I am disapproving H.R. 4175 because it would not repeal the Maritime Administration's Title XI loan program, as I proposed in the 1987 Budget. This program is one of several Federal credit programs that I proposed to reduce or phase out in order to limit the government's intervention in the Nation's lending market.

Achievement of our credit reform goals is important to the maritime industry and the economy as a whole. The maritime industry must be encouraged to rely on the private credit market, without Federal intervention, as its source of capital if we are to continue our progress toward restoring that industry to full health. Borrowers in general must be freed from the government's preemptive allocation of credit, which forces unsubsidized borrowers to pay more for credit and may result in some borrowers being "crowded out" entirely.

I am also not approving H.R. 4175 because it would continue to authorize appropriations for financial assistance to State maritime schools. Such an authorization of appropriations is entirely inappropriate during this time of necessary fiscal restraint.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 28, 1986.*

On November 1, 1986:

NATIONAL APPLIANCE ENERGY CONSERVATION ACT

I am withholding my approval of H.R. 5465, the "National Appliance Energy Conservation Act of 1986."

This legislation would have established specific, minimum energy efficiency standards for home appliances without regard to technological feasibility or the need for economic justification. The bill intrudes unduly on the free market, limits the freedom of choice available to consumers who would be denied the opportunity to purchase lower-cost appliances, and constitutes a substantial intrusion into traditional State responsibilities and prerogatives. It also mandates a complicated series of 19 rule-makings over the next 20 years for 52 subcategories of appliances, virtually assuring extensive litigation, increasing Federal regulation many years into the future.

Moreover, although I share the interest in the need for conserving energy resources that led the Congress to pass this bill, H.R. 5465 fails to advance this goal in a manner that takes account of the tremendous cost to consumers, who would have to spend an estimated extra $1.4 billion per year on appliance purchases. Higher prices would force many to buy more expensive appliances than they would prefer, and make some delay or forgo some appliance purchases altogether. By eliminating the lower-priced models, the bill would hit low-income consumers particularly hard. It could also discourage and slow the introduction of useful product innovations.

Disapproval of this bill does not mean, however, that the energy efficiency of appliances will be wholly without Federal regulation. Under current law, the Department of Energy is required to conduct a rule-making which may lead to the imposition of Federal standards, and any such standards would preempt existing State law.

Thus, the choice is between Federal regulation of appliance standards under this bill and regulation under current law, which requires the Department of Energy to take account of technological feasibility and economic factors. Under these circumstances, I think current law is preferable.

In addition, I note that the Congress included in H.R. 5465 amendments requiring the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue a declaratory order in a pending proceeding and setting a deadline for the Commission to resolve a pending rate case. I am in agreement with what the Congress sought to achieve in requiring the Commission to issue a declaratory order and am asking the Secretary of Energy to take appropriate action before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission so that this matter will be promptly and favorably resolved. I also agree with the Congress that the rate case matter should be resolved swiftly and urge the Commission to exert its best efforts to meet the deadline the Congress has sought to impose.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 1, 1986.*

On November 4, 1986:

INDEPENDENT SAFETY BOARD ACT AMENDMENTS

I am withholding my approval of H.R. 4961, the "Independent Safety Board Act Amendments of 1986," for reasons unrelated to improving transportation safety—a cause to which I remain firmly committed. My Administration is actively implementing new aviation technology, both on the ground and on-board aircraft. Furthermore, over the last five years, my Administration has increased funding for the Federal Aviation Administration by 50 percent. Our multi-billion dollar safety modernization program for the Nation's air traffic system—already the safest in the world—has contributed to a decline in the accident rate by over 50 percent during the last decade. We have been equally dedicated to improving highway safety. In the past decade, the highway fatality rate has declined by about 25 percent. Still, my 1987 budget request for motor carrier safety exceeded 1982 funding five-fold.

I remain steadfast in my commitment to transportation safety, but H.R. 4961 would authorize excessive appropriations for the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) for fiscal years 1987, 1988, and 1989 and would lead the Federal government to become involved in an industry-by-industry approach to the larger problem of liability insurance.

I find several provisions of this legislation objectionable. First, the bill would authorize appropriations for NTSB in 1988 and 1989 that would be $8.7 million, or 20 percent, more than the projections in my 1987 budget. Specifically, these authorization levels exceed the projections by the following amounts: (1) $3.7 million in 1988—$25.4 million versus $21.7 million projected and (2) $5 million in 1989—$27 million versus $22 million projected. Given our current efforts to reduce the size of the Federal deficit, the size of these increases is unacceptable. I point out that the NTSB's budget has already grown 26 percent in the past five years and that my budgets provide sufficient funding for the NTSB to maintain its safety functions. Moreover, since funds have already been appropriated for the NTSB in 1987, NTSB activities will continue uninterrupted even with my disapproval of this bill.

Second, H.R. 4961 directs the Administrator of the Federal Aviation administration to establish an airport liability insurance clearinghouse and, with the Secretary of Transportation, to prepare reports on the increasing costs of general liability insurance coverage for airports and the implications of those increasing costs for airports. A final report would include recommendations for actions that the Federal government might undertake to assist in ameliorating the liability insurance difficulties of airports used by the public.

Many Americans are caught by the spiraling costs of liability insurance. While I am not unsympathetic to those who are bearing the cost of rising insurance premiums, I believe it would be inequitable and unwise for the Federal government to address this issue on an industry-by-industry basis.

For these reasons, I am compelled to withhold my approval from the bill. In so doing, I reemphasize that the disapproval will not disrupt the NTSB's activities in 1987 and that my Administration remains firmly committed to ensuring safe transportation.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 4, 1986.*

On November 5, 1986:

PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON HEALTH PROMOTION AND DISEASE PREVENTION

I am withholding my approval of S. 2057, which would establish a President's Council on Health Promotion and Disease Prevention.

Many Federal health promotion and disease prevention activities are underway at the Department of Health and Human Services, which set an ambitious agenda of health promotion and disease prevention goals to be achieved by 1990. I am encouraged by the progress that is being made toward those objectives and the plans which lie ahead. These plans include a national conference in late 1989 or early 1990, and many individual programs such as the Low Birth Weight Prevention Initiative, the National High Blood Pressure Education Program, and the Healthy Older People Public Education Program. Because our Federal commitment to such activities