

The original documents are located in Box 119, folder “Executive Protective Service” of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

December 17, 1975

SUBJECT: ADMINISTRATION AGREES TO SUPPORT
NEW COMPROMISE ON PREVIOUSLY
VETOED EPS LEGISLATION

According to a story in this morning's New York Times, Jim Lynn has sent a letter to New York advising them that the Administration has agreed to support compromise legislation which would have reimbursed New York and other cities for expenses incurred protecting foreign diplomats. On November 29, the President vetoed H.R.12, which would have expanded the Executive Protective Service and required the Federal government to reimburse state and local governments for protective assistance.

Is the New York Times story correct? Have Jim Lynn and the Administration agreed now to support the previously vetoed EPS bill providing support for New York City?

GUIDANCE: Jim Lynn has sent a letter to Senator Buckley advising him that the new substitute draft legislation for H.R.12 does meet the basic objections set forth in the President's veto message, and that the Administration would have no objection to its enactment.

Why did the President veto the original bill?

GUIDANCE: The language of the original bill was too broad, very vague, and required the Federal government to reimburse state and local governments for protective assistance which we feel is a local responsibility.

How is this bill different?

GUIDANCE: The new bill is much more explicit, and will provide support to cities in cases of extraordinary protective need, while still preserving the proper distinction between Federal and local law enforcement responsibilities.

I think this is a good example of how the Executive Branch and the Congress can work together to achieve acceptable legislation.

JGC