

MEMO ROUTE SLIP Form AEC-93 (Rev. May 14, 1947)		See me about this. Note and return.	For concurrence. For signature.	For action. For Information.
TO (Name and unit) <i>J. W. Tuttle</i> <i>B. 7-2</i>	INITIALS	REMARKS 405120		
	DATE			
TO (Name and unit)	INITIALS	REMARKS <i>R</i>		
	DATE			
TO (Name and unit)	INITIALS	REMARKS		
	DATE			
FROM (Name and unit) <i>B. Thompson</i>	REMARKS	<i>① - U. should have some idea of what capital expenditures will amount to and will be for before we commit the AEC sight un-</i>		
PHONE NO. <i>624</i>	DATE <i>9/9/57</i>	<i>seen</i>		

USE OTHER SIDE FOR ADDITIONAL REMARKS

16-56667-1 U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

200

US DOE ARCHIVES
326 U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

RG DOE HISTORIAN (DBM)

Collection 1132

Box 3365

Folder # 24

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DOE ARCHIVES

② My explanation does not contradict your statement
to CNR contacts. The approved memo was sub-
stantially the same as in title of 7/3/51. Minor
modifications were made for the benefit of Princeton. The
case and substance, however, is indisputable. Why this
should be a problem here any more than in our
regular unclassified research program is a mystery
to me. All that is required is to set up a system
modeled on G M - 93. This should have consultations
from the outset. The fact that we are dealing with
PHS instead of directly does not mean we discard
what we know about how an AEC sponsored
unclassified research program should be conducted in
the light of our special responsibility for security under
the Atomic Energy Act.

③ Refer to enclosure