required by present law to be marked with the name of the country of origin must be similarly marked by the repacker, whether the importer, distributor, retailer, or other handler of the merchandise. Goods in packages not so marked would be subject to seizure and forfeiture. The requirement could be waived only where found to necessitate such substantial changes in customary trade practices as to cause undue hardship.

H.R. 5054 runs counter to one of our major foreign policy objectives—the reduction of unnecessary barriers and hindrances to trade. The burdens the bill would impose are unnecessary because the Federal Trade Commission requires the disclosure of the foreign origin of repackaged imported articles when it is in the public interest to do so.

The United States and other principal trading nations of the world have recognized that burdensome marking requirements can be a hindrance to trade and have agreed to the principle that such hindrances should be reduced to a minimum. H.R. 5054 might well result in successive domestic handlers requiring written assurances of proper marking in order to avoid the severe penalty of seizure and forfeiture. The cost and the complications involved in such cumbersome paperwork would tend to discourage such imports. Moreover, this measure could prove ultimately damaging to the American goods.

In addition, the bill would unnecessarily extend the Bureau of Customs into areas by requiring the Bureau to follow goods after they have entered the stream of domestic commerce and to act against handlers of merchandise who are not importers. The Bureau would be required to determine the nature of customary trade practices and the possibility of undue hardship in a field outside its normal competence. Aside from the substantial additional expense, these new responsibilities would be most awkward for the Bureau to administer.

For these reasons I am withholding my approval of H.R. 5054.

Dwight D. Eisenhower
The White House, September 8, 1960.

H.R. 7424, Bankruptcy Act—Statutory Liens
I have withheld my approval of H.R. 7424, to amend sections 1, 57J, 64a(5), 67B, 67C, and 70C of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other further purposes.

I recognize the need for legislation to solve certain problems regarding the priority of liens in bankruptcy, but this bill is not a satisfactory solution. It would unduly and unnecessarily prejudice the sound administration of Federal tax laws. In some cases, for example, mortgages would be given an unwarranted priority over Federal tax liens even though the mortgage is recorded after the filing of the tax lien.

This and other defects of the bill can, I believe, be corrected without compromising its primary and commendable purpose. The Treasury Department and the proponents of H.R. 7242 have been working toward the solution of recognized problems in current law. Further cooperative efforts should produce satisfactory legislation that would avoid the undesirable effects of this measure.

Dwight D. Eisenhower
The White House, September 8, 1960.

H.R. 7618, H. P. Lambert Co., Inc., and Southeastern Drilling Corp.
I am withholding my approval from H.R. 7618, a bill for the relief of H. P. Lambert Co., Inc., and Southeastern Drilling Corp.

The bill would waive the applicable statute of limitations and permit a claim for refund of duty paid on certain nondutiable equipment imported into the United States.

The claimants requested that certain oilfield equipment be entered under provisions of the tariff for duty-free status to property originally manufactured in the United States. The equipment was admitted duty-free after the Lambert Co., the brokerage firm in the case, had posted a bond to assure the correctness of the documentation required to establish U.S. origin. At the request of the brokerage firm, the time covered by the bond was extended on several occasions. At the end of 2 years,