To the House of Representatives: I return herewith, without my approval, H.R. 7577, "To amend title 28, entitled 'Judiciary and Judicial Procedure,' of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal officers and employees arising out of the operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes."

As originally introduced, this legislation provided that when a Government driver is sued in a State court on a claim resulting from his operation of a motor vehicle while acting within the scope of his employment, such action should be removed to the appropriate United States district court. There it would become an action against the United States under the Federal Tort Claims Act and be the plaintiff's exclusive judicial remedy. Government drivers would thus cease to be defendants and would be relieved of personal liability in such cases. These are desirable objectives.

However, to require the consent of the plaintiff before any such action could be removed to a Federal court. This amendment is unfortunate, for any plaintiff, by refusing to give his consent, can prevent the conversion of the action to one under the Federal Tort Claims Act and thus thwart the sound purposes of the original bill. The amendment also makes the bill inconsistent internally and could give rise to needless litigation.

Although unwilling, therefore, to approve this bill, I would gladly sign new legislation corresponding to H.R. 7577 as first passed by the House of Representatives.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and, without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed. There was no objection.

GRAND LODGE OF NORTH DAKOTA, ANCIENT FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H.DOC. NO. 416)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives: I return herewith, without my approval, H.R. 8141, "For the relief of Grand Lodge of North Dakota, Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons, of $1,155.26 in customs duties assessed on Masonic jewels, consisting of insignia and emblems composed of metal and other material, imported from Canada. In support of the refund, it is asserted that such jewels should have been granted duty-free status under bilateral law. The entry free of duty of regalia and sculptures is permitted, but an express provision of the applicable law excludes any articles of utility. The Bureau of Customs has determined that the organ boarding in question is an article of utility within the meaning of the statute, and therefore does not meet the requirements for free entry."

The entry free of duty of certain sculptures is asserted to be an express provision of the applicable law excludes any articles of utility. The Bureau of Customs has determined that the organ boarding in question is an article of utility within the meaning of the statute, and therefore does not meet the requirements for free entry. The entry free of duty of certain sculptures is asserted to be an express provision of the applicable law excludes any articles of utility. The Bureau of Customs has determined that the organ boarding in question is an article of utility within the meaning of the statute, and therefore does not meet the requirements for free entry. The entry free of duty of certain sculptures is asserted to be an express provision of the applicable law excludes any articles of utility. The Bureau of Customs has determined that the organ boarding in question is an article of utility within the meaning of the statute, and therefore does not meet the requirements for free entry.

The entry free of duty of certain sculptures is asserted to be an express provision of the applicable law excludes any articles of utility. The Bureau of Customs has determined that the organ boarding in question is an article of utility within the meaning of the statute, and therefore does not meet the requirements for free entry. The entry free of duty of certain sculptures is asserted to be an express provision of the applicable law excludes any articles of utility. The Bureau of Customs has determined that the organ boarding in question is an article of utility within the meaning of the statute, and therefore does not meet the requirements for free entry. The entry free of duty of certain sculptures is asserted to be an express provision of the applicable law excludes any articles of utility. The Bureau of Customs has determined that the organ boarding in question is an article of utility within the meaning of the statute, and therefore does not meet the requirements for free entry. The entry free of duty of certain sculptures is asserted to be an express provision of the applicable law excludes any articles of utility. The Bureau of Customs has determined that the organ boarding in question is an article of utility within the meaning of the statute, and therefore does not meet the requirements for free entry. The entry free of duty of certain sculptures is asserted to be an express provision of the applicable law excludes any articles of utility. The Bureau of Customs has determined that the organ boarding in question is an article of utility within the meaning of the statute, and therefore does not meet the requirements for free entry. The entry free of duty of certain sculptures is asserted to be an express provision of the applicable law excludes any articles of utility. The Bureau of Customs has determined that the organ boarding in question is an article of utility within the meaning of the statute, and therefore does not meet the requirements for free entry. The entry free of duty of certain sculptures is asserted to be an express provision of the applicable law excludes any articles of utility. The Bureau of Customs has determined that the organ boarding in question is an article of utility within the meaning of the statute, and therefore does not meet the requirements for free entry. The entry free of duty of certain sculptures is asserted to be an express provision of the applicable law excludes any articles of utility. The Bureau of Customs has determined that the organ boarding in question is an article of utility within the meaning of the statute, and therefore does not meet the requirements for free entry.
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has been misinterpreted, however, there is no need for a special bill. General law provides procedures by which importers may challenge, administratively and in the courts, the Bureau of Customs’ interpretations of the law relating to importation. The Grand Lodge has not yet availed itself of these procedures, but it still has the opportunity to do so. If the bill would, therefore, discriminate in favor of a single importer who has not taken advantage of the available remedies. Such a result would be unfair to other importers and would create an unwise and unending precedent.

Although the enrolled bill would provide for a refund of $1,155.26, the Treasury Department has previously advised the Congress that the amount of duties due upon final liquidation of this entry will be only $375.34, and that the difference between this figure and the amount deposited at the time of entry by the Grand Lodge will be refunded administratively in any event.

In view of the foregoing, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

Dwight D. Eisenhower.


The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

OVERPAYMENT AND REFUNDS OF TAXES ERRONEOUSLY COLLECTED

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 10000) to amend further several provisions of the District of Columbia tax laws relating to overpayments and refunds of taxes erroneously collected, with Senate amendments thereto, and ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be concurred in.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out “of 1959.”
Page 1, line 9, strike out “accept assignees” and insert “make attorneys available.”
Page 2, line 3, strike out “municipal court of” and insert “municipal court for.”
Page 2, line 6, strike out “for” and insert “of.”
Page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike out “Mental Health Commission” and insert “Commission on Mental Health.”
Page 2, line 2, strike out “fee” and insert “fee;” except that the aforesaid sworn statement in writing shall not be required of patients in proceedings before the Commission on Mental Health of the District of Columbia and proceedings in courts arising therefrom.”
Page 3, line 19, strike out “of” where it appears the second time and insert “for.”
Page 3, line 22, strike out “of” where it appears the first time and insert “for.”
Page 4, line 1, strike out “Chief Judge of the Juvenile Court” and insert “Judge of the juvenile court.”
Page 4, line 4, after “Appeals” insert “for the District of Columbia.”
Page 4, lines 16 and 17, after “prescribe.” Insert “The Director shall be a member of the bar of, and qualified to practice law in, the District of Columbia.”
Page 5, line 16, after “employment,” insert “service of individuals.”
Page 5, line 17, after “any voter” insert “municipal volunteer attorney pursuant to this section shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual into any provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes, nor shall any person serving as a municipal volunteer attorney be considered, by reason of such service, an employee of the government of the District of Columbia for any purpose.”
Page 6, line 3, after “Appeals” insert “for the District of Columbia.”
Page 6, line 8, strike out “auditor” and insert “accountant.”
Page 6, line 16, strike out all after “Sec. 11.” down to and including “Act” in line 19 and insert “For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, out of any moneys in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia, such sums as may be necessary; except that not to exceed $575,000 shall be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960.”
Page 7, line 1, strike out all after “Columbia” down to and including “Agency” in line 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF LIFE INSURANCE ACT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 10694) to amend sections 1 and 5b of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be concurred in.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out “‘Standard Ordinary Mortality Table’” and insert “‘Standard Ordinary Mortality Table’”.
Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out “‘Standard Ordinary Mortality Table’” and insert “‘Standard Ordinary Mortality Table’”.
Page 4, line 19, strike out “‘Standard Ordinary Mortality Table’” and insert “‘Standard Ordinary Mortality Table’.”
Page 5, line 25, strike out “‘Standard Industrial Mortality Table’” and insert “‘Standard Industrial Mortality Table’.”
Page 5, line 19, strike out “‘Standard Ordinary Mortality Table’” and insert “‘Standard Ordinary Mortality Table’.”
Page 6, lines 4 and 5, strike out “‘Extended Term Insurance Table’” and insert “‘Extended Term Insurance Table’.”
Page 7, line 20, strike out “‘fourth’” and insert “‘fourth’”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SOCIETY DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN COLONISTS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 11052) to authorize the National Society Daughters of the American Colonists to use certain real property in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of that society, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?