



**Congressional
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

U.S.-China Nuclear Cooperation Agreement

Mark Holt

Specialist in Energy Policy

Mary Beth D. Nikitin

Specialist in Nonproliferation

April 20, 2015

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

RL33192

Summary

Negotiated by the Reagan Administration nearly 30 years ago, the U.S. peaceful nuclear cooperation agreement with the People's Republic of China (PRC) is set to expire on December 30, 2015. Such agreements are often called "123 agreements" because they are required by Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (P.L. 95-242). They are a prerequisite for any significant nuclear cooperation with another country, such as exports of nuclear power plants and components and the transfer of nuclear material. Negotiations on a new agreement are under way. Since the original agreement was concluded before China was a member of the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), some changes to the text are required. The agreement is expected to be submitted to Congress for review in spring 2015.

Almost 13 years passed between the time President Reagan submitted the current 123 agreement to Congress in July 1985 and its implementation in March 1998 under President Clinton. While Congress did not reject the agreement outright, it passed a Joint Resolution, P.L. 99-183, which required that certain nonproliferation-related certifications be made by the President before the agreement could be implemented. P.L. 99-183 required a presidential certification and a report followed by a period of 30 days of continuous session of Congress. After the 1989 Tiananmen Crackdown, Congress enacted sanctions in P.L. 101-246, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, suspending nuclear cooperation with China and requiring an additional presidential certification on the PRC's nuclear nonproliferation assurances.

Ahead of a summit with the PRC, President Clinton, on January 12, 1998, signed certifications (as required by P.L. 99-183) on China's nuclear nonproliferation policy and practices. Some sources indicate this was after China agreed to cease cooperation with Iran. Clinton also issued a certification and waived a sanction imposed under P.L. 101-246. Congressional review ended on March 18, 1998, allowing the agreement to be implemented.

U.S. nuclear commerce with China has expanded since implementation of the agreement. On February 28, 2005, Westinghouse submitted an initial bid to sell four nuclear power reactors to China, as supported by the Bush Administration. In Beijing in December 2006, Energy Secretary Samuel Bodman signed a bilateral Memorandum of Understanding that granted the deal to Westinghouse. The first four Westinghouse reactors under the deal are now being constructed, with six more planned and as many as 30 more proposed.

At the same time, Members of Congress continue to question whether China is fulfilling its nonproliferation commitments, particularly regarding transfers to North Korea by Chinese entities. Proliferation sanctions on Chinese companies and individuals remain in place, and the United States cooperates with China in improving export control and detection systems. In addition, China continues to develop its own nuclear arsenal.

By 2014, the Obama Administration started to negotiate a renewal of the U.S.-PRC nuclear cooperation agreement, subject to congressional review. Congress might examine whether the PRC's record on nuclear proliferation warrants continued cooperation in nuclear power. A key issue for the U.S. nuclear industry is its continued participation in the construction of new Chinese nuclear power plants.

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction and Current Status | 1 |
| Congressional Concerns | 1 |
| Nuclear Proliferation | 1 |
| Nuclear Exports and Jobs | 3 |
| Chinese Re-export of U.S. Reactor Technology | 4 |
| Plutonium Separation from U.S.-Origin Reactor Fuel | 5 |
| Safety and Environmental Benefits | 7 |
| History of the U.S.-China Agreement on Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation | 8 |
| Strategic Interests | 8 |
| Summits and Timeline | 9 |
| Congressional Concerns in Early 1980s | 9 |
| President Reagan Visits China in 1984 | 10 |
| United States Initials Agreement | 10 |
| PRC Nonproliferation Pledges | 10 |
| President Reagan Submits Agreement in 1985 | 11 |
| Administration’s Concerns | 11 |
| Proliferation Concerns | 12 |
| Formal Submission | 13 |
| Issues During 1985 Congressional Review | 13 |
| Legislation and P.L. 99-183 | 15 |
| Sanctions After the Tiananmen Crackdown | 16 |
| Initial Legislation | 16 |
| P.L. 101-246 | 17 |
| Implementation of the 1985 Agreement | 17 |
| Congressional Action Before Certification | 17 |
| U.S.-PRC Summit Agreements | 18 |
| President Clinton Certifies Agreement in 1998 | 18 |
| Congressional Review of Clinton Certifications | 19 |
| Memorandum of Understanding on Ensuring Peaceful Uses | 20 |
| Retransfers of Nuclear Technology | 20 |
| Nuclear Cooperation Restrictions on Countries Assisting Iran | 21 |

Contacts

| | |
|----------------------------------|----|
| Author Contact Information | 21 |
| Acknowledgments | 21 |

Introduction and Current Status

This CRS Report discusses renewal of the peaceful nuclear cooperation agreement between the United States and the People's Republic of China (PRC). The current agreement was signed in 1985 and implemented in 1998. The agreement is set to expire on December 30, 2015, and a new agreement is expected to be submitted for congressional review in spring 2015.

The discussion in this report focuses on congressional roles in crafting and carrying out the agreement. Such agreements are subject to Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended (AEA, P.L. 95-242) and commonly are called "123 agreements." They are a prerequisite for any significant nuclear cooperation with another country, such as exports of nuclear power plants and components and the transfer of nuclear material.

On July 24, 1985, President Reagan submitted to Congress the "Agreement Between the United States and the People's Republic of China Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy." President Clinton, on January 12, 1998, signed certifications (as required by P.L. 99-183) on China's nuclear nonproliferation policy and practices to implement the agreement. Clinton also issued a certification and waived a sanction imposed after the 1989 Tiananmen Crackdown (as required by P.L. 101-246). Congressional review ended on March 18, 1998, allowing the agreement to be implemented.

Under the AEA, the President is to transmit the proposed text of the new U.S.-China 123 agreement to Congress, along with the required Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) and his determination that the agreement promotes U.S. national security. Congress will then have 30 days of continuous session for consultations with the Administration, followed by an additional 60 days of continuous session to review the agreement (in practice the 90 days of review begin on the day the package of documents is received by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee). If the agreement is not opposed by a joint resolution of disapproval or other legislation, the agreement is considered approved at the end of this time period and may enter into force.

The Administration has stated its intention to submit the new U.S.-China nuclear cooperation agreement to Congress in time for the 90-day review before the existing agreement expires. A lapse in the agreement would force suspension of export licenses for nuclear components and materials to China and could disrupt ongoing and planned U.S. nuclear power projects in China.

Congressional Concerns

The renewal of the U.S.-China peaceful nuclear cooperation agreement is likely to raise significant issues for the 114th Congress.

Nuclear Proliferation¹

In its consideration of the Section 123 agreement, Congress will have a chance to review the classified and unclassified nonproliferation assessment statements (NPAS) that are to be submitted by the Administration. While the NPAS does not have a defined structure, it is expected to address concerns over the proliferation of nuclear-weapons-relevant technology out of China.

¹ See also CRS Report RL31555, *China and Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Missiles: Policy Issues*, by Shirley A. Kan.

Questions remain about China's nonproliferation record, especially its ability to prevent Chinese-based companies and individuals from exporting dual-use goods relevant to nuclear weapons programs, particularly to Iran and North Korea. Since the original nuclear cooperation agreement was concluded, China has joined the Non-Proliferation Treaty, become a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, and has made nuclear security improvements to its civilian sector. Its civilian reactors are under voluntary International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. In the past decade, China has also cooperated with the United States on the detection of illicit nuclear materials at ports and border points.

In the 1990s, the most significant proliferation concerns were about Chinese government assistance to the nuclear weapons programs in Pakistan and Iran. In 1996, China gave assurances to the United States that it would no longer assist Pakistan's nuclear weapons program. In 1997, China pledged not to begin new nuclear projects in Iran. These assurances led to the Clinton Administration's certifications to Congress that allowed the nuclear cooperation agreement to be implemented.²

While this level of direct transfers to the nuclear weapons programs of other states may have ended, the proliferation issue is certain to remain a main focus of congressional oversight. While some experts assess that Chinese government-owned companies have improved strategic export controls since a national law was passed in 2002,³ Chinese individuals and companies remain under U.S. sanctions related to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Concerns persist about Chinese willingness as well as ability to detect and prevent illicit transfers.

Missile proliferation from Chinese entities is a continuing concern. The 2011 Director of National Intelligence Worldwide Threat Assessment said, "North Korea and entities in Russia and China continue to sell technologies and components in the Middle East and South Asia that are dual use and could support WMD and missile programs."⁴ However, the 2015 statement did not include this. The State Department 2014 Compliance Report said, "In 2013, Chinese entities continued to supply missile programs in countries of concern. The United States notes that China made a public commitment in November 2000 not to assist 'in any way, any country in the development of ballistic missiles that can be used to deliver nuclear weapons (i.e., missiles capable of delivering a payload of at least 500 kilograms to a distance of at least 300 kilometers).'"⁵ Congress may wish to question what progress has been made on this issue.

Another related issue is China's decision to build power reactors in Pakistan, which does not have safeguarded facilities and has not been approved as a recipient state by the Nuclear Suppliers Group. China argues that its contracts with Pakistan were in place before it joined the NSG.⁶ However, as China makes plans for exporting nuclear reactors to other countries, some question its commitment to nonproliferation standards. The Chinese government has said it will abide by the NSG rules for exports.

² See Evan Medeiros, *Reluctant Restraint*, NUS Press, 2009.

³ Ian Stewart, "China and Non-Proliferation: Progress at Last?" *The Diplomat*, March 25, 2015.

⁴ The Section 721 Report to Congress was last submitted in 2011, http://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Newsroom/Reports%20and%20Pubs/2011_report_to_congress_wmd.pdf.

⁵ "Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments," U.S. Department of State, July 31, 2014. <http://www.state.gov/t/avc/rls/rpt/2014/230047.htm>.

⁶ Christopher Buckley, "Behind the Chinese-Pakistani Nuclear Deal," *New York Times SinoSphere Blog*, November 27, 2013.

Nuclear Exports and Jobs

The U.S. nuclear industry lobbied Congress vigorously in the 1990s to implement the U.S.-China 123 agreement, contending that China's planned growth in nuclear power generation would provide tremendous opportunities for U.S. businesses. The U.S. firm Westinghouse (now mostly owned by Toshiba of Japan) signed a contract in 2007 to supply its most advanced reactor, the AP1000, to China. Westinghouse also agreed to transfer its reactor technology to China so that Chinese firms could eventually build them.

Some in Congress expressed concern about the technology transfer arrangement, but the AP1000 technology transfer is now well underway. The first four Westinghouse reactors are under construction, and 32 more are planned, with Chinese firms to take over an increasing share of the work. China has developed a larger version of the AP1000, as allowed by the Westinghouse technology transfer agreement, and is reportedly about to start construction of the first unit.⁷

The PRC's nuclear power expansion program is the most aggressive in the world. Although China's 26 operating power reactors currently account for less than 2% of the country's electric generating capacity, the PRC has an additional 23 reactors under construction and plans to build up to 100 more by 2030.⁸ For comparison, the United States has a total of 99 power reactors as of April 2015. The PRC announced in December 2014 that it would spend about \$11.2 billion annually on reactor construction during the next 10 years, providing a large potential market for nuclear equipment suppliers around the world.⁹ The Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), the major U.S. nuclear industry trade association, called "timely renewal" of U.S. nuclear cooperation agreements with China and other countries "critical to continuation of nuclear trade between U.S. firms and firms in these nations."¹⁰

The value of U.S. nuclear exports to China and resulting U.S. employment are difficult to quantify. According to NEI, "Major Chinese contracts awarded to U.S. nuclear suppliers have created billions in U.S. exports and tens of thousands of American jobs," as well as employment providing engineering, construction, and other services.¹¹ A CRS search of the U.N. Comtrade Database of international trade statistics from 2010 to 2013 found \$519.3 million in U.S. exports of nuclear components and materials to China, averaging about \$130 million per year.¹² However, the database may not capture all commodity trades and does not include services.

Westinghouse's 2007 sale of four AP1000 reactors to China was announced at a value of \$8 billion. Under an engineering and procurement agreement and a separate technology licensing agreement, "Westinghouse will provide nuclear fuel and safety-related major components, as well as information on design, operation and plant maintenance," according to the law firm Baker Donelson, which represents the nuclear industry.

⁷ World Nuclear Association, "Nuclear Power in China," March 31, 2015, <http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/Country-Profiles/Countries-A-F/China—Nuclear-Power/>.

⁸ WNA, "Nuclear Power in China," op. cit.

⁹ *Platts Nuclear News Flashes*, "China Plans to Spend \$11 Billion a Year on Reactor Construction," December 23, 2014.

¹⁰ Nuclear Energy Institute, "Nuclear Cooperation Agreements," viewed December 23, 2014, <http://www.nei.org/Issues-Policy/Exports-Trade/Nuclear-Cooperation-Agreements>.

¹¹ Nuclear Energy Institute, "Nuclear Energy in China," White Paper, January 2015, <http://www.nei.org/Master-Document-Folder/Backgrounders/White-Papers/Nuclear-Energy-in-China>.

¹² U.N. Comtrade Database, searched March 11, 2015, <http://comtrade.un.org/>.

Approximately 30 percent of the work outlined under current contracts is being performed in the United States by Westinghouse or its subcontractors and suppliers, which has created or is sustaining approximately 8,000 direct jobs and another approximately 20,000 indirect and induced jobs in twenty U.S. states, with significant sourcing from Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Connecticut, Utah, Minnesota, and New Hampshire.¹³

Westinghouse has acknowledged that the technology-transfer provisions in the contract would reduce U.S. participation in Chinese AP1000 projects over time, much as has occurred in a similar reactor contract signed with South Korea in the mid-1980s. U.S. firms initially provided most of the nuclear-related components of the plants supplied under the deal, valued at several hundred million dollars per reactor,¹⁴ and by 2006, U.S. firms were continuing to provide about \$100 million in components and services for each new South Korean reactor, according to Westinghouse.¹⁵ South Korea's \$20 billion sale of four of its U.S.-derived reactors to the United Arab Emirates in 2010 included \$2 billion in U.S. participation.¹⁶

According to Baker Donelson,

Currently Westinghouse is in discussions in China for contracts for the next wave of up to 20 additional AP1000 units. This would result in 2,000 to 2,500 direct jobs and 5,000-6,000 in indirect/induced USA jobs, for a total of 7,000-8,000 jobs in the U.S. Although China has indigenized significant manufacturing capabilities as part of their self-reliance program, a key reason for renewing the Section 123 agreement is that certain products and services necessary to fulfill that program cannot be procured solely in China. This means that the Chinese will have to use some of the suppliers that were used on the initial AP1000 plants, many of whom are located in the United States.¹⁷

Chinese Re-export of U.S. Reactor Technology

China's plans to export nuclear power plants based on Westinghouse technology have raised a number of concerns. A key question is the level of U.S. control that would continue to be exercised over the export of reactors based on U.S. designs and the use of nuclear materials produced by those reactors. The potential for Chinese dominance of the world nuclear power market with U.S. help is also an issue. A related area of concern is the extent to which U.S. nuclear power technology could be transferred to the Chinese naval reactor program, particularly the unique sealed pumps used by the AP1000.

According to Baker Donelson, the Westinghouse technology transfer agreement for the AP1000 reactor grants the Chinese only a "nonexclusive license to use that technology in China," with Westinghouse retaining all its intellectual property rights. The agreement allows the Chinese to modify the AP1000 design but they cannot export such variants "unless they do so with Westinghouse under a marketing alliance."

¹³ Email from John H. Kinney, Senior Advisor, Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, April 1, 2015.

¹⁴ MacLachlan, Ann, "C-E Selected to Supply NSSS for Two New South Korean Units," *Nucleonics Week*, October 2, 1986, p. 1.

¹⁵ Hibbs, Mark, "Westinghouse Wins China Contract; Chinese Look at Next Expansion," *Nucleonics Week*, December 21, 2006.

¹⁶ For details, see CRS Report R41032, *U.S. and South Korean Cooperation in the World Nuclear Energy Market: Major Policy Considerations*, by Mark Holt.

¹⁷ Email from John H. Kinney, *op. cit.*

However, the Westinghouse agreement does give China the right to export a “large passive plant,” essentially a larger version of the AP1000. Such plants could be sold to any country except the United States and Japan, subject to U.S. export control laws, according to Baker Donelson. Westinghouse would have the right to participate in such export projects to the extent that they incorporated AP1000 technology. If China did not include Westinghouse in such exports, then Westinghouse would have to be compensated for any of its technology that was used.¹⁸ China is currently developing a “large passive plant,” as envisioned by the Westinghouse agreement. The first of these reactors, called the CAP1400, is to begin construction in China in 2015, with exports planned to follow.¹⁹

Aggressive Chinese exports of nuclear technology, particularly to countries that do not currently have nuclear power, could pose proliferation risks, as noted above. China’s policies for ensuring that countries that import its reactors are fully compliant with international safeguards will be of particular concern. Moreover, even fully safeguarded nuclear power programs could raise U.S. concerns if they create a perceived need to develop fuel cycle facilities such as uranium enrichment and spent fuel reprocessing plants, which can be used to produce nuclear weapons material. Without Westinghouse’s advanced reactor technology, China was not generally believed to have a reactor that could compete in world markets. Therefore, the AP1000 technology transfer appears to be crucial to China’s planned nuclear export program.²⁰

Transfers of nuclear technology to a foreign country require authorization by the Secretary of Energy under 10 C.F.R. Part 810. Such “Part 810 authorizations” must be based on assurances from the recipient government that the technology will be used for peaceful purposes only and will not be retransferred without approval of the supplying country, as explained by this statement from Export.gov website:

Government-to-government assurances obtained by either the Department of State or the Department of Energy are required for the 810 approval and 110 licensing process.

The assurances for 810 approvals affirm that the recipient government pledges to use the acquired technology exclusively for peaceful purposes and will not re-transfer it to another country without the consent of the supplier-country government.²¹

Plutonium Separation from U.S.-Origin Reactor Fuel

The possible reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel from reactors built under the U.S.-China 123 agreement has raised concern that it could help increase Chinese stockpiles of weapons-useable plutonium. This was a key issue in the congressional debate when the agreement was first reviewed (see below, “President Reagan Submits Agreement in 1985”).

Under the current Section 123 agreement, China could potentially reprocess spent fuel from U.S.-designed reactors for peaceful purposes, although only following consultation and U.S. agreement before such reprocessing took place. No such arrangements have been made. Section 5(2) of the agreement says the parties “will consult immediately and will seek agreement within six months

¹⁸ Email from John H. Kinney, *op. cit.*

¹⁹ World Nuclear Association, “Nuclear Power in China,” March 31, 2015, <http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/Country-Profiles/Countries-A-F/China—Nuclear-Power/>.

²⁰ Mycle Schneider Consulting, World Nuclear Industry Status Report 2014, p. 46, <http://www.worldnuclearreport.org>.

²¹ Export.gov, “Company Files for Part 810 Authorization with DOE,” December 1, 2010, http://www.export.gov/civilnuclear/eg_main_022102.asp. See also: National Nuclear Security Administration, “10 CFR Part 810,” <http://nnsa.energy.gov/aboutus/ourprograms/nonproliferation-0/npac/policy/10cfr810>.

on long-term arrangements for such activities.²² The Nonproliferation Assessment Statement which accompanied the agreement's submission to Congress interprets Article 5(2) as follows: "China cannot unilaterally proceed with reprocessing, enrichment, or alteration in the face of U.S. objection."²³

As detailed below, Congress was concerned that the language in the agreement did not clearly state U.S. consent rights. One of the Presidential certifications required in P.L. 99-183 said that "the obligation to consider favorably a request to carry out activities described in Article 5(2) of the Agreement shall not prejudice the decision of the United States to approve or disapprove such a request." In President Clinton's certification, he said, "The U.S consent rights provided for in Article 5(2) of the Agreement satisfy this standard because the specific language used ensures that the United States must exercise an approval right before the activity in question is carried out."²⁴

As a recognized nuclear weapons state under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, China has a military stockpile of about 1.8 metric tons of plutonium and about 250 nuclear warheads.²⁵ This weapons plutonium was produced by two reactors: the oldest was shut down in 1984 and the second is believed to have produced plutonium through 1989.²⁶ China's current capacity for weapons-grade plutonium production is uncertain.²⁷ While China has not been transparent about its fissile material production, analysts believe fissile material production for weapons ended in the early 1990s.²⁸ While China is modernizing and increasing the number of its strategic delivery systems, U.S. official open-source reports do not address whether it is expanding its nuclear warhead stockpile.²⁹

The extent to which U.S.-supplied commercial reactor technology could allow China to produce more plutonium for nuclear weapons may be a topic of congressional discussion. As noted above, U.S. nuclear technology transferred to China is to be used only for peaceful purposes. However, if China in the future decided to disregard those restrictions, it could potentially use plutonium produced during the normal operation of commercial reactors for weapons. Such "reactor grade" plutonium has high levels of plutonium isotopes that are undesirable for weapons, but it is widely accepted that such use is possible. Alternatively, U.S.-designed commercial reactors (as well as any other reactor in China) could be refueled more frequently than normal to minimize the buildup of undesirable isotopes, resulting in plutonium better suited for weapons.

²² Agreement Between the United States and China for Cooperation Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, Article 5, July 23, 1985.

²³ Any reprocessing of fuel subject to U.S. controls would require negotiation of separate arrangements as called for by Article 5(2) of the agreement, and would require a prior report to Congress by DOE and 15 days of continuous session of Congress thereafter.

²⁴ President William J. Clinton, Letter to Congressional Leaders on the China-United States Nuclear Cooperation Agreement, January 12, 1998.

²⁵ Nuclear Threat Initiative, "China," December 2014, <http://www.nti.org/country-profiles/china/>.

²⁶ International Panel on Fissile Materials, "China," January 5, 2011, <http://fissilematerials.org/countries/china.html>.

²⁷ Institute for Science and International Security, "China," viewed April 3, 2014, <http://isis-online.org/country-pages/china>.

²⁸ International Panel on Fissile Materials, "Banning the Production of Fissile Materials for Nuclear Weapons: Country Perspectives on the Challenges to a Fissile Material (Cutoff) Treaty," 2008, <http://fissilematerials.org/library/FMCT-Perspectives.pdf>.

²⁹ U.S. Department of Defense, *Annual Report to Congress: Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2014*, http://www.defense.gov/pubs/2014_DoD_China_Report.pdf.

The situation was summarized in a recent issue paper from the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center (NPEC):³⁰

The PRC, of course, already has nuclear weapons and is believed to retain a stockpile of weapons usable plutonium and uranium sufficient to make roughly 1,000 more nuclear warheads. It also could generate plutonium from French and Russian designed reactors it has operating in China. Some experts have emphasized these points to downplay the likelihood that the PRC would ever reprocess plutonium from US-designed reactors. Yet, if a major nuclear weapons competition should break out in East Asia between Russia and China or China and Japan and the US, weapons requirements for the PRC could easily climb into the several thousands of weapons.

Under such an arms race scenario, according to NPEC, China might be tempted to use plutonium produced in U.S.-designed reactors for its weapons program:

To be sure, presuming that the PRC is certain to reprocess spent power reactor fuel to make bombs would be a leap. For the moment there is no clear Chinese nuclear competition with Russia or Japan. On the other hand, this could change in the next decade or less. More important, if it so unlikely that China would ever do this, it is a mystery why the Chinese won't allow consent rights and IAEA nuclear inspections.

Congress may wish to examine how the renewal agreement treats the issue of the reprocessing of U.S.-obligated material and how the agreement guarantees peaceful use.

Safety and Environmental Benefits

Increased nuclear safety and reduced carbon emissions have been cited as reasons to support the extension of the U.S.-China nuclear cooperation agreement.

“U.S. equipment and technology exports have enabled China to deploy the safest technologies, including a U.S. advanced reactor design that has been standardized for most of China’s planned nuclear power stations,” according to NEI. On carbon emissions, NEI asserted, “Nuclear power is planned to carry the largest share of China’s non-emitting generating capacity additions through 2030. Ending U.S. nuclear cooperation would disrupt China’s nuclear development plans and set back its efforts to limit carbon emissions.”³¹

The Westinghouse AP1000 reactor technology that is being transferred to China incorporates “passive” safety features that are intended to reduce the likelihood of radioactive releases by orders of magnitude below that of existing commercial nuclear power plants. In approving the design in the United States, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission noted that it “includes many features that are not found in the designs of currently operating reactors,” most significantly “the use of safety systems for accident prevention and mitigation that rely on passive means, such as gravity, natural circulation, condensation and evaporation, and stored energy.”³²

To the extent that the AP1000 and larger reactors derived from it would displace older designs in the Chinese nuclear power program, the likelihood of accidents could be reduced. A probabalistic

³⁰ Sokolski, Henry, “US-China Civilian Nuclear Cooperative (123) Agreement: What’s at Issue,” Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, Washington Seminar Series, March 26, 2015, http://npolicy.org/event_file/US_China_123Agreement.pdf.

³¹ Nuclear Energy Institute, “Nuclear Energy in China,” White Paper, January 2015, <http://www.nei.org/Master-Document-Folder/Backgrounders/White-Papers/Nuclear-Energy-in-China>.

³² Nuclear Regulatory Commission, *Final Safety Evaluation Report Related to Certification of the AP1000 Standard Plant Design*, NUREG-1793, Volume 1, Supplement 2, p. 1-3.

risk assessment by Westinghouse asserted that the risk of nuclear core damage in the AP1000 would be 1% of the level of risk at existing nuclear power plants and 5% of the risk considered acceptable for advanced reactor designs.³³

Targets for controlling carbon emissions were jointly announced by China and the United States on November 11, 2014. The United States agreed to cut its net emissions of greenhouse gases by 26%-28% below 2005 levels by 2025, while China agreed to halt its rapid rise in carbon dioxide emissions by no later than 2030. In addition, China agreed to increase its non-fossil-fuel energy share to 20% by 2030, which “will require China to deploy an additional 800-1,000 gigawatts of nuclear, wind, solar and other zero emission generation capacity by 2030,” according to the White House.³⁴ The agreement could provide further impetus to China’s already-ambitious nuclear growth.

However, the potential safety and environmental benefits of expanded nuclear power in China are questioned by some environmental groups and analysts. They contend that efforts to reduce carbon emissions should be focused on energy efficiency and renewable energy, which avoid nuclear power’s risks of radioactive releases, waste management issues, and nuclear weapons proliferation.³⁵ Analysts point out that Chinese installation of new wind and solar capacity currently exceeds nuclear: Announced capacity additions for 2014 totaled “56.6 GW [gigawatts] of non-fossil fueled generating capacity, comprising 20 GW of hydro, 18 GW of wind, 10 GW of solar, and 8.6 GW of nuclear power.”³⁶

History of the U.S.-China Agreement on Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation

Strategic Interests

The question for U.S. policymakers since the Reagan Administration in the 1980s has been whether nuclear cooperation with the PRC would be necessary to advance U.S. diplomatic, security, and economic interests. There were tensions in the framework for bilateral relations that affected U.S. consideration of peaceful nuclear cooperation. While the PRC under the rule of the Communist Party of China already possessed nuclear weapons, the PRC also has had a record of nuclear proliferation to countries such as Pakistan and Iran.³⁷

The United States and the PRC have not been allies. Nonetheless, in 1970, President Nixon began a rapprochement with Communist Party ruler Mao Zedong, and both countries cooperated in various areas during the Cold War until the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991.

³³ Westinghouse, “Unequaled Safety,” company website, viewed April 7, 2015, <http://www.westinghousenuclear.com/New-Plants/AP1000-PWR/Safety>.

³⁴ White House, “Fact Sheet: U.S.-China Joint Announcement on Climate Change and Clean Energy Cooperation,” November 11, 2014, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/11/11/fact-sheet-us-china-joint-announcement-climate-change-and-clean-energy-c>.

³⁵ See, for example, Natural Resources Defense Council Switchboard, “Response to an Open Letter on the Future of Nuclear Power,” November 5, 2013, http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/dbryk/response_to_an_open_letter_on.html.

³⁶ Mycle Schneider Consulting, *World Nuclear Industry Status Report 2014*, p. 105, <http://www.worldnuclearreport.org>.

³⁷ For details, see CRS Report 97-391, *China: Ballistic and Cruise Missiles*, by Shirley A. Kan; CRS Report RL31555, *China and Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Missiles: Policy Issues*, by Shirley A. Kan.

Nuclear cooperation involves weighing risks and benefits. The risks include nuclear proliferation and upgrading technology and knowledge that also might have military uses. The benefits involve expanding engagement, building mutual confidence, and enabling U.S. businesses to compete for potentially lucrative nuclear power contracts. Increased nuclear power in China also could help reduce its emissions of greenhouse gases.

Summits and Timeline

Key developments in the U.S.-China nuclear cooperation agreement were timed for diplomatic summits between U.S. Presidents and PRC leaders. On April 30, 1984, President Reagan witnessed the initialing of the nuclear cooperation agreement. Secretary of Energy John Herrington signed the agreement on July 23, 1985. On July 24, 1985, President Reagan submitted the agreement to Congress. Consideration of whether a presidential certification (as required by P.L. 99-183 on China's nuclear nonproliferation policy and practices) would be the centerpiece of a summit in 1997 advanced the agreement's implementation. President Clinton, on January 12, 1998, signed certifications to implement the agreement. The President also waived a sanction imposed after the 1989 Tiananmen Crackdown (in P.L. 101-246). Congressional review ended on March 18, 1998, allowing the agreement to be implemented.

Almost 13 years passed between the time that President Reagan submitted the agreement to Congress in July 1985 and its implementation in March 1998 under the Clinton Administration. Congress played an important role in determining implementation of the agreement, including holding hearings, crafting legislation, and requiring and reviewing presidential certifications. One of the primary congressional actions was P.L. 99-183, the Joint Resolution Relating to the Approval and Implementation of the Proposed Agreement for Nuclear Cooperation Between the United States and the People's Republic of China (December 16, 1985), which required a presidential certification and a report followed by a period of 30 days of continuous session of Congress before the agreement could be implemented. After the 1989 Tiananmen Crackdown, Congress enacted sanctions in P.L. 101-246, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (February 16, 1990), suspending nuclear cooperation with China and requiring an additional presidential certification on the PRC's nuclear nonproliferation assurances.

Congressional Concerns in Early 1980s

In January 1983, U.S. officials negotiating a nuclear cooperation agreement with China linked possible U.S. nuclear exports to China with its reported nuclear proliferation practices, particularly in Pakistan.³⁸ Before an agreement was finalized, Senators Gordon Humphrey, William Roth, and William Proxmire wrote to Secretary of State George Shultz in December 1983. They urged that an agreement be drafted so that none of the provisions of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978 would be waived. They also wrote that the agreement should include explicit pledges by China not to transfer any nuclear weapons equipment or information to any nation; to support the U.S. requirement for recipients to accept the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA's) safeguards on nuclear exports; and to enter into an agreement with the IAEA to place China's civilian nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards with terms identical to

³⁸ Rob Laufer, "China's Role in Worldwide Nuclear Weapons Buildup Under U.S. Scrutiny," *Nucleonics Week*, January 20, 1983.

those of the U.S.-IAEA safeguards agreement. Reported concerns about China also included its nuclear proliferation activities in Argentina and South Africa.³⁹

President Reagan Visits China in 1984

United States Initials Agreement

In preparation for President Ronald Reagan's first visit to the PRC in April 1984 to improve the bilateral relationship, U.S. officials sought an agreement on civil nuclear cooperation as the "deliverable" that caught the most attention. Begun in 1981, negotiations intensified before the visit over the U.S. requirement (under the Atomic Energy Act) for China to obtain U.S. prior approval before reprocessing, enrichment, or other alteration of transferred nuclear material. China objected to perceived infringement of its sovereignty. At the end of his visit, on April 30, 1984, President Reagan witnessed the initialing of the nuclear cooperation agreement. The President said that he was "particularly proud" of the agreement, saying that "it will open broad opportunities for joint work in development of the energy base which China needs for her modernization." According to a summary of the terms provided by officials to the *New York Times*, China agreed that it would not enrich or reprocess fuel from U.S.-built reactors or store materials without U.S. consent; and the United States agreed not to use its control rights to inhibit the growth of China's nuclear industry out of commercial rivalry.⁴⁰

PRC Nonproliferation Pledges

China also took steps in response to U.S. concerns about nuclear proliferation during negotiations for the agreement. While at the time China opposed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), China applied for membership in the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in September 1983 and became a member on January 1, 1984. The PRC did not accede to the NPT until March 9, 1992. Also, China joined the Zangger Committee⁴¹ in October 1997 and the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) in May 2004. In 2004, the Bush Administration supported China's application to join the NSG, despite congressional concerns about China's failure to apply the NSG's "full-scope safeguards" to its nuclear projects in Pakistan. Since 1992, the NSG has required "full-scope safeguards," or IAEA inspections of all other declared nuclear facilities in addition to the facility importing supplies to prevent diversions to weapon programs.⁴²

In making China's first address to the IAEA conference in September 1984, the PRC Minister of Nuclear Industry said, "China will, in exporting its nuclear materials and equipment, request the recipient countries to accept safeguards in line with the principles established in the agency's statutes. In the same view, when importing nuclear materials and equipment, China will also

³⁹ *Nucleonics Week*, August 1, 1983 and December 8, 1983.

⁴⁰ Steven Weisman, "Reagan Leaves on Trip to China; Seeks to Ease Tension in Relations" and "U.S. Said to Reach Pact with Chinese on Nuclear Power," *New York Times*, April 23 and 24, 1984; Christopher Wren, "Chinese Concession Permits U.S. Accord on Atom Power," *New York Times*, April 17, 1984; "U.S.-Chinese Agreements," *New York Times*, April 30, 1984.

⁴¹ The Zangger Committee, or Nuclear Exporters Committee, has established guidelines for export control of nuclear items in Article III of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Since the 1970s, the committee has compiled a "trigger list," or list of nuclear items which if transferred would trigger a requirement for IAEA safeguards. This list helps to prevent diversion of nuclear materials and especially designed or prepared material, equipment, and facilities to programs making nuclear explosives.

⁴² CRS Report RL31555, *China and Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Missiles: Policy Issues*, by Shirley A. Kan.

make sure that they are used for peaceful purposes.” China did not offer to place its civilian nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards, the only nuclear weapon state that remained outside such arrangements.⁴³ Also, PRC Premier Zhao Ziyang issued a statement when he visited the United States in January 1984 that “we do not engage in nuclear proliferation ourselves, nor do we help other countries develop nuclear weapons.”⁴⁴ That promise left a question about any future activities. Later, on January 19, 1985, PRC Vice Premier Li Peng issued an additional nonproliferation pledge, saying that the PRC “does not and will not in the future help any non-nuclear states to develop nuclear weapons” and that China would abide by commitments to the IAEA.⁴⁵ Still, questions remained about whether there would be written pledges and whether any such assurances would be publicly issued by China, itself, rather than the United States expressing its interpretation of an understanding reached with China either verbally or in writing.

President Reagan Submits Agreement in 1985

Although the agreement was initialed during Reagan’s visit to China in April 1984, the President did not submit it to Congress until July 1985, apparently timed for a visit by PRC President Li Xiannian, who arrived in Washington, DC, on July 22, 1985, and was invited to a state dinner at the White House. Prior to this visit, Administration officials briefed Congress and the press about supposed new written assurances from China about nuclear nonproliferation. Members included Senator Alan Cranston, who had reported in May 1984 that PRC nuclear technicians were in Pakistan at a suspected nuclear weapon facility. The Administration, however, did not release the written assurance and said that the language of the agreement remained largely the same.⁴⁶ Secretary of Energy John Herrington and Li Peng signed the agreement on July 23, 1985.

Administration’s Concerns

Although President Reagan’s top officials approved the agreement, there were acknowledgments of problems in the agreement as well as disagreements within the Administration. Kenneth Adelman, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), wrote in his memorandum for the President that “the proposed Agreement meets all the applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act and its entry into force will substantially benefit U.S. non-proliferation objectives.”

Nonetheless, Adelman first acknowledged that

the subject agreement is unique among agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation concluded since the 1978 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act. It is the first such agreement with a nuclear-weapon state; and it is with a country that has not, *until recently*, supported non-proliferation measures. Although the agreement was initialed in April 1984, we needed to clarify certain matters related to implementation of China’s nuclear policies. Those discussions concluded successfully last month. A major threat to our non-proliferation objectives is the potential for “maverick” suppliers to undercut the safeguards and other controls established through international cooperation and consensus. *In the past*, China’s policies were a cause for concern because it neither adhered to that consensus nor accepted other non-proliferation norms.” [emphasis added]

⁴³ Ann MacLachlan, “China Makes Strong Nonproliferation Pledge in IAEA Conference Address,” *Nucleonics Week*, September 27, 1984.

⁴⁴ *New York Times*, April 27, 1984.

⁴⁵ Ron Redmond, “China Elaborates Nuclear Non-proliferation Policy,” *UPI*, January 25, 1985.

⁴⁶ Joanne Omang, “U.S.-China Nuclear Pact Near,” *Washington Post*, July 22, 1985.

Adelman also noted that

a few of the major provisions in the agreement were subject to *long and difficult negotiations*. We have had detailed discussions on what it means in practice not to assist other countries to acquire nuclear explosives.... *We understand* that China's policy will be implemented in a manner consistent with those basic non-proliferation practices common to the United States and other major suppliers.... The United States sought China's acceptance of IAEA safeguards on U.S. supply under the agreement, *but they adamantly refused to accept that condition*. [emphasis added]

Finally, Adelman argued that the agreement for U.S. exports provided for "mutually acceptable arrangements," in the future, "*to be established* prior to approval of U.S. exports" that "will include exchanges of information and visits by U.S. government personnel to relevant sites in China where material or equipment subject to the agreement will be stored or used." He also contended that "reprocessing of U.S. origin material *cannot take place without U.S. consent*." He concluded that "it will be important to ensure that the specific arrangements provide *adequate confidence* that any material or equipment subject to the agreement will be used only for purposes consistent with the agreement."⁴⁷ [emphasis added]

Adelman also submitted ACDA's "Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement" that detailed the Reagan Administration's justification for the agreement with China, pursuant to Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act.⁴⁸ ACDA reached "a favorable net assessment of the adequacy of the provisions of the proposed agreement to ensure that any assistance furnished thereunder will not be used to further any military or nuclear explosive purpose." It also concluded that execution of the proposed agreement "would advance the non-proliferation program, policy, and objectives of the United States."

Proliferation Concerns

In contrast, Thomas Roberts, Acting Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), wrote a memorandum to President Reagan that offered a different assessment. He referred to reviewing not only the State Department's proposed agreement but also an accompanying "Agreed Minute." He wrote that he agreed with the State Department that the agreement met the legal requirements of Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act. However, Roberts wrote of concerns about "the adequacy of certain assurances provided by the PRC." He wrote that,

We also note that, although we believe the requirements of Section 123 are satisfied, we would have preferred that the agreement contain a clear statement of U.S. consent rights for the subsequent reprocessing or enrichment of U.S.-supplied nuclear reactor fuel or fuel used in U.S.-supplied reactors. Such a statement would eliminate the potential for future misunderstandings.

Our final observation is that the Agreement contains a provision which would expressly qualify the authority of the Congress to enact subsequent legislation affecting the activities covered by the Agreement. Previous agreements for cooperation with other countries have not contained such a provision. The provision could reduce the flexibility of the United States in the future.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Kenneth Adelman, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, "Memorandum for the President; Subject: U.S.-China Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation Agreement," July 19, 1985.

⁴⁸ Kenneth Adelman, "Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement," July 19, 1985.

⁴⁹ Thomas Roberts, Acting Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Memorandum for the President, July 19, (continued...)

Formal Submission

On July 24, 1985, President Reagan submitted to Congress the “Agreement Between the United States and the People’s Republic of China Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy,” pursuant to Sections 123(b) and 123(d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. In his transmittal message, Reagan did not refer to the NRC’s concerns (the memorandum cited above was classified at the time). He noted that the proposed agreement was the first peaceful nuclear cooperation agreement with a Communist country and the only such agreement with another nuclear-weapon state (because cooperation with the United Kingdom and France was covered by U.S. agreements with the European Atomic Energy Community, or EURATOM).

The President first cited China’s “ambitious plans” for a “substantial number of nuclear power stations.” He pointed to China’s steps to “clarify” its non-proliferation and nuclear export policies, including Premier Zhao’s statement, but Reagan did not mention PRC practices. He referred to bilateral “talks” rather than statements or agreements and said that “we can expect” that China’s policy of not assisting a non-nuclear weapon state to acquire nuclear explosives will be implemented in a manner consistent with the basic non-proliferation practices common to the United States and other suppliers.

As benefits for U.S. interests, the President wrote that the agreement would “have a significant, positive impact on overall U.S.-China relations”; “provide the United States and its companies an opportunity to participate in another aspect of China’s energy programs, with possible substantial economic benefit”; and “further the non-proliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.” Reagan argued that the agreement would not constitute an “unreasonable risk” to common defense and security. He noted that he was submitting the agreement to Congress “without exempting it from any requirement” in Section 123(a) of the Atomic Energy Act.⁵⁰

Issues During 1985 Congressional Review

The agreement’s submission began the periods of congressional review: 30 days of continuous session under Section 123(b) to be followed by 60 days of continuous session under Section 123(d) of the Atomic Energy Act (P.L. 83-703). Chaired by Representative Dante Fascell, the House Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing on July 31, 1985.⁵¹ Secretary of Energy John Herrington, ACDA Director Kenneth Adelman, Ambassador for Non-proliferation Richard Kennedy, and Assistant Secretary of State Paul Wolfowitz testified. Members debated a number of issues, raised in particular by Representative Edward Markey, Chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Power, who testified and submitted his legal analysis of the proposed agreement.⁵²

(...continued)

1985 (redacted unclassified version).

⁵⁰ Ronald Reagan, “Message from the President of the United States Transmitting An Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the People’s Republic of China Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, Pursuant to Secs. 123(b) and 123(d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as Amended,” July 24, 1985, House Document 99-86.

⁵¹ Besides the hearing held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on July 31, 1985, other hearings were held by the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on U.S.-Pacific Rim Trade, on September 12, 1985; the House Foreign Affairs Committee, closed hearing, on October 3, 1985; and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, October 9, 1985. See archived CRS Issue Brief IB86050, *Implementation of the U.S.-Chinese Agreement for Nuclear Cooperation*, by Warren Donnelly, September 28, 1989.

⁵² House Committee on Foreign Affairs, “Proposed Nuclear Cooperation Agreement With the People’s Republic of (continued...)”

Safeguards and Prior Approvals: Representative Markey raised objections about the agreement, saying that it contained the same “lax terms” as the draft that was initialed in 1984: objections based on a lack of guarantee that safeguards will be maintained for U.S. nuclear materials and equipment to ensure peaceful use; lack of a guarantee of prior approval by the United States of any reprocessing, enrichment, or alteration of nuclear material; and concerns about China’s nuclear exports and technical assistance with other countries. He asserted that,

Instead of obtaining a tightening of the language of the agreement, the Administration reportedly has spent the last year providing itself with classified assurances that the shadowy Chinese technicians purportedly working at Pakistan’s renegade Kahuta uranium enrichment plant have disappeared, and that China is no longer exporting unsafeguarded supplies of heavy water and low-enriched uranium to other threshold nuclear-weapon states such as Argentina and South Africa. It is not enough that the Administration satisfy itself on this count.⁵³

Unilateral Understanding of Verbal Assurances: Representative Markey also contended that the assurances from China were actually assurances in a secret memorandum or “Non-Paper” of the State Department. In his written statement, he reported that “Ambassador Kennedy reportedly resorted to the device of writing down his own (classified) understanding of China’s new improved nonproliferation policy. While declining to sign this ingenious document, responsible Chinese officials reportedly nodded their assent, and Kennedy raced back to Washington to report this triumph of diplomacy to the President.”

Ambassador Kennedy testified that the Chinese “understood” U.S. legal requirements, “said” they had no “plans” to undertake activities in question, and were concerned about whether the United States would give a timely response. Kennedy also testified that the Chinese made it “clear” that when they “say” that they will not assist other countries to develop nuclear weapons, “this also applies to all nuclear explosives,” acknowledging that it was in question.⁵⁴ (During a meeting of the committee to mark up legislation in November 1985, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State James Devine confirmed Representative Dan Burton’s assertion of confidential summaries of discussions that were not in writing. Devine said that the PRC “assured us orally that they would ... require safeguards on their own exports.”)

Compliance with Atomic Energy Act: Representative Markey further testified that the proposed agreement did not reconcile with all the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, and so the President should re-submit the agreement with exemption from the criteria for safeguards and prior consent, as stipulated in the “Proxmire Amendment” to the Export Administration Act that amended the Atomic Energy Act.

Exception for China: Representative Markey differed with the Administration on whether China should be treated as an exception concerning the question of safeguards, stating that “we insisted that the United Kingdom, a weapons state and our closest ally, accept [safeguards] as part of our nuclear cooperation agreement. So why not the Chinese?” He said that “under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, the People’s Republic, as a nuclear weapons state, is exempted from the IAEA safeguards requirement. However, contrary to the agreement’s erroneous implication, China is not altogether exempted from safeguards requirements.”

(...continued)

China,” Hearing and Markup on H.J.Res. 404, July 31, November 13, 1985.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ On the PRC’s refusal to give its own assurances in writing, see R. Gregory Nokes, “How the U.S.-China Nuclear Agreement was Saved,” *AP*, August 3, 1985.

Prejudice: Representative Markey objected to the lack of a guarantee of U.S. prior approval for any reprocessing or enrichment of nuclear materials by China, along with language to consider the activities “favorably.”

Legislation and P.L. 99-183

Legislative options for Congress included requesting the President to re-submit the agreement; passing a resolution to disapprove the proposed agreement; passing a resolution to approve it; or passing a resolution to approve it with conditions.

H.Res. 269. On September 20, 1985, Representative Markey introduced H.Res. 269 to request the President to re-submit the proposed agreement with exemptions from Sections 123a(1) and 123a(7) of the Atomic Energy Act.

H.R. 3537. On October 9, 1985, Representative Edward Feighan introduced H.R. 3537 to ensure adequate verification of peaceful uses of nuclear exports to the PRC (modeled on IAEA safeguards). The Administration opposed the bill.⁵⁵

S. 1754. Also on October 9, 1985, Senator John Glenn introduced S. 1754 to ensure adequate verification of peaceful uses of nuclear exports to the PRC (modeled on IAEA safeguards). The Administration also opposed this bill. Senator Dave Durenberger, Chairman of the Committee on Intelligence, supported the bill. In a floor speech on October 21, 1985, Senator Alan Cranston reported questions about China’s assistance for Iran’s nuclear program. Senators Richard Lugar and Jesse Helms reportedly supported the Administration.⁵⁶

H.J.Res. 404. On October 1, 1985, Representative Fascell introduced by request H.J.Res. 404, a joint resolution to approve the proposed agreement. On November 13, 1985, the House Foreign Affairs Committee met to mark up the resolution. Representative Don Bonker offered an amendment, favoring the agreement with conditions. The language added requirements for a presidential certification before the issuance of export licenses or approval of retransfers and a waiting period of 30 days of continuous session of Congress. The President was to certify that (1) the verification was designed effectively to ensure the peaceful use of U.S. exports; (2) China provided additional details about its nuclear non-proliferation policies and all information was in conformity with Section 129 of the Atomic Energy Act (prohibiting nuclear exports to any country that engaged in nuclear proliferation); and (3) the obligation to consider activities favorably shall not prejudice U.S. decision-making. The amendment also declared that each proposed export would be subject to U.S. laws and regulations in effect at the time of each export. The language also called for a presidential report detailing in unclassified form the PRC’s past and current non-proliferation policies as well as practices. Finally, the amendment stated that the agreement with China would not provide a precedent for negotiating other agreements.

Representative Howard Wolpe objected to the language as a unilateral attempt to address the agreement’s “deficiencies” with U.S. interpretations. Representative Solarz defended the language, which the Administration accepted, because China already possessed nuclear weapon capability and would have “additional incentives” to refrain from nuclear proliferation. The committee adopted the amendment by voice vote. The committee’s report on the bill, H.Rept. 99-382, noted that while U.S. nuclear cooperation with the PRC will in no way further its ability to use nuclear energy for military or explosive uses, the committee “has long been concerned by reports of Chinese nuclear assistance to Pakistan’s clandestine nuclear program.” On November

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Mark Crawford, “Rumors of China-Iran Trade Clouds Nuke Pact,” *ASAP*, November 8, 1985.

20, 1985, the Foreign Affairs Committee reported H.J.Res. 404 (H.Rept. 99-382). The House subsequently passed S.J.Res. 238 in lieu.

S.J.Res. 238 (P.L. 99-183). Meanwhile, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed a resolution identical to that of the Foreign Affairs Committee, S.J.Res. 238, the Joint Resolution Relating to the Approval and Implementation of the Proposed Agreement for Nuclear Cooperation Between the United States and the People’s Republic of China. The Senate passed (by voice vote) S.J.Res. 238 on November 21, 1985. The House then passed it (307-112) on December 11, 1985. President Reagan signed it on December 16, 1985 (as P.L. 99-183). The agreement took effect on December 30, 1985.⁵⁷

In his statement upon signing the bill, the President noted that he was required to submit a one-time certification and a one-time report, with the decision about certification assigned “exclusively to the President.”⁵⁸ However, President Reagan did not issue the certification.

Sanctions After the Tiananmen Crackdown

Initial Legislation

On June 4, 1989, Deng Xiaoping and other PRC leaders used the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) to suppress peaceful demonstrators in Beijing (commonly called the Tiananmen Crackdown in reference to the square that was the focal point of nationwide protests for political liberalization). The military crackdown killed or wounded hundreds, if not thousands, of demonstrators, and mass arrests, executions, and summary imprisonment of demonstrators and sympathizers ensued.

As part of the U.S. response, on June 21, 1989, Representative Markey sought to limit nuclear cooperation with the PRC by introducing language to H.R. 2655, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act. The language sought to ban the issuance of export licenses and nuclear cooperation unless the President (1) has made certifications and submitted the report required by P.L. 99-183; (2) has certified to Congress that the PRC government ended martial law and that the human rights situation has “significantly improved”; and (3) has certified to Congress that the PRC government has provided the United States with a “written declaration that it is not directly or indirectly assisting any nation in testing, developing, or acquiring nuclear explosive devices or the materials and components for such devices.”⁵⁹ On June 29, Representative Dante Fascell introduced sanctions on China in an en bloc amendment (H.Amdt. 107) to H.R. 2655, which passed the House by 418-0. H.R. 2655 was passed in the House but not the Senate.

In the Senate, on July 14, 1989, Senators George Mitchell and Robert Dole introduced an amendment (S.Amdt. 271) to S. 1160, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY1990, seeking to impose additional sanctions against the PRC. Those sanctions included the limitation of nuclear cooperation. The Senate passed the amendment by 81-10. On July 21, the Senate incorporated the bill in the House version (H.R. 1487) and passed it in lieu of S. 1160.

⁵⁷ Archived CRS Issue Brief IB86050, *Implementation of the U.S.-Chinese Agreement for Nuclear Cooperation*, by Warren Donnelly, September 28, 1989.

⁵⁸ Ronald Reagan, “U.S.-China Nuclear Cooperation Agreement, President’s Statement, December 16, 1985,” *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*, December 23, 1985.

⁵⁹ Archived CRS Issue Brief IB86050, *Implementation of the U.S.-Chinese Agreement for Nuclear Cooperation*, by Warren Donnelly, September 28, 1989; and *Congressional Record*, June 21, 1989, p. H2995.

P.L. 101-246

In the end, Congress legislated comprehensive sanctions in response to the Tiananmen Crackdown in H.R. 3792, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (introduced on November 21, 1989, and enacted as P.L. 101-246 on February 16, 1990). Section 902(a)(6) of P.L. 101-246 suspended nuclear cooperation with China until the President (1) certified to Congress that the PRC “has provided clear and unequivocal assurances to the United States that it is not assisting and will not assist any non-nuclear weapon state, either directly or indirectly, in acquiring nuclear explosive devices or the materials and components for such devices”; (2) makes the certifications and submits the report required by P.L. 99-183; and (3) makes a report under subsection (b)(1) or (2), reporting that the PRC government has made progress in political reforms or that it is “in the national interest” of the United States to terminate a suspension or disapproval.

Implementation of the 1985 Agreement

Presidents Reagan and George H. W. Bush did not issue the certifications to implement the agreement. After the deterioration in bilateral ties after the Tiananmen Crackdown of 1989, the relationship with China again deteriorated in the Taiwan Strait Crisis of 1995-1996. Questions persisted about U.S. sanctions for PRC nuclear proliferation activities in Pakistan and Iran.⁶⁰ President Clinton’s 1998 certification to Congress conceded that “the United States [had] decided not to proceed with implementation of the 1985 nuclear cooperation agreement because of continuing questions about contacts between Chinese entities and elements associated with the Pakistani nuclear weapons program.” He also noted that “nuclear cooperation between China and Iran dates from June 1985.”⁶¹

Congressional Action Before Certification

By the spring of 1997, Washington and Beijing discussed efforts to improve ties, including the first formal U.S.-PRC summit in the United States in 12 years. Those discussions included China’s request for implementation of the agreement. The Clinton Administration considered a presidential certification for implementation as the “centerpiece” of a state visit by PRC ruler Jiang Zemin to Washington, DC, in October 1997. (Jiang was the Communist Party General-Secretary, Central Military Commission Chairman, and PRC President.)

In Congress, Representatives Markey and Solomon led a total of 62 Members to write a letter to President Clinton in July 1997, urging him not to certify.⁶² Chaired by Representative Benjamin Gilman, the House International Relations Committee held a hearing on the agreement on October 7, 1997.⁶³ In the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, chaired by Senator Frank Murkowski, held a hearing on October 23, 1997.⁶⁴ On November 5, 1997, the House passed (by 393-29) an amendment sponsored by Representative Gilman to extend

⁶⁰ For more discussion, see CRS Report RL31555, *China and Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Missiles: Policy Issues*, by Shirley A. Kan.

⁶¹ William Clinton, “Unclassified Report to Congress on Nonproliferation Policies and Practices of the People’s Republic of China,” January 12, 1998.

⁶² Representatives Edward Markey and Gerald Solomon, “Dear Colleague,” June 5, 1997; “Clinton Urged to Deny Nuclear Certification to China,” *Reuters*, July 31, 1997.

⁶³ House International Relations Committee, “Implementation of the U.S.-China Nuclear Cooperation Agreement: Whose Interests are Served?,” October 7, 1997.

⁶⁴ Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, “U.S.-China Relations,” October 23, 1997.

congressional review for implementation of the agreement from 30 to 120 days and provide for expedited review procedures. The language amended H.R. 2358, the Political Freedom in China Act of 1997, which passed the House on November 5, 1997. Meanwhile, U.S. firms, such as Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Bechtel Power Corporation, and Stone and Webster Engineering, lobbied Congress to allow them to bid in a market worth as much as \$50 billion.⁶⁵

U.S.-PRC Summit Agreements

On the eve of the U.S.-China summit in October 1997, the PRC advanced its nuclear nonproliferation policy by joining the Zangger Committee (the NPT's Exporters' Committee) on October 16 and promising in writing not to begin new nuclear projects in Iran (in a confidential letter to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright).⁶⁶

At the summit on October 29, 1997, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and the PRC State Planning Commission signed an "Agreement of Intent on Cooperation Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Technology." Later, at a summit in Beijing in June 1998, DOE and the PRC State Planning Commission signed an Agreement on Cooperation Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Technologies, including bringing PRC scientists to U.S. national laboratories, universities, and nuclear reactor facilities.⁶⁷

President Clinton Certifies Agreement in 1998

On January 12, 1998, President Clinton signed certifications (as required by P.L. 99-183) on China's nuclear nonproliferation policy and practices to implement the 1985 Nuclear Cooperation Agreement. The President also issued the certification and waived a sanction imposed after the Tiananmen Crackdown (in P.L. 101-246). President Clinton submitted his certifications to Congress, contending that "the Agreement will have a significant, positive impact in promoting U.S. nonproliferation and national security interests with China and in building a stronger bilateral relationship with China based on respect for international norms."⁶⁸

Under Section 902(b)(2) of P.L. 101-246 (waiver authority), President Clinton reported that it was in the "national interest" to terminate the suspension of nuclear cooperation:

- "it is in the U.S. national interest to consolidate and build on the progress China has made in the nonproliferation area, and the implementation of the Agreement for Cooperation between the U.S. and the People's Republic of China Concerning the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy will establish a promising framework for doing so";
- "it is also in the U.S. national interest to build stronger, mutually advantageous bilateral relations with China based on respect for international norms";

⁶⁵ Dan Morgan and David Ottaway, "U.S. Reactor Firms Maneuvering to Tap China's Vast Market," *Washington Post*, October 21, 1997.

⁶⁶ R. Jeffrey Smith, "China's Pledge to End Iran Nuclear Aid Yields U.S. Help," *Washington Post*, October 30, 1997; also see CRS Report RL31555, *China and Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Missiles: Policy Issues*, by Shirley A. Kan.

⁶⁷ "Agreement Between the Department of Energy of the United States of America and the State Development Planning Commission of the People's Republic of China on Cooperation Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Technologies"; and White House, "Fact Sheet: Achievements of the U.S.-China Summit," June 29, 1998.

⁶⁸ William Clinton, letter to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House, January 12, 1998.

- “the United States also has an economic national interest ... The Agreement will enable U.S. companies to compete for contracts in the world’s fastest growing nuclear energy market.”

In making his certification, Clinton submitted to Congress:

- Presidential Determination No. 98-10 (Memorandum for the Secretary of State, “Certification Pursuant to Section (b)(1) of P.L. 99-183 and to Section 902 (a)(6)(B) of P.L. 101-246”) dated January 12, 1998;
- Unclassified Report on the PRC’s Nonproliferation Policies, Practices, and Assurances Required by P.L. 99-183;
- U.S.-PRC Memorandum of Understanding on Exchanges of Information and Visits (initialed on June 23, 1987) and Side Notes on Protection of Business Confidential Information (signed on October 22, 1997);
- Basis for certification under Section (b)(1)(A) of P.L. 99-183;
- Rationale for Report Required by P.L. 101-246.

Congressional Review of Clinton Certifications

During debate on the agreement, some Members of Congress, the nonproliferation community, and other interests were skeptical that PRC nonproliferation policies and practices had changed sufficiently to warrant the certifications and that they served U.S. interests. They also pointed out that China had not joined the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), which required full-scope safeguards. The House International Relations Committee held a hearing on February 4, 1998, in which Robert Einhorn, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Nonproliferation, testified for the Clinton Administration. Einhorn testified to Congress that

We must, therefore, approach implementation of the agreement with a healthy skepticism. President Reagan’s advice to trust but verify is clearly warranted here. So we will be monitoring China’s behavior carefully, and the Chinese will know that any actions inconsistent with their commitments will jeopardize future cooperation.⁶⁹

Congressional review ended on March 18, 1998, with no legislation to block the agreement, allowing it to be implemented. U.S. firms may apply for Export-Import Bank financing and licenses from the NRC and DOE for nuclear exports to China, and foreign firms may apply to re-export U.S. technology.

On March 19, 1998, 13 Members in the House led by Representative Markey wrote to President Clinton to urge him to terminate implementation of the agreement. Also, as amended by Representative Gilman, Section 1523 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY1999 (P.L. 105-261), enacted on October 17, 1998, requires the President to notify Congress “upon” granting licenses by the NRC for nuclear exports or re-exports to a non-NATO country that has detonated a nuclear explosive device (e.g., China). As required, the State Department, on June 9, 2000, issued the first notification to Congress that the NRC issued a license on February 3, 2000, for the export of tantalite ore to China.

⁶⁹ House International Relations Committee, hearing, “Implementation of the U.S.-China Nuclear Cooperation Agreement,” February 4, 1998.

Memorandum of Understanding on Ensuring Peaceful Uses

President Clinton had submitted his certification with a Memorandum of Understanding (pursuant to Article 8 of the agreement) that was initialed in Washington, DC, on June 23, 1987, but not signed. The President contended that this initialed Memorandum provided for arrangements that met the certification standard of P.L. 99-183 that the arrangements be designed to be effective in ensuring peaceful uses of nuclear material, facilities, or components.

Concerning “consultations,” Article 8(2) of the agreement stated that the cooperation would be between two nuclear-weapon states and that bilateral safeguards “are not required.” It called for “diplomatic channels to establish mutually acceptable arrangements for exchanges of information and visits to material, facilities, and components.” The Memorandum called for annual visits to reactors. In the event of discrepancies, it called for the parties to “consult” to make “mutually acceptable” arrangements for the addition or reduction of visits, in place of safeguards.

In February 1998, the Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation of the Department of Energy published the “Proposed Subsequent Arrangement Concerning Reciprocal Arrangements for Exchanges of Information and Visits Under the Agreement for Cooperation for Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy” between the United States and the PRC, noting that it sought to sign the initialed Memorandum which provided the “framework” for arrangements.⁷⁰ The United States and the PRC signed the Memorandum of Understanding on May 6, 1998, and DOE published it.⁷¹

Retransfers of Nuclear Technology

Given the PRC’s nuclear cooperation with Pakistan that raised questions of U.S. sanctions,⁷² the Clinton Administration apparently did not have adequate assurances from the PRC that it would not re-transfer and divert U.S. nuclear technology to another country, potentially for military use. The Administration continued negotiations with China on this issue after the agreement’s implementation.⁷³ According to a reported NRC memorandum of April 4, 2000, DOE officials had held up 16 applications for authorization to export U.S. technology since 1998, due to disagreement about assurances, including a U.S. demand for a blanket assurance and a PRC offer of case-by-case assurances.⁷⁴ Those cases were called “Part 810 cases” in reference to the DOE’s export controls that are regulated by Part 810 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

On September 16, 2003, in Vienna, Austria, Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham and the chairman of China’s Atomic Energy Authority apparently agreed to assurances from China that U.S. nuclear technology would not be retransferred by China to third parties without prior U.S. consent. The understanding, however, was reached in an exchange of diplomatic notes to “establish a process for determining what nuclear technologies require government-to-government nonproliferation assurances and set forth procedures for exchanging the assurances.” Afterwards, the Bush Administration continued to seek assurances to prevent unauthorized re-transfers by China.⁷⁵

⁷⁰ *Federal Register*, February 10, 1998.

⁷¹ *Federal Register*, June 4, 1998.

⁷² For more, see CRS Report RL31555, *China and Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Missiles: Policy Issues*, by Shirley A. Kan.

⁷³ *Nucleonics Week*, July 1, 1999.

⁷⁴ Bill Gertz, “Beijing Stalls on Nuclear Promises,” *Washington Times*, May 9, 2000.

⁷⁵ *Nucleonics Week*, September 18, 2003; April 1, 2004.

In September 2004, the State Department publicly stated that the exchange of diplomatic notes in September 2003 followed as a “second significant event” the 1998 implementation of the agreement, which permitted transfers of nuclear reactor fuel and components “based on case-by-case review.” Then, the diplomatic notes “confirmed conditions and assurances governing transfers of nuclear technology which are not covered by the agreement, and those notes provided as well for a case-by-case review.” The NRC issued licences for export of nuclear reactor components under the nuclear cooperation agreement, while the DOE authorized transfers of nuclear technology to China for its civilian nuclear power program based on the PRC’s “written nonproliferation assurances.”⁷⁶

Nuclear Cooperation Restrictions on Countries Assisting Iran

The Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act (CISADA) of 2010 (P.L. 111-195), which became law July 1, 2010, contains additional restrictions on licensing nuclear exports to countries with entities that have been sanctioned for conducting certain types of energy-related transactions with Iran.

Section 102(a) of CISADA prohibits the issuance of nuclear export licenses under a 123 Agreement for any country whose nationals have engaged in activities with Iran relating to the “acquisition or development of nuclear weapons or related technology, or of missiles or other advanced conventional weapons that are designed or modified to deliver a nuclear weapon.” The President can waive the provision by making a determination and notification to the appropriate congressional committees that the country did not know or have reason to know about the activity, or if the country is taking “all reasonable steps” to prevent recurrence and penalize the person involved.

Author Contact Information

Mark Holt
Specialist in Energy Policy
mholt@crs.loc.gov, 7-1704

Mary Beth D. Nikitin
Specialist in Nonproliferation
mnikitin@crs.loc.gov, 7-7745

Acknowledgments

A version of this report was originally written for the House International Relations Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific in the 109th Congress, and material from that study is made available for general congressional use with permission. Most of the history section of this report was written by retired CRS specialist Shirley A. Kan.

⁷⁶ Department of State, Daily Press Briefing and Question Taken, September 2, 2004.