order to evade the higher duties placed on Communist goods and other restrictions on trade that would benefit our adversaries.

Under present law, marking duties are due on marked merchandise. If, whether or not there is evidence that the importer knew or had reason to know that the merchandise was mismatched, I believe that the policy behind this rule is sound. It should be the responsibility of the importer to assure proper marking, since he is in a position to insist on indemnification from the foreign seller if goods have been misrepresented. If, on the contrary, relief were granted to all importers with respect to mismarked merchandise whenever customs could not show that the importer was aware of the mismatching, this would be tantamount to making customs prove in each case of mismatching that the importer was at fault at considerable cost in time and effort. This would greatly change the impact of the marking law.

I am withholding my approval of H.R. 4670, a bill "to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia."

Although I am in complete accord with the Congress that the people of the District of Columbia should adequately be protected against the dissemination of indecent and obscene publications and articles, there are grave constitutional and other considerations which have been brought to my attention which compel me to withhold my approval of the legislation.

Among other things, my attention has been directed to the 1961 Supreme Court decision in Marcus v. Search Warrant, reported at page 717 of volume 367 of the U.S. Reports, which seems clearly to make the search and seizure provisions of this bill unconstitutional.

The Congress will convene in less than 3 months and I am convinced it is desirable that the considerations which have been brought to my attention should be brought to its attention. Such a brief delay in the enactment of this legislation seems a small price to pay in order to obtain an enforçable law which will achieve the worthy objectives which prompted the bill before me.

I am withholding my approval of H.R. 3131, a bill "for the relief of Richard C. Collins." The bill directs the Court of Claims to grant a rehearing to Mr. Collins, of Billerica, Mass., in connection with his contesting the action of the Department of the Treasury in demoting him to a lower grade.

Provisions contained in this legislation are as follows. Mr. Collins was employed by the Internal Revenue Service. He was notified, on November 27, 1956, that his work was unsatisfactory and that his personnel classification was decreased due to inefficiency. However, the district director decided, after further review of Mr. Collins' case, that a more compassionate step would be to demote him to
MRS. HELENITA K. STEPHENSON

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 9285, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Helenita K. Stephenson. The bill would pay veterans' death benefits in a lump sum of $5,144.29 to Mrs. Stephenson for the period 1946 to 1955, during which she was remarried and ineligible for such benefits. The asserted basis for this payment is that her remarriage was annulled in 1955, because her husband had fraudulently misrepresented his wealth and health, and from a legal point of view, remarriage did not therefore exist during those years.

Mrs. Stephenson's entitlement to veterans' survivor benefits derived from the death of her husband in service in 1843. The monthly payments to her on this account were terminated in 1946, in accord with the law that remarriage is a bar to such benefits. Also in accord with longstanding regulations and practice, the payments were resumed in 1955 when her remarriage was annulled. Death benefits were paid all during the period of her remarriage on behalf of her children, continuing even after they were in college.

Mrs. Stephenson's situation appears to be no different from thousands of similar cases where individuals have not been given lump-sum settlements to cover the period of an invalid remarriage. While it may be, given the grounds of the annulment, that she did not receive adequate support during her remarriage, in all the circumstances this does not seem to be adequate reason for the retroactive payment proposed. Retroactive payments in this program are inherently objectionable because the program is based on the rule that death benefits are compensation toward support of the widow for current monetary loss resulting from the service death of a husband. A remarriage, even one subsequently annulled, must be assumed to replace that loss and to remove the Government's obligation to do so.

Approval of this bill would therefore seriously discriminate against similarly situated widows of veterans and it is important that we preserve the integrity and impartiality essential to the administration of programs involving hundreds of thousands of veterans and their dependents. This we cannot do if we grant special privilege or favored treatment as proposed by H.R. 9285.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 23, 1962.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Is Motto “In God We Trust” Being Left Off $1 Bills?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, together with the other Members of the House, I have been pleased to note the recent installation of the motto, “In God we trust,” over the podium.

An assertion frequently held is that $1 bills currently being produced by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing do not contain this motto. As an example, I received, in the mail, this inquiry only last week:

Since you are on the House Committee for Banking and Currency, I direct to you this inquiry concerning why the motto “In God we trust” has been eliminated from the $1 bill. As you know, on the side of the bill which has the pyramid and great seal of the United States the motto appeared above the word “one.” Some of the more recent $1 bills have been printed without the motto. Can you tell me if this is something voted upon by the Congress or is left up to some one in the appropriate Government department?

I will very much appreciate any information you can give on this query.

The answer, of course, is that since 1955 the law has required that the motto be placed on all U.S. currency and coins. My full answer to the above inquiry follows:

I wish to acknowledge your letter of October 1 in which you inquire why the motto “In God we trust” has been eliminated from the $1 bill.

I wish to advise you that this motto has not been eliminated from the $1 bill—that it is in law to be placed upon the currency and coins of the United States (31 U.S.C. 334(a) 69 Stat. 206). Section 334(a) is to the effect that “at such time as new dies for the printing of currency are adopted the dies shall bear, at such place or places thereon as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be appropriate, the inscription ‘In God we trust’ and thereafter this inscription shall appear on all U.S. currency and coins.”

The Bureau of Engraving and Printing has followed the provisions of law in this regard carefully. As the new process for the printing of currency has been adopted, new dies are prepared for the printing of the $1 silver certificate is being printed today without the aforementioned inscription being printed thereon. You must remember that many thousands of the $1 silver certificates printed prior to the change in the printing process are still in active circulation. Until these are all recovered by the Treasury Department you will see some of such certificates without this most appropriate inscription being printed thereon.

I appreciate your having brought this matter to my attention and I trust that within a reasonable time all of our coins and currency shall bear the inscription “In God we trust.”