H.R. 4059. An act for the relief of Jesse Lee, Jr.; and
H.R. 5338. An act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and
H.R. 5754. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and
H.R. 6807. An act for the relief of W. H. Robinson and Co., Inc.; and
H.R. 7019. An act to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain expenses corresponding to that paid by Mr. Johnson Bradley for services in the Department of Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and
H.R. 7083. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and
H.R. 7431. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part out of the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and
H.R. 8667. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and
H.R. 9413. An act to provide for the coinage of additional 1 cent pieces; and
H.R. 9450. An act making appropriations for the National (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Biological and other activities chargeable in whole or in part out of the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and
H.R. 9498. An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message further announced that the President had disapproved of bills of the following titles:

MARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN IMPORTED ARTICLES
H.R. 2513

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 2513, a bill to require, with respect to every imported article removed from its container and repackaged, that the new package be marked with the name of the country of origin if, under present law, the country of origin must be so marked, with failure to do so subjecting the repackager—regardless of whether he is the importer, the distributor, the retailer or any other handler of the merchandise—to fines, imprisonment, and seizure and forfeiture of the article. Such a bill was vetoed by President Eisenhower in 1961. A second provision of the bill would require that all sawed lumber and wood products be marked with the country of origin, a provision which specifically violates our longstanding trade agreement with Canada. This bill would raise new barriers to foreign trade and invite retaliation against our exports at a time when we are trying to expand our trade and improve Western unity.

This bill would impose new costs upon our merchants and consumers at a time when we are trying to keep all costs and prices down. This bill would saddle new and unworkable burdens upon our Bureau of Customs at a time when we are trying to reduce Government expenditures.

This bill would encourage new price increases in lumber and homebuilding at a time when we are trying to expand our housing opportunities. This bill would aggravate our relations with Canada at a time when we are trying to improve those relations at every level.

There is no need for this bill. The Federal Trade Commission already has authority to require disclosure of the foreign origin of articles offered for sale where there may be danger of deception of the purchaser. The Federal Tariff Commission already has authority to protect domestic industries against serious economic injury resulting from imports. A unanimous Commission decision last February, in fact, found that the facts did not entitle the softwood lumber industry to such protection.

Approval of this bill, in short, is clearly not in the best interests of all the United States.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

DECEMBER 31, 1963.

CLAIM OF ROBERT ALEXANDER
H.R. 4506

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 4506, a bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander. Mr. Alexander was selected out of the Foreign Service in 1955. In 1958, he brought suit in the Court of Claims for lost salary, alleging that his separation was invalid. On January 20, 1960, the court concluded, after considering all the evidence presented by Mr. Alexander, that his claim had no merit. His complaint was accordingly dismissed, and on April 18, 1960, his motion for rehearing was denied. He now seeks to obtain reconsideration of the court's judgment against him on the basis of additional evidence.

Mr. Alexander has had his day in court. The full facilities of a court for discovering the truth were available to him. While the circumstances of his case may have made it difficult at the time to obtain evidence, there is nothing in the record to indicate that diligent use of the court's procedures would have failed to obtain the evidence relating to the handling of his discharge which he now offers to establish.

In these circumstances it is unnecessary to consider the relevance of the testimony offered. Mr. Alexander had a year after the court's judgment within which to move to set it aside on the basis of newly discovered evidence, an opportunity which he failed to use. This period of grace has a definite limit because a court's judgment must become final at some point in time in order that all parties may conduct themselves thereafter in reliance upon it.

Unless such a judgment becomes final in circumstances which have prevented a litigant from taking advantage of opportunities for proof accorded to all alike, it should not be set aside. In the absence of such circumstances in Mr. Alexander's case, I am constrained to withhold approval from H.R. 4506.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON


STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON H.R. 9440

I have today approved the Public Works Appropriations Act.

This does not mean approval of that provision in the act which precludes the Panama Canal Company from disposing of any real property or any rights to the use of real property without first obtaining the approval of the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate. Four Attorneys General of the United States have held provisions of this nature unconstitutional. The opinions of the Attorneys General point out that it is either an unconstitutional delegation to congressional committees of powers which reside only in the Congress as a whole, or an attempt to confer Executive powers on the legislative branch and the violation of the principle of separation of powers set forth in the Constitution.

I concur in these views.

However, it is entirely proper for the committees to require information with respect to the disposal of property, and I recognize the desirability of consultations between officials of the executive branch and the Congress. Therefore, it is my intention to treat the provision as a request for information and to direct that the appropriate legislative committees be kept fully informed with respect to disposal and transfer actions taken by the Panama Canal Company.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON
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LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:
Mr. Albert (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for January 7 to 9, 1964, on account of his absence, which is necessary to attend the funeral of his father.
Mr. Steed (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for January 7 to January 18, 1964, on account of official business.
Mr. Bow (at the request of Mr. Hallinan), for today, on account of official business.