son in 1947 at Schofield Barracks, Ha-

wall.

As a member of the Armed Forces, the

beneficiary had been convicted of

housebreaking by a court-martial, sen-
tenced to 5 years' confinement, and
given a suspended dishonorable dis-
charge. While confined in a post stock-
ade he was shot and killed during an
attempted escape in any

determined that the decedent was not
ade he was shot and killed during an
charge. While confined in a post stock-
tage of the decedent the beneficiary was paid the usual 6 months' death

Earlier in his military career the ben-
ciciary's son had taken out a sta-

tional service life insurance policy, des-

ignating his mother as beneficiary, and

paying the premiums on his policy by

allotments from his pay. However, since he had forfeited all pay and allow-

ances while in confinement his allotment became ineffective, causing the policy to

lapse for lack of premium payment. When the beneficiary made application

after his death for regular monthly payments under the policy, the Veterans' Ad-

ministration made such payments to her over a period of several years in an
aggregate amount of $4,225.50 before dis-

covering that the policy had not actually

covered that the policy had not actually

matured on April 16, 1943.

The correctness of the Veterans' Ad-

ministration's determination should be

made to an ineligible beneficiary.

Favorable action appears to have been

predicated on a belief that because the

restriction concerning the permitted classes of beneficiaries has been removed to

as to national service life insurance ma-
turing on and after August 1, 1946, pay-

ment should be made to an ineligible beneficiary involving life insurance which

matured prior to August 1, 1946, and further, that the Government failed to advise the insured properly con-

cerning classes of eligible beneficiaries.

I assume that the latter view is not

supported by the record. As to the form-

er, a similar view was urged in support of

H. R. 3733, 83d Congress, which like-
wised proposed to pay an ineligible bene-

ficiary the personal service life insurance policy. In my message of

February 23, 1954, returning the bill without approval, I said that it seemed to

me irrelevant and unwise to accept as justi-
fication for that bill the fact that the

ineligible beneficiary could at the time of the message qualify as a bene-

ficiary under existing law which was not

made retroactive. My view has not

changed and applies with equal force to

the present case.

Furthermore, approval of H. R. 6529

would be discriminatory and preceden-
tial. I am asked to approve approxi-
mately 3,600 claims for the proceeds of

national service life insurance denied by

the Veterans' Administration because the

claimants were not within the classes of

beneficiaries permitted by law. It is esti-

mated that a majority were cases simi-

lar to Mr. Hill's, where the claimants

had been designated as beneficiaries.

As stated on previous occasions, I am

opposed to setting aside the principles

and rules of administration prescribed in

the general law relating to veter-

ans' benefit programs. Uniformity and

equality of treatment to all who are

equally situated but be the steadfast

rule if the Federal programs for veterans

and their beneficiaries are to be operated

successfully. Approval of H. R. 6529

would not be in keeping with these prin-
ciples.

The White House, September 1, 1954.

Dwight D. Eisenhower.

CARL PIOWATY AND W. J. PIOWATY,

H. R. 1665

H. R. 1665. I have withheld my

approval from H. R. 1665, for the relief of

Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty.

This bill authorizes and directs the

Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Carl

Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty the sum of

$4,450 in full settlement of their claim

against the United States for war-crop

advances made to them by the Regional

Agricultural Credit Corporation prior to

April 18, 1943.

The claims of the United States against

these two persons and their claims against the United States have been adjudicated in the courts where both sides were afforded an opportunity to present their respective positions and rule on the issues involved. The case was tried be-

fore a jury in the circuit court of Orange

County, Fl., on May 22 and 23, 1947, and a

judgment was obtained against both

Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty for the

full amount they owed. They appealed the verdict to the Supreme Court of Florida where the lower court's judg-

ment was sustained on October 15, 1948. Appeal for a rehearing was there-

after denied.

In 1950, W. J. Piowaty and his wife in-

stituted an action in the circuit court of

Orange County, Fl., seeking declara-
tory judgment relieving their real prop-

erty from the lien of the judgment. That suit was dismissed on motion of the

United States. In 1951, suit was filed

by the United States against Carl Pio-

waty, W. J. Piowaty, and the Globe In-

demnity Co. on the bonds which were

posted when the appeal was taken to the

Supreme Court of Florida. Carl Pio-

waty and W. J. Piowaty filed an an-

swer in that suit, but on motion for sum-

mary judgment, judgment was rendered against all the defendants in favor of the

United States on October 29, 1952.

In the light of this history of repeated judi-
cial review, I cannot agree that Carl

Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty should be

given the special consideration and re-

lief which the bill would provide.

Dwight D. Eisenhower.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 2, 1954.

TRUST ASSOCIATION OF H. KEMPER,

H. R. 951

H. R. 951. I have withheld my

approval from H. R. 951, for the relief of

the Trust Association of H. Kemper.

This bill would provide an indirect

means for payment of approximately $1

million by the United States for cer-

tain peacetime commercial losses of the

Kemper Trust Association. To accom-

plish this purpose the bill would require

the Court of Claims to determine the

loss and rules of administration prescribed in

the general law relating to veter-

ans' benefit programs. Uniformity and

equality of treatment to all who are

equally situated but be the steadfast

rule if the Federal programs for veterans

and their beneficiaries are to be operated