MEMORANDUM
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

SUBJECT: President's Meeting with the Republican Leadership

DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, April 27, 1976
8:00 - 9:30 a.m.

PLACE: The Cabinet Room

President: I want to discuss two items which involve possible vetoes. First, foreign aid. I have been a constant supporter of foreign aid. I ran first for Congress against an isolationist. Also, no one has been more supportive of Israel. While I did not put money in a Transition Quarter, I requested $4 billion over 1976-77. The '76 Authorization Bill contains some serious restrictions on Presidential authority. There were some cuts in MAP in the Appropriations Bill. There is little flexibility since both Houses used almost identical figures, but I think we need about 100 more in MAP. So, if the two bills come down here like they are now, I may have to veto. With this background, I'd be happy to hear your comments.

Case: There is a possibility of a supplemental. There isn't much trouble working out the money; it is the authorization which is the problem.

President: Here are some of the restrictive provisions. [Reads]

Broomfield: I would agree that the Bill should be vetoed and let us start all over again.

Scott: I agree. I would veto. You can't run a program country by country by committees of the Congress.

Case: We are not trying to do that, just to have the right to terminate.
Scott: We are giving aid to Israel up to about half the Treasury. I am more worried about Korea and the chance that this Bill will be used as a vehicle to punish Korea.

President: I think the first time a country was mentioned specifically was Franco Spain by Rooney. If this is passed, you would have lobbying by each of the 20 countries. It would make the other lobbying look like child's play.

Curtis: I think you should veto. You would be supported by the country because it is an improper infringement of your authority. If this passes, aid will be administered by politics, not the national interest.

President: Is there any way to send the Bills back, rather than veto?

Michel: I think you should handle the restrictions first rather than dealing with the money.

Case: I agree. I don't think Transition Quarter money should be mixed in this.

Broomfield: I think it is too difficult parliamnetarily. The clearest way is to veto. There is just too much politics involved. This is a matter of principle -- who is going to run foreign policy, you or the Congress? I think the people will support you.

Griffin: You can certainly be sustained in a veto. The question is what kind of a bill will you then get. The fact that Israel needs money might help there.

President: Now that that has been brought up, I have asked for over $4 billion, so there is no doubt where I am on Israel, but under CRA, they only get $600 million.

Quillen: Isn't it a possibility to get a rule and skip the authorization bill? But I recommend a veto, because it really does tie your hands.

President: Based on the observations here, plus my own feelings and those of my staff, there is a strong chance of a veto. Then we can figure out how to go.

Edwards: Shouldn't we still try to recommit the bill first?
Broomfield: It wouldn't work, but it is not a bad tactic. Shouldn't we list all these heavy infringements on your authority?

President: I think a straight motion to recommit is best. Then you don't get people reacting on the basis of narrow concerns they might have and offset each other. Anyway, I think you can anticipate a veto. That should slow up the appropriations bill so we can see where to go from here.
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Scott, I agree; I would write, “I am very unhappy by reason of lack of time.”

Scott: We agree and I my problem is, I am unable to be with this because of time.

P. I think it is 20 countries existing more critical specifically w/ France being by Romess.

If this is true, you would have lobbying in such a 20 countries? Would make

---
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I don't think you should handle emotions just because they're dealing with money.

I don't think the money should be mixed in this.

I think it is the duty of parliamentarians to speak the truth. There is just too much political involved.

This is a matter of principle. You're doing what you're doing.

I think people will support you.

Griffin, you can certainly be sustained in an effort. The question is what kind of a bill will you try to get. The fact that I would move to

By written time

You suggest that has been brought up, I have asked because of it, as the doubt, when I can see I, but under ATA, the only get 10% and

Waller just a probability to get a setup thing is with that. I see in a world, because it really

You can't you should.

Bruges are a relationship here, plus any warm feeling that from staff. There is a strong chance of a rate. Then we can figure and

Edmond shouldn't we still try to encourage it with it?
Dear friend,

It wouldn't work, but it isn't a bad idea. Something we lost all those years being unemployed to come your authority.

I think a shorter motion is the best. Then you don't get people confusing bits of meaning because they might have a different meaning. Anyway, I think you can anticipate a vote. That should show up a pretty well. You can see the article is going from here.