by 40 percent. In May of this year I signed an Executive order calling for a White House Conference on Small Business to be held in January 1980. This Conference will involve over 25,000 small business people throughout the country helping to develop a small business policy for this country. I intend to work with the Congress and particularly with Chairman Smith and Nelson to develop and implement such a policy.

I believe we must have a Federal policy to isolate the Chief Counsel for Advocacy to the proper policy and administrative areas more and more as new business are adequately reflected in the establishment of this office as a Chief Counsel for Advocacy. I supported this bill.

The bill also distorts the role of the Small Business Administration. The bill would have on the operations of the Small Business Administration of any existing SBA program since SBA programs are already authorized for fiscal year 1982. It continues a duplicative program of farm disaster lending by the SBA with excessively deep interest subsidies and terms which we believe are unwise. This has led to an unwarranted amount of farm disaster lending which should be done by the Farmers Home Administration. This Administration has proposed that farm lending be consolidated in the Department of Agriculture which has the farm credit expertise and extensive field network necessary to operate the program effectively and efficiently.

The bill authorizes over $2 billion in expenditures in excess of our budget projections through 1982. It continues a duplicative program of farm disaster lending by the SBA with excessively deep interest subsidies and terms which we believe are unwise. This has led to an unwarranted amount of farm disaster lending which should be done by the Farmers Home Administration.

The Congress has failed to act on this recommendation. Even more important is the effect this bill would have on the operations of the Small Business Administration. The bill virtually mandates significant staff increases. It would also interfere with the ability of the Administrator of the SBA, my own small business advisor and representative, to effectively run that agency. The legislation imposes specific titles and responsibilities upon agency officials and specifies funding and personnel levels for activities throughout SBA down to the smallest detail. These legislative strictures run counter to my efforts to better manage the Federal government.

The bill also distorts the role of SBA's Chief Counsel for Advocacy. I supported the establishment of this office as a means to assure that the views of small business were adequately reflected in the policy-making processes of the government. But the legislation tends to move the Chief Counsel for Advocacy into policy and administrative areas more properly those of the Administrator of the SBA. This bill also might begin to isolate the Chief Counsel for Advocacy from the executive policy-making process by requiring an annual report to Congress which could not be reviewed or coordinated with any other agency of the Executive Branch. Current statutes provide the Chief Counsel with sufficient authorities to evaluate small business issues and serve as an ombudsman to small business interests. I am withholding my approval of this bill.

I am withholding my approval of this bill on the loan pool provision in this bill that would authorize private dealers to issue a new class of 100 percent Federally guaranteed securities which would compete directly with the Treasury and other Federally-backed securities in the bond markets.

I look forward to working with the Congress and the small business community in the next Congress an approach will be fashioned to meet the needs of the small business community, with the full involvement of my Administration.

JIMMY CARTER.


H.R. 11092

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I am withholding my approval of H.R. 11092, the "Navajo and Hopi Relocation Amendments of 1978." I have no objection to the authorization in this bill to fund the important and difficult work being performed by the Relocation Commission to administer the partitioning of land which has been jointly used by the Navajo and Hopi Tribes. My failure to approve this bill will not affect the ability of Congress to continue its work, because appropriation for this fiscal year have already been approved.

My objections to the bill center on section 4, which would provide for a one-house veto of the relocation plan which is finally adopted by the Relocation Commission. I have previously informed the Congress of my view that such legislative veto devices are unconstitutional intrusions into the day-to-day administration of the law by the Executive Branch, including independent agencies such as the Relocation Commission. Congress is constitutionally empowered to overturn the result reached by agency decisions executing the law only by enacting legislation subject to the veto power of the President under Article I, section 7, of the Constitution.

Where either Congress or the President is dissatisfied with the execution of the law by an independent agency or commission, legislation agreeable to both or enacted over the President's veto is an unconstitutional intrusion into the day-to-day administration of the law by the Executive Branch, including independent agencies such as the Relocation Commission. This principle was adhered to by the Ninety-third Congress when it enacted the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission Act in 1974. As a result of the advice I received from the appropriate officials of the Executive Branch, further, as a matter of fairness and equity, interpretation of the current law would not allow me to override the decision of authorized officials by the imposition of new "qualifications" that would not be lightly undertaken. Accordingly, I would suggest that the Ninety-sixth Congress, in any consideration of a similar bill, give due consideration to these problems.

The Administration will work with the Congress next year to develop any legislation necessary to address the problems of the Relocation Commission. The Congress needs to operate more effectively and I look forward to working with Congressional leaders such as Senator DeConcini and Congressman Ullman toward this end.

JIMMY CARTER.


H.R. 11861

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I am withholding my signature from H.R. 11861, which would require the Secretaries of Commerce and the Navy to notify at least four representatives of the maritime industry who represents the maritime industry and to submit an annual report to the President and Congress on their activities and recommendations.

Both the Maritime Administration of the Commerce Department (MARAD) and the Navy already have numerous contacts with the maritime industry and with each other to study, develop, and implement the goals of the Merchant Marine Act. Navy and MARAD are currently working to improve their cooperation in this area by adding the Secretary of Commerce and Navy to an existing inter-agency advisory board on maritime matters. They are also arranging to have the board meet at least four times a year, and at least one of these meetings will be open to maritime industry representatives.

In addition, in order to assure that the concerns that generated this bill are fully addressed, I am directing the Secretaries to consult regularly with maritime industry officials to discuss issues of mutual concern.

In light of these actions, I see no reason for this legislation. It is not necessary to achieve our goal of an adequate merchant marine. It would mandate a change in administrative functions which are currently satisfactory. This is an undue legislative intrusion into administrative activities which are the appropriate responsibility of the Executive Branch, and the required report would be an additional and unnecessary government expense. For these reasons, I am disapproving this bill.

JIMMY CARTER.


H.R. 6536

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 6536 which would make certain changes in the retirement program for police, firefighters, teachers, and judges of the District of Columbia.

This action today in no way alters my commitment to the basic principles of fairness and self-determination which must be the cornerstone of Federal-District relations. Included among our ac-