J. Devine L. Bickwit
- 1	c Stoiher

## PROCEEDINGS

2

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Okay, we are off and running on a Commission session on export matters, specifically having to do with the Taiwan licenses.

5

6

7

4

We will be discussing classified information, so the meeting is closed and the classification level, I guess, is generally Secret. Is that a fair characterization, Jim?

8

MR. SHEA: Yes, I think so.

9

10

11

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Now, there are two aspects that we wanted to cover this afternoon. One of them is a summary

12

of what I will call the nationhood problem which appears to

13

offer some difficulties for Commission action on licenses

14

to export to Taiwan. We will have that summary from

15

16

17

Counsel's office.

Beyond that, we are getting started on a matter that I think would be very useful and that Dick suggested,

18

and that is that it would be a good idea to begin to look

19

at the aspects of the outstanding licenses for Taiwan.

20

21

problem, and if, as, and when that clears, the result of

then we would be able to take fairly expeditious action.

22

legislation or some other suitable form of magic, why

23

So we have these two sorts of things that we

With regard to matters other than the nationhood

24

want to treat this afternoon. Why don't I start out by

asking Counsel and his folks for a summary on the nationhood situation. I understand they met recently with the Department of State lawyers.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Could I ask a question at the outset in that connection?

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Why not.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I wrote the Department of State a rather lengthy letter on the 5th of February on that very question. The first question of a number that I sent to them was: "Does Taiwan meet the nationhood requirements set forth in the Atomic Energy Act, and if so, what is the specific legal basis for that conclusion?" I have not yet had a response to that letter.

Could Counsel, if they have been discussing this with State's counsel discuss that and also, indicate whether they have any intention of replying to my letter, or should I drop them a note reminding them that they have it.

MR. BICKWIT: We'll contact them.

Our purpose is to bring you up to date on our legal analysis, and basically, we adhere to the position that is in the paper that you -- the January 30th paper that you have.

We still can't advise that exports can be legally issued, absence the legislation. With legislation of the sort that is being considered, our view is that the

That would

threshold legal impediments will be removed, and our best reading is that it appears that the legislation will pass in about two or three weeks. 4 And in light of that, it was our view, and I know 5 the view of the Chairman and Commissioner Gilinsky, that -6 the Commission may as well focus on any other questions 7 associated with the licenses so that these can be eliminated and the licenses can issue closely after enactment, assuming 8 the bill, as presently drafted, is not altered. 10 As far as our meeting with State is concerned, 11 they made four arguments. They do not buy ours. 12 be the answer to your question request. 13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That's only the answer to 14 the first half. 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The second half is what is their legal basis for that.

MR. BICKWIT: I'll give that one to you next. COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Why can't they write it to us? Do they feel uncomfortable with it?

MR. BICKWIT: I don't plan to be their apologist. COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I wondered if they had said anything to you.

MR. BICKWIT: They dir not.

They first argue that the question that we pose, which is essentially does Congress intend to continue nuclear commerce with an entity not treated as a nation for purposes of our foreign policy. I can say that biases the answer a bit, and they would have been more comfortable with the question of did Congress intend to continue exports to Taiwan in the event of normalization.

I guess our response is that you can pose these questions any number of ways. Their question, I feel, biases the answer a bit because you might be inclined to answer yes, if you felt the Congress wanted to continue exports to Taiwan, even if they didn't use the word nationhood.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: What date are they thinking of in that question?

MR. BICKWIT: When the nationhood requirement was passed, when was it, '62?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: '54, wasn't it.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Then the question would then be that even if you answered yes, at that time you would have to ask, in what manner did Congress think that the normalization would occur.

MR. BICKWIT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I think it is '54, it would have been.

MR. BICKWIT: I think we could have sat there quite some time and probably would not have been able to

agree on a common question. In any case, whatever question you ask the answer is unclear and ---COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The answer is unclear? MR. BICKWIT: I think the answer is unclear. COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: But they do not agree with that? 8 MR. BICKWIT: Yes, they do. 9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Oh, they do. 10 MR. BICKWIT: The way they phrased it was they felt 11 the arguments, on the one side, were as good as the arguments 12 on the other. 13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: But could you take that just 14 one step farther. That is 'n the present circumstances, but 15 if legislation were passed and the legislation implied that, 16 in fact, Congress did intend that exports go forward or that relations continued as they have been in the past, 17 would that then meet the requirement? 18 19 MR. BICKWIT: Sure. 20 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. MR. BICKWIT: And we wouldn't dispute that. 21 It is cless that their reading is a strange one, 22 that ---23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: To them too? 24 MR. BICKWIT: Yes, I think they would have to admit 25

that, and given that there is no legislative history to support a strange reading, we adhere to the view that we can't go with that strange reading. I felt we ought to cover ourselves in that. COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You favor a reasonable 6 use of English. 7 MR. BICKWIT: 'In the absense of strong legislative 8 history we are going the other way. 9 (Laughter) 10 MR. BICKWIT: Their second argument had us going 11 for a while, which is that basically what we are dealing with in the situation is an understanding that there was 13 14 15 16 17 13

one land mass, and one particular government was the one we recognized, and all that has really changed is that we are now dealing with another government. So that in essence, you have a nation and you have the same nation that you always had. The problem is that the agreement is not ---COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- with that nation. MR, BICKWIT: Right. The third argument they make ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And what do they say to that?

MR. BICKWIT: We couldn't come up with it on the

spot.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Really!

MR. BICKWIT: Well, we were acutally going around it.

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: They were arguing that it is one nation. 3 MR. BICKWIT: We have always viewed it as a nation. 4 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, not always. Since 5 about 1971, I think. 6 MR. BICWIT: Well, our position under the 7 Shanghai Communique has been that we acknowledge ---8 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: It pre-dates that if one goes 9 back and looks at the annual reports of foreign policy issued 10 by President Nixor, by a few months. 11 MR. BICKWIT: I see. 12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: The position is that we 13 have for some years recognized that the People's Republic 14 is a nation? 15 MR. BICKWIT: No. We have always recognized, since '71, that there was a nation called -- well, the 16 17 problem is that there was a single nation and that Taiwan 18 was ---COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: China isn't a nation. 19 MR. BICKWIT: Well, part of it. The only thing 20 that has changed is we now believe that a different government 21 is running it. 22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We never said at that time, 23

which government was the Government of China.

MR. BICKWIT: That's right.

24

1.0

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So that type of argument then would say that if it was legal to license for Taiwan before, then it is still legal?

MR. BICKWIT: That is right. They tried to analogize it in essence to the situation to where you have an acknowledged nation and you simply changed your initiative of who you are dealing with. And under those circumstances, we would say we would advise that exports would be legal.

In other words, if the agreement ---

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, if the Swiss Government decided to call themselves George, we could probably, within the Commission's sweep of things, especially if the State Department sent us a letter saying, well, we now call them George. I expect we could make the transition. It is the same group of people, the same fellow signed the papers and are carrying out the thing, and it is the same government with the same policemen and buildings and courts and clubs and all the rest of it. But on Taiwan, it is a different set of people and a different government located in a different place with whom this thing called an agreement was not negotiated, and one China with two different sets of people is one set too many for our purposes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:

MR. BICKWIT: 2 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: 5 6 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: 7 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: 9 MR. BICKWIT: 10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: 11 12 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: 13 14 MR. BICKWIT: Their third argument is that even if 15 there is a problem under the statute, the Executive Memorandum 16 relieves us of that problem, and we hold to the principle 17 that any action by the President cannot substantively change 18 the expressed provisions in the statute. They do not adhere 19 to that. We just had to part on that issue. 20 MR. STOIBER: I have a interesting note here 21 that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate also 22 parted company with them on that. On page 41 of the 23 report the Committee says that it doubts that the power to 24

issue this directive is within the authority conferred upon

....

3 5 Taiwan. 8 10 did to you, did they? 11 12 13 of their statement. 14 15 16 17 18 19 Hill bias, jokingly. 20 Then finally ---21 22 23 24 25

the President by the Constitution. And they then say, therefore, it is the Committee's judgment, the enactment of these provisions, that is the provisions of the Statute, is legally required, not simply politically desirable, but legally required if the President is to be enabled to continue to conduct the myriad of programs concerning

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, the State Department, in writing to the Congress didn't make it as blunt as they

MR. BICKWIT: They didn't make it as blunt as they do -- as I just indicated, but that was the clear implication

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes. I guess they would be very hesitant about making it very bluntly.

MR. BICKWIT: That's right.

In light of this, given our interpretation, our General Counsel's office was accused of having a Capitol

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I would have thought it would be the other. That Capitol Hill had an NRC bias.

MR. BICKWIT: Their final point is that they hoped that the Commission would not come down on this question, given that there was no need to understand various

policy options available to you, and that if by chance this legislation become hung up, they would like to have another crack at us, which would obviously, they would be harmed by your having come down on the side of our memorandum.

And I think that is a good point. If you were inclined to go in the direction of our advice, there is no reason for you to actually come down on that side in this proceeding.

are predisposed to issue the license, go ahead, but as a matter of fact, we don't.

MR. BICKWIT: Now, with respect to the -- the bottom line with respect to this point is that our advice remains that it is not legally permissible to go forward.

I'd like Carl to speak to the question of whether it would be under the legislation.

MR. STOIBER: What I would like to do, if we have sufficient time, is to basically run through the Statute now as it exists. I'm not clear if the Senate will be able to finish this legislation this week, although I believe the House may well complete its action on the bill. Chairman Zablocki has made his intentions to do that known, and he would like to see it out of the committee.

In the event that at that point, these enactments, these two different enactments as they emerge from either house, and that would be, of course, the Conference Committee

and ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Are they substantially different?

MR. STOIBER: They are substantially different in the sense that the Senate version is a much more highly developed document in the reports. The House version parallels, I think, to a greater extent, the version submitted by the Administration.

What I would like to do is run through the key portions of the Senate bill which is entitled "The Taiwan Enabling Act", S. 245. We did forward a copy of the Administration version to you on January 31st, but it has been considerably revised since that time. It was reported out of the Committee to the floor on March 1st and its structure is in five titles. The first 14 sections on Taiwan deal with specific aspects of continued cooperation of Taiwan. Title 2 contains implementing provisions for the American Institute on Taiwan, the appropriate entity which we are establishing to conduct these relations.

Title 3 contains the authorization for the appropration of funds. Title 4 provides for a Congressional review of agreements entered into by the AIT and the reporting requirement, and Title 5 makes the enactment retroactive to the first of the year, and contains a separate holding clause.

Title 1 is the one that is important for purposes of the Commission's review of these licenses and I'd like to run through, very quickly, the 14 sections and point out where they specifically impact the Commission's licensing authority.

I think, by way of introduction, we, in the General Counsel's office believe that as currently framed, the Statute would enable the Commission to continue its licensing activities with respect to Taiwan and would resolve the legal problems cornected with the status of Taiwan and the authorities on Taiwan and I will try to explain to you how the Act attempts to do that.

First of all, Section 101 of the Act makes all domestic, United States laws which refer to a state or a nation applicable and makes that include Taiwan. Page 23 of the section-by-section analysis of the report makes it clear that that also applies to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. That was listed specifically in the report as one of the domestic United States statutes which is to be included here. This is one of the several sections which deal with the nationhood requirements.

One addition to Section 101, which was put in by the Senate, dealt with the problem that was discussed here in your last meeting about this locution, "people on Taiwan," and what that actually means.

The Senate has now flushed out the definition of
that phrase to say, "people on Taiwan," as used in this

Act shall mean and include the governing authority on

Taiwan recognized by the United States prior to January 1,

1979, as the Republic of China with agencies, instrumentalities

and political subdivisions; and the people governed by it in

7 the islands of Taiwan and the Pescadores.

Now, it seems to me that the basic legal effect of that definition is to confer what I would call defacto government status on the people on Taiwan. I think that is an important consideration for us in terms of a continuing relationship here, and I think it cures a fairly significant defect in the language as proposed by the Administration.

Section 102 of the Act provides that diplomatic relations will not be required to make Taiwan eligible for participation in any program or any series of relations conducted with the United States.

Section 103 gives the entity to be established by Taiwan and that comes up in a further section here. The standard procedure in the United States courts, if our entity, the American Institute in Taiwan has reciprocal rights to sue in courts on Taiwan, so it is a reciprocal provision or outstanding provision.

Section 104 is another significant provision for

----

our purposes because what it does is to provide that all agreements in force with the Republic of China prior to January 1, 1979, entered into by the United States, will continue in force and it places the Congress's approval of that continuation in force on the President's Memorandum of Law which he issued back in December. So it is, in a sense, a Congressional ratification of the -- all these past agreements including the agreement with Taiwan in the Nuclear Cooperation Agreement.

Section 105 is also extremely important for the Commission because it authorizes any programs to be carried out with a foreign state or nation to be carried out with Taiwan. Page 25 of the Senate report contains the following lauguage: "This will assure the continuation of authority for such important programs as arms sales, nuclear exports, and export-import bank financing. So nuclear exports are specifically referenced in the report as one of these programs to be continued under Section 105.

Section 106 is the section which mandates the carrying out of all relations between the United States and Taiwan through the American Institute on Taiwan is going to be or has been incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. So that is the provision which sets up the AIT.

Section 107 is a provision in which the United State:

is to advance human rights in Taiwan through the Institute. Section 108 is another significant one from our view point. This also bears upon the agreement for cooperation requirement because the state, that whenever we have to have an agreement in force in order to conduct any sort of program or arrangement, that those kinds of arrangements shall be entered into or performed in force in the manner and to the extent directed by the President, by or through the Institute. This is particularly significant 10 in view of the provision in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation 11 Act which requires the renegotiation of agreements for 12 cooperation, as this specifically authorizes this renegotiation 13 process to take place under the auspicious of the American 14 Institute on Taiwan. 15 Section 109, also ----16 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let's see. If there is 17 a renegotiation, it would be with the Taiwan Institute? 18 MR. STOIBER: Yes. 19 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It would be between these two institutes? 20 21 MR. STOIBER: That's right. COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: And the signature on the 22 agreement would be? MR. STOIBER: The Director of the Institute or 24

whoever headed the agency.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And what would the title of the person on Taiwan be on this document? MR. STOIBER: I believe it would be a director of 4 the coordinating -- Director of the Coordinating Committee 5 for American Affairs. CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: POT. You would probably have 6 Senior POTs. 8 (Laughter) 9 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Most distinguished POTs. 10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: POT emeritus. 11 MR. STOIBER: Moving briskly on to Section 101. 12 This is very important ---13 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Will somebody tell me what 14 happened to Senator Percy? 15 MR. BICKWIT: That was to be passed along. 16 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Was I reading your mail, 17 sorry about that. 18 (Reporter's note: A message was received for Mr. Bickwit with regards the Percy Amendment to 19 the Taiwan bill, thus, the above comments.) 20 MR. BICKWIT: It doesn't make a lot of sense without 21 some explanatory note. 22 The Percy Amendment ---23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I was particularly worried 24 about tabling Percy. 25

\* People of Taman, sur page 15.

MR. BICKWIT: The Percy Amendment is an amendment which would increase security guarantees for Taiwan over and above the Committee reported version. The Percy Amendment carries -- you could have a situation where this legislation became hung up in conference or wherever, and the fact that they failed to table it suggests that that would be the place to carry it. So it is very relevant to this discussion.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Has the House, in fact, passed legislation yet?

MR. BICKWIT: No, but it is on the floors of both the House and the Senate today.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Today?

MR. BICKWIT: Yes.

MR. STOIBER: Section 109 deals with the problem of assurances and provides that whenever an agency of the United States is required to receive assurances, they shall be rendered or provided to or recieved or accepted from an instrumentality established by the people on Taiwan.

Now, that is amplified somewhat in the report that states as follows: This section provides for dealing with the people on Taiwan through an instrumentality act of one we already have. It makes clear that provisions for dealing with a foreign government would be satisfied with respect to the people on Taiwan by dealing with that

instrumentality. For example, the Arms Export Control
Act authorizes the sale of defense articles and services
to foreign countries and it requires those countries to
agree to certain conditions and to provide certain
assurances. Under the bill, these sales will be made by the
Institute to the Taiwan counterpart instrumentality in the
agreements and assurances by that counterpart instrumentality
will be accepted in satisfaction with the requirements of
the Arms Export Control Act.

Now, the Atomic Energy Act is not specifically referenced in that section, but in talking with people in the Congress, the indication was that the same language would apply.

Section 110 qualifies Taiwan for purposes of any United States statute to enable courts to enforce Taiwanese law as foreign law or any statute referring to the need to apply foreign law would also be able to apply the law applied on Taiwan.

Section lll provides that no ownership of property interest of Taiwan is to be affected by the recognition of the PRC. This basically deals with the embassy up here at Twin Oaks and other properties. It also preserves pre-existing contracts entered into by Taiwanese and United States nationalists.

Section 112 allows for loans, guarantees and

1001-000 1101-000 1101-000 1101-000 1101-000

reinsurance under the Foreign Assistance Act.

Section 113 provides for privileges and immunities comparable to the diplomatic privileges for representatives of these counterpart agencies as long as they recripocal, and Section 114 is the policy article which also contains the various security guarantees and the grave concern of the United States of 2r any attempt to resolve the Taiwan issue by force.

So those are basically the provisions of the Act. In combination, we believe that they do provide a firm legal foundation for continuing relations and do resolve the nationhood and reassurance problems.

I might just mention that the counterpart article in the House bill is Section 201(a) and there is some interesting language in the House report which indicates how the House view is presented.

It says: "Likewise, this section does not effect the future resolution of legal issues based on changed circumstances. It simply makes the fact that the recognition, irrelevant to the resolution of those issues, for example, under this section the Nuclear Regulatory Commission would be able to make the required findings and determinations under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 in order to permit continued nuclear exports to Taiwan and derecognition will not constitute a basis for not making those

findings and determinations. At the same time, there is nothing in this bill that would prevent the Commission from taking into account subsequent changes and circumstances in its application to the statutory criteria in particular cases."

So this preserves your ability to look at the factual circumstances, just as you would in any other case, to determine whether or not the criteria are met. However, it makes the fact that derecognition is irrelevant to that determination. We are to treat Taiwan, essentially, as we do any other government for the purposes of licensing.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let me ask you, are U.S.

Government personnel going to continue to travel to Taiwan?

MR. STOIBER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: In any particular capacity, or?

MR. STOIBER: Not in an official capacity, I don't believe. That gets you into Title II of the Act and there are provisions here in which officers or employees of United States agencies may be permitted to serve with the other agency in a nonofficial capacity.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, what happens to things like physical security inspection or it comes to that, safeguards or ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Or American citizens on Taiwan?

MR. STOIBER: We did raise that issue with the
State Department and they wanted to assure us that those

matters would be dealt with by the Institute.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, what happens to

Jerry Page when he goes on his periodic jaunts around the

world? Does he get to go to Taiwan?

MR. STOIBER: It says: "Any Department or..." this is Section 202. I'm sorry.

MR. BICKWIT: Section 106 provides that U.S.

Government program transactions and other relations with respect to the people on Taiwan shall be carried out through the American Institute in Taiwan. So I would assume that you would have to have any activity of the United States running through that Institute. I think there might be a problem with personnel -- Government personnel actually doing inspections. But AIT personnel, there would be no problem with AIT personnel, though.

citizens carrying regular passports temporarily assigned to AIT to do whatever it is they have to do. This is being done in business in more than one place where we do not have diplomatic relations on business, but on official business, you simply had to do this with a standard tourist passport and no indication of orders indicating that you were, in fact, visiting there on official business of the U.S. Government.

MR. STOIBER: 201, I think is the applicable section. It allows any department or agency of the United States to perform support functions and services for the operations of the Institute and for reimbusement to other agencies for those services provided.

If you are talking about a physical security visit, for example, I think what would have -- the way they envision this operating is that the physical security people would be secunded to the American Institute in Taiwan and they would have to perform their services as a liaison officer or as an official of this entity, then they would be, of course, separated ---

Institute, presumably, would carry out the U.S. side of the agreement. In other words, certain determinations would need to be made and certain fall-back, safeguard functions that might have to be exercised at some point. I assume that the American Institute then would officially carry out those functions rather than the United States Government. So that agreement is no longer with the United States Government, is that right?

MR. BICKWIT: As no agreements would be with the United States Government.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: So no only is it not with the Republic of China, but it is not with the United

1	
	States Government either. Now, what control would the
2	United States Government here, have over this Institute?
3	MR. STOIBER: The Taiwanese entity?
4	COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Over our entity.
5	
6	MR. BICKWIT: In fact, total control.
7	COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, in what sense, I
8	mean, you are obviously going to be appointing the who
9	is it, the Secretary of State appoints the directors or?
	MR. STOIBER: The provisions which establish the -
10	You have two links. You have the statutory link in Taiwan
11	which provides that in the instrumentality that we are
12	going to set up here, it is going to conduct its activities
13	in the manner and to the extent directed by the President.
14	So it is under his direct executive control, but it is not
15	in the same sort of constitutional relationship that one
16	ordinarily has with an executive agency. It is a special
17	statutory type control that it
18	statutory type control that the President has by virtue of this act.
19	게 되는 사업 및 경기를 받는 다른 사람이 되는 사람들이 보고 있는 사람이 있다면 보다 되었다.
	The other nature of control is provided under the
20	articles of Cooperation of the American Institute.
21	COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: They have to do as
2	directed by the President?
3	MR. STOIBER: Well, you have directors which are
4	appointed by President
5	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: As you said, they have to
	no you said, they have to

carry out their functions to the extent and in the manner prescribed by the President. 3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Are they removable by the 4 President? 5 MR. STOIBER: Yes. 6 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Without any binding clause 7 or anything like that? -8 MR. BICKWIT: I'm sure they are. 9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: To the extent that legal 10 minds have been able to come up with it, this is a fairy 11 castle representation of the United States Government on 12 the one hand, and of the Republic of China Government on 13 the other hand? 14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The Japanese have been doing 15 this for several years. 16 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Any other discussion on the 17 nationhood proposition? 18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: We have moved into the realm of a true international government in this fictious 19 world. 20 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Now, on the issue on the merits 21 of the case, aside from who they are. 22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Which case? 23 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: We have what, four? 24

MR. SHEA: We have a total of 6 Taiwan exports

before NRC, that is, completed through the Executive Branch review.

One of those is with the staff and the export qualifies as a minor. In our prior referral to the Commission we have been holding it pending the resolution of these questions. Five of them are actually cleared with the Commission. Gerry is prepared to summarize those --

even the minor ones if they were of a particularly sensitive character would normally be put before the Commission, and I'm sure Taiwan must be in that category. Am I confused about -- maybe I was confused about the way we sort of agreed on how these things were to be handled.

MR. SHEA: I think maybe Marv could summarize Part 110 on that.

MR. PETERSON: You are correct on this, they may be forwarded to the Commission for review, but in this case the problem is the country is at issue and not the particular case, so the case remains minor.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: So when the major cases go --MR. SHEA: Then we notify the Commission.

MR. PETERSON: There are no other sensitive issues in this Taiwan case.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Gerry, why don't you go ahead.

MR. OPLINGER: All right.

The minor case, I might add, is 20 percent material.

The other cases are as follows:

We have an application for about 32kg of 20 percent material. This is for a water boiler reactor at their research institute.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: 32 plus 19 is 51.

MR. OPLINGER: Where does the 19 come from. 32 kilograms of 19 percent material.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I see, all right. And the other one is?

MR. OPLINGER: The minor one that I mentioned is three and a half kilograms.

There is another application for 239,000 kilograms of LEU for two power reactors, the Chinshan Units 1 and 2. We have an application for two power reactors, Tai Power 5 and 6 and then we have two cases for depleted uranium.

One for 10,000 kilograms and one for 17,000.

Now, the first of those, the usage was to make containers for radioisotopes and in the second case, 17,000 kgs to make shipping casks for spent fuel rods.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Is that what you make shipping casks out of?

MR. OPLINGER: Out of depleted uranium? Well, they use it to line shipping crates. I don't know how common that usage is, but I gather it

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Are these exempt from the

safeguards? CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Depleted uranium? 3 MR. SHEA: They consider it as source material, I believe. 5 (Simultaneous discussion.) 6 MR. SHEA: We produced a paper a while back on the 7 use of source material. . 8 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Is there a shipping cask business on Taiwan? What use do they have for casks? 10 MR. OPLINGER: The only use for it I know of is 11 12 spent fuel. 14 15 16 Marv, do you know anything more about it? MR. FETERSON: The tails material resulting from 17 the previous or original contract by Taiwan Power Company 18 19 and , provides for the return of material, so they apparently have a cask facility for making casks. 20 MR. OPLINGER: If you want, I can go through these 21 cases briefly to describe what remaining issues we see 22 besides the legal problems we have been talking about 23 in relation to Taiwan. 24

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I think it would be useful to

cite those.

MR. OPLINGER: The first one is the question of facility attachments, and this could raise some problems under Criterion 1 because of Taiwan's status with the IAEA. They are no longer recognized by the agency as occupying the seat of China and in effect, that government is no longer a member of the agency.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's nothing new.

MR. OPLINGER: Right, nothing new about that.

Do you want me to stop and read this or --
(Indicating to Ms. Becker who was showing Mr.

Oplinger a paper.)

MS. BECKER: No. I thought you were familiar with it.

MR. OPLINGER: Yes, I think that's clear, but the question I'm raising is the fact that it is not apparently possible for the agency to negotiate a facility attachment with a government that is not a member of the agency.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: On what basis do they inspect from?

MR. OPLINGER: Well, because there is an existing

agreement, a trilateral agreement between the three parties. That is in existence now and they can operate under it, apparently, but we are not aware that there are any existing facility attachments or that they plan to negotiate any.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I must say that it is not clear to me that the agency takes its inspection in Taiwan as seriously as it does in other places. They are paid on sort of a by hour or per hour basis, and we have got to have some confirmation that in fact they do regard it to be on the same basis as other responsibilities.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Gerry, what does that business about facility attachment 3 in terms of cameras mean?

MR. OPLINGER: Well, I don't think very much, because, remember, this is an INFCIRC '66 agreement and therefore, there is no requirement, even if they were negotiating this facility attachment under a '66 agreement to have seals and cameras, although, in fact, they do, at least -- for example, the Canadian reactor has had camera coverage.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, doesn't a facility attachment go into the how often inspectors come around?

MR. OPLINGER: It goes into that and any kind of details ---

CO'MISSIONER KENNEDY: What is going to be inspected

and what the general characteristics are of the systems. MR. OPLINGER: Right. COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: So on what basis are they inspecting? MR. OPLINGER: I don't know, and we have been trying to get the answer to that question for some time from the Executive Branch, and they don't have a clear answer. We sent over to them on February 16th four questions about safeguards operations that NMSS has asked us to get answers to. We have not received any answer. COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Why don't you read the question? MR. OPLINGER: Yes, I'll just summarize it. 

Now, if we got clear answers, well, to the first of those questions, that would give us a better handle on how, in the absence of facility attachments they do decide what they can do, what their inspection schedule would be and all of those things. We simply don't know at this point.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: When did we issue the last export license for Taiwan?

MR. SHEA: Do you recall -- we can check that out. I think it has been about a year.

MR. OPLINGER: Asking about facility attachments was not the common practice at that point for us.

MR. ROTHSCHILD: The Commission has almost issued nothing since the NPA went into effect. So the Commission has gone for the criteria on that one.

MR. OPLINGER: In particular on this water boiler reactor, we sort of routinely asked State, what was the status of your facility attachment on that, and we got an answer which said, well, there isn't one because the reactor has not completed construction yet, so there wouldn't be.

Then we got a letter from one of the people in the ROC nuclear program who said, hurry up with the license because the reactor is sitting there, it is all completed and we want our fuel. So we have gone back to State and said, please clarify it and we don't have an answer to

that.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But you know the answer.

MR. OPLINGER: Well, I assume there is no facility attachment.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I thought you had said at the beginning of that little discussion that there couldn't be.

MR. SHEA: State's position was that they couldn't because it wasn't completed.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: No. If you define a facilities attachment as a negotiated agreement between the country and IAEA on how IAEA is going to go about doing inspections, then there can't be.

MR. OPLINGER: Unless there had been something negotiated before the change in the status of the IAEA.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: They feel they can inspect someone with whom they can't negotiate? Is that the logic?

MR. OPLINGER: Apparently so.

I have talked to people on the telephone about this in DOE and State, and I get somewhat different answers from everybody I talk to. Some people have told me that there have been some kind of arrangements, negotiated or that decide questions like you would address in a facility attachment, but they don't have the status of a real facility attachment. Whether that's true or not, I can't

confirm it or haven't beer able to.
COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: You ought to try to find
out what they are. There is no reason why the Taiwanese
shouldn't let us know.
MR. OPLINGER: Now, on more general matters, if
I could go on,
, I don't think we have anything very significant
to add to any of that.
COMMISSIONER GILINSKY:
MR. OPLINGER:
and you will have to decide whether or
not you :e satisfied with that response, I think, before
we go ahead with licenses.
There is one other possible question that may
arise on at least two of these, I believe, with respect to
full-scope safeguards, because the reactors case and the
low enriched fuel both involve exports which will go and
be used after March 10, 1980. I personally
COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Are they part of the NPT?
MR. OPLINGER: They are part of the NPT, but it is

1.7

not clear, for example that the agency takes any official cognizance, for example, of this water boiler reactor inside the research institute. There is no document that we can identify under which they, at this point, will apply safeguards to that thing. So how can we say, in approving a license, that all the known Taiwanese facilities are under safeguards.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Doesn't the IAEA have an .

obligation to inspect all parties of the NPT whether or

not they are members of the IAEA?

MR. OPLINGER: Well, yes, but that has to be done,
I think, through a safeguards agreement. Either a 153 or
66's on every facility. We have no way of knowing that all
Taiwanese facilities, at this point, are covered by safeguards
agreements, and therefore, whether or not they qualify under
128.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: When you say we have no way of knowing, does that mean that as far as we can tell there is no way of knowing or that we have asked IAEA and they haven't answered, or that we have asked Taiwan and they haven't answered or we haven't asked, but ---

MR. OPLINGER: We haven't asked the question,
I guess is the answer, and I think we should.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, why don't we ask, and why don't we get the IAEA to get cracking on this.

MR. OPLINGER: The only one that I can identify where there is a real as opposed to a theoretical question is this water boiler reactor There could be others. 4 On the other hand, this could be the only one. I simply 5 don't know. 6 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, let's at least deal 7 with this one. 8 MR. OPLINGER: Yes. Well, we have asked the question of State on this one and we don't yet have an 10 answer. But we had that answer which said, well, it's 11 not completed yet, but that's not a real answer. 12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: What does it mean to say, 13 let's get the IAEA cracking? What is it that they are 14 supposed to do (a) and what can they do (b). 15 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, if there is a 16 facility out there that is going to be operating, they 17 ought to be inspecting it. 18 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The question is, can they? COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: If the can't, then we 19 ought to be doing it. Somebody has got to be covering that. 20 The Taiwanese, I presume, are willing to have it inspected. 21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'm confident of that. 22 MR. STOIBER: Are we informed about the legal 23 case which the Secretariat makes where it is better to 24

enter into the facility attachments under its statute?

00 0

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: If they can't then we have got to employ bilateral safeguards.

MR. STOIBER: It is sort of a troublesome legal issue that I would like to have the Secretariat, at least, to respond to if they are asserting that they can't do this.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, that's what I'm saying. What is it that they can do and what is it they can't do, before we sort of assert what they ought to do.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, certainly we want to find out what the facts are.

MR. OPLINGER: It would seem to me that instead of dealing with these questions piecemeal, as we have done, what we need is a letter to State now, saying, during this period while the legislation is pending, we are trying to clean up all of these things and we have the following safeguards questions.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Some of those questions you will find in my letter, to which I have not yet received a reply. It has only been a month. I was trying to clear them up last month. I'll try to clear them up this afternoon.

## CHAIRMAN HENDRIE:

MR. OPLINGER: Commissioner Bradford had asked the question

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:
9	
10	MR. OPLINGER:
11	
12	
13	
14	COMMISSIONER BRADFORD:
15	
16	
17	
18	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:
19	
20	
21	COMMISSIONER BRADFORD:
22	
23	
24	
25	

	28
	i.
	10
	*
1	15
	11
	11
	73
2	
6	7.6
	11
-	1
3	11
100	11
	15
	23
1	14
1	11
	15
	13
-	11
5	1
-	11
	19
6	
0	11
	-12
	11
-	11
7	1:
	11
	11
	11
0	1.5
8	11
	11
	11
	2.5
9	2
-	13
	11
10 11 12	11
3.0	11
10	16
	11
	11
11	11
77	11
44	14
	11
	11
2 0	11
12	11
	21
	11
	11
7 7	11
72	11
	11
	11
	11
13 14 15	11
-	11
	11
	11
15	11
70	11
	11
16	11
* **	11
16	11
-	11
	100
	11
17	11
4.6	11
	11
	11
4 4	1
18	11
-	
	1.1
19	1
73	11
	11
	11
40.0	11
20	1
2	1.0
	11
	11
2.1	
21	
21	- 11
21	- 11
	- 11
	- 11
21	The second second
	The second second

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE:

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD:

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Okay, so that's interesting.

What else is hidden on these things?

MR. OPLINGER: That's it as far as we have been able to identify.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Why don't you get off and running with communications with the Executive Branch and see if we can't get some of these matters cleaned up.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Let me reiterate, that's what I tried to do on February 2nd, and they haven't answered.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Let me ask: out of the five major licenses before the Commission, either three or five of them are over the 120 day limit at this point, aren't they?

MR. SHEA: That's right.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Quite apart from the nationhood problem, why are they in that condition at that age with regard to these other questions?

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I don't think you can separate them from the nationhood problem, can you?

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: The vigor with which the other questions might have been pursued, I guess, has been slowed down by the nationhood problem.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The vigor with which they have answered a number of the questions that have been posed has probably been slowed down by the same situations, which I would grant them, of course.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, the business of the facilities attachments and the Taiwanese, in effect, hiring the agency to make safeguards inspections, that has been in existence for some time, for some years.

MR. OPLINGER: That's right.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: So with regards to new facilities and so on, that's some sort of problem with having an agreed upon inspection routine for a new facility. It isn't something that has just turned up since Mr. Carter said we've got to switch into China recognition.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: There is a nationhood dimension to that problem, that is, whether the facility

attachment can pe put together. 2 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes, but it sounds to me as 3 though the problem -- such problems may have existed before 4 the nationhood problem came up, wasn't making any progess, 5 and I don't understand why the damned license applications. 6 have aged the way they have without any progress on what 7 I'll call the old problem. 8 MR. OPLINGER: Well, it wasn't identified as a 9 arablem in some of these cases. 10 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Well, these things have 11 aged in a funny way. It seems to me, I remember a Friday 12 afternoon in November when they were almost out the door. 13 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes, that's right. 14 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: I have forgotten how 15 many signatures there were on ---16 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Enough. 17 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: They would have gone without 18 this problem being focused on, I guess. 19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes. CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, now we are going to 20 sway into mid-March. 21 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: What happened was that the 22 President made his announcement. I think Peter's point is 23 quite right, that they were ready to go and would have gone --24 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: 25

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, let's go after them now and see if we can please or generate some action of these assorted questions. If the Congress moves ahead in a couple of weeks, two-three weeks or something, it would be very nice if we could be well underway with this.

MR. OPLINGER: Well, we have asked at least some of these questions, weeks ago, and had no response to them. Should we consolidate them all into a -- repeat those that we already asked, or ---

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Do an omnibus package.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I think the most useful

thing is to call Lou up and see if he can focus a little attention on it.

I notice that both we and the Department of State have the problem that we seem to lose cases and when somebody rattles our foor we say, Oh, yes, gee, look at that.

Son of a gun. It may be you have asked enough questions and it may be that all we need to do is get some motion on the answers.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: They are probably waiting for a replacement for Dixon.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I don't know. They are short

handed over there and they can't work on everything that they ought to be working on. That's quite clear. We 3 have some of the same problems. I notice we have got a few things now that seemed to have fallen off the table. 5 They have to decide just as we do, what's the case that we 6 are going to burn the resources on today, and maybe the 7 time is getting close and maybo it would be useful for them 8 to devote a little of their limited and precious resource to moving toward some of these answers so that we can move. 10 assuming that the Congress will act in the meantime. 11 Okay, anything else? Now, what I'm trying to 12 search for here is are there other things that are of difficulty that we haven't enunciated. Does anybody know 13 of any thorns laying around that we ought to identify. 14 15 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Is your correspondence with Lou at an end now. It seems as though you had asked 16 rather more of a question than he had answered the last time 17 I had ---18 COMMISSIONER A"EARNE: I guess I relayed that ---19 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: This is in respect to the 20 book? 21 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes, this is in respect to 23 the book. 24

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So I was satisfied with respect to the -- as far as it addressed the questions I had. but I still fell that they have an obligation, as a representative.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: They actually said that too? There were several statements, I noticed they hadn't addressed and I don't remember that one.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:

1	
2	COMMISSIONER AHEARNE:
3	
4	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:
5	
6	
7	
8	COMMISSIONER AHEARNE:
9	
10	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:
11	
12	COMMISSIONER GILINSKY:
13	
14	
15	COMMISSIONER AHEARNE:
16	
17	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:
18	
19	CHAIRMAN HENDRIE:
20	
21	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:
22	
23	COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: That would be a help.
24	CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: But the outcome of this
25	conversation is that with regard to the applications before

1	us. There is a more general problem, perhaps, but thi
2	is referring to these applications.
3	COMMISSIONER BRADFORD:
4	
5	
6	COMMISSIONER AHEARNE:
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	COMMISSIONER GILINSKY:
17	COMMISSIONER AHEARNE:
18	
19	COMMISSIONER GILINSKY:
20	
21	COMMISSIONER AHEARNE:
22	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:
23	
24	COMMISSIONER GILINSKY:
25	

1	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I tend not to try find the
2	lowest guy on the totem pole, but the responsible guys.
3	COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But the State Department
4	answer,
5	
6	
7	COMMISSIONER BRADFORD:
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	COMMISSIONER AHEARNE:
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Other items that are going to be

1	thorns under this
2	COMMISSIONER BRADFORD:
3	
4	
5	
6	COMMISSIONER AHEARNE:
7	
8	
9	CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I don't hear any other citations
10	being made and I'll assume that we have heard about the proble
11	Let's see if we can make some progress on these.
12	Thank you very much.
13	By the way, let's vote to withhold this tape and
14	transcript.
15	(A chorus of "ayes".)
16	CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: So ordered.
17	(Whereupon, the meeting in the above-entitled matter
18	was concluded at 3:55 p.m.)
19	
20	
21	
22	