

[REDACTED]

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY

9 FEB 1965

MEMORANDUM FOR Dr. McMillan

SUBJECT: [REDACTED] NRO-Congressional Relationships

1. Reference is made to Mr. McCone's 5 February letter to Mr. Vance wherein he expressed concern that you were "planning to substantiate" the [REDACTED] NRP FY 66 Budget Estimate to Congressional Committees; proposed that this be a joint CIA-DOD presentation instead; and indicated he has not yet agreed with the FY 66 budget (this last item is not dealt with in this memorandum).

2. I would guess the CIA's concern is based on two unrelated actions by the [REDACTED] NRO Staff with regard to the Congressional appropriation process.

3. On 30 December, I wrote the CIA Director of Security:

a. expressing the belief that a clearly stated security policy for briefing members of Congress on [REDACTED] NRO matters was needed;

b. noting the [REDACTED] DNRO's responsibility to prepare and substantiate budget requests for [REDACTED] NRO Programs;

c. noting how Congressmen have been briefed in the past; and

d. requesting his advice on the matter (atch 1).

4. Paragraph 2 in the attached letter (sub-paragraph 3b above) is rather loosely worded--and, in retrospect, was probably superfluous--and undoubtedly is the point that upset the CIA. I was thinking largely of [REDACTED] business and did not visualize your making a formal presentation/defense

HANDLE VIA [REDACTED]
CONTROL SYSTEM ONLY

1 2
Page 1 of 2 Pages
Control No. _____

[REDACTED]

to all of the Committees. In any event, I have never received a reply to the 30 December request for "advice", nor has anyone from the CIA contacted me to discuss the matter.

5. In late January, I had Mr. [REDACTED] request an up-dated list of Congressional members of key committees who had been briefed on the [REDACTED] NRP and/or any specific projects. My intention was to provide this information to a few select cleared and key Air Staff witnesses (Gen McConnell, Gen Merrell, Gen Gerrity, and Gen Ferguson)--not so they could present or defend [REDACTED] NRO items, but rather so that they could steer Committees away from sensitive matters by separately soliciting assistance from the Chairman and key Committee members.

6. You will recall that we have discussed the possible problems Air Force witnesses may encounter in the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

7. The reason for our concern (para 6 above) and the intended use, if necessary, of the cleared-Committee member information (para 5 above) has been explained to the CIA staff several times. Thus far, they have not provided the [REDACTED] NRO Staff with up-to-date information on Committee members, and we are thus using information that is one year old (which is still valid as far as it goes).

8. The preceding explanation should allay the concern expressed in Mr. McCone's letter--no unilateral formal presentation by the [REDACTED] NRO to Congressional Committees has ever been contemplated. I must note, however, that this situation is rather typical of our dealings with the CIA staff. They seldom ever seem to refer questions back to the originator, but rather elevate too many minor items to the DCI/DepSecDef level.

9. With regard to the joint-presentation proposal, since there are [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I believe we must seek the understanding and support of key committee members. This would appear to be a most appropriate subject for an Ex-Com discussion.

[REDACTED]

5: 13 Jan 64

file

SAFSS Mr. [redacted] nac/30 Dec 64

1964 DEC 30 16 13 30 December 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR OF SECURITY, CIA

SUBJECT: Briefings of Members of Congress on the [redacted] National Reconnaissance Program

With the advent of a new session of Congress and negotiations that will ensue to obtain Congressional approval of those portions of the DOD budget which are related to the [redacted] National Reconnaissance Program, a need arises for clearly stated security policy pertaining to briefing members of Congress on matters related to this program.

As you are probably aware, the agreement of 13 March 1963 relating to the management of the [redacted] National Reconnaissance Program provides that the [redacted] D/NRO is responsible for preparation of budget requests for all [redacted] NRO programs, and the substantiation of such budget requests to the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence, the Bureau of the Budget and Congressional Committees.

My staff security officer advises me that the list of congressmen currently appearing on the special projects clearance roster is actually a compilation of the names, derived from the CIA, Legislative Liaison Office, of those members of Congress with whom the DCI had found necessary from time to time to discuss various aspects of this program. It is further understood that the briefings were very general in nature, particularly with respect to satellite reconnaissance; were not oriented to the particular project by name, and that secrecy oaths were not effected, although a security admonishment by the DCI occasioned such discussions. It does not appear clear what if any degree of formal security clearance processing is necessary with respect to Congressional members.

Your advice concerning this matter would be greatly appreciated as it is necessary to the formation of the overall [redacted] NRP congressional strategy for the forthcoming year.

DISTRIBUTION:
1&2 to Addres:
3 to SS-3
4&5 to RF #1&

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC DOWNGRADING;
TOP DIR. 5200.10 DOES NOT APPLY

JAMES T. STEWART
Brigadier General, USAF
Director

(S) NRO Staff COPY [redacted] COPIES [redacted]

No Accountability
This copy is not controlled

HANDLE WITH CARE
CONTINUED SYSTEM ONLY

PAGE [redacted] PAGES [redacted]
CASE [redacted] 8326