

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</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 - You should have some idea of what capital expenditures will amount to and will be for before you commit the AEC sight un-</i>		
PHONE NO. <i>622</i>	DATE <i>9/5/51</i>	<i>seen</i>		

USE OTHER SIDE FOR ADDITIONAL REMARKS

16-50667-1 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 substantially the same as in title of 7/3/57. Minor modifications were made for the benefit of Princeton. The issue 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-2-93. This should have been obvious 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