

a lower grade. After the civil service regional office at Boston and the Board of Appeals and Review of the Civil Service Commission in Washington held that the demotion was valid and warranted, Mr. Collins instituted suit in the Court of Claims in April 1958. The court thoroughly reviewed his case and held that his demotion complied with applicable regulations, procedures, and laws. The court subsequently denied a motion for reconsideration.

Mr. Collins, who appeared before the court in his own behalf, contends that because of improper Civil Service procedures and through his own lack of understanding of legal procedures, he failed to emphasize the most important aspects of his case. The Court of Claims, however, appears to have fully considered the applicable statutes and regulations and Mr. Collins had previously presented his views before the agency and before the Civil Service Commission in a lengthy hearing.

In summary, I do not believe that a constitutional court should be directed to hear particular matter once deposed of. Mr. Collins has had his day in court. If each dissatisfied litigant were to be permitted repeatedly to litigate his claim, there would scarcely ever be an end to litigation against the Government.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 23, 1962.

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 1943. 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 view of 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.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

2628. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report entitled "Report on Borrowing Authority" for June 30, 1962, pursuant to section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act as amended, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 13419. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, and distribution of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, and of amphetamine and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 13420. A bill to amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 252), to increase the basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services, and to make living conditions more fair and pleasant for their families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 908. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring Sir Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Is Motto "In God We Trust" Being Left Off \$1 Bills?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

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 someone 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 fact required by law to be placed upon the currency and coins of the United States (31 U.S.C. 324(a) 69 Stat. 290). Section 324(a) of the code provides 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 currency. This process has not been completed for all the various denominations of currency, but the new dies, rolls, and plates for the \$1 silver certificate have been completed, and no \$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."