

Calendar No. 319

72D CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

} REPORT
No. 300

RELIEF OF ROBERT SMITH WATSON

FEBRUARY 24, 1932.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Finance, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 140]

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 140) to extend certain benefits to Robert Smith Watson, having considered the same, report it back to the Senate and recommend that the bill do not pass.

The report of the Veterans' Administration is as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, December 28, 1931.

Hon. REED SMOOT,
Chairman Committee on Finance,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMOOT: This is in reply to your letter dated December 17, 1931, transmitting S. 140, a bill to extend certain benefits to Robert Smith Watson and William La Velle Watson.

The provisions of this bill are similar to those contained in S. 2915 introduced in the Seventy-first Congress, second session, January 6, 1930, and which failed of enactment. As was reported to your committee January 31, 1930, in connection with the former bill for the same purpose, the World War veteran, George C. Watson, XC-540778, applied for and was granted insurance in the amount of \$10,000 during his military service. In applying for this benefit he designated his estate as beneficiary. Subsequent to his discharge from the service he allowed his insurance to lapse for the nonpayment of premium due for June, 1919. However, it was possible under amendment to the World War veterans' act to revive such insurance at the time the veteran became totally and permanently disabled, namely July 7, 1920. The veteran died May 21, 1921.

The veteran, by his last will and testament, directed that his war-time insurance be paid to his brother, Roy S. Watson, and his sister-in-law, Eunice L. Watson. Accordingly, awards were approved in favor of the brother and sister-in-law authorizing the payment in the amount of \$28.48 monthly to each. Roy S. Watson died December 10, 1922, and following his death the entire insurance was awarded to surviving beneficiary.

No payment of death compensation or adjusted compensation has been made as these benefits are limited by law to veteran's widow, children, and dependent parents. There does not appear to be anyone surviving this veteran within the permitted class.

The records do not disclose any particular reason for special legislation for the nephews mentioned in the bill, who appear to be the children of the sister-in-law, Eunice L. Watson, who is now in receipt of the insurance installments referred

to above and the surviving brother, Roy S. Watson, now deceased. Further, to approve special legislation for the nephews in this case would prejudice the rights of others in the same group of surviving relatives who are not entitled under existing law and who might be able to present claims of equal merit.

It is, as you probably know, against the policy of the Veterans' Administration to recommend special legislation, except where administrative error or legal technicality has worked detriment or disadvantage to the person in whose favor legislation is suggested.

A copy of this letter is inclosed for your use.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, *Administrator.*

