

who has sinned himself, in ignorance and in passion, from time to time.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

MISSOURI COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Jefferson City, Mo., January 10, 1962.

Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: Your letter of January 8 is appreciated, although it contains several false statements.

In the first place, the resolution under question did not originate in, nor does it have any connection with the Missouri Council of Churches. It was adopted on November 5, 1961, by the General Council of the American Baptist Convention (denomination) of which I am a member. Therefore, if anyone is to be condemned it is not the Missouri Council of Churches, but the American Baptist Convention. I hope you will get this point clear.

In the second place, we were asked by the General Council of the American Baptist Convention to place this resolution before certain key Congressmen. Is it a crime to make the views of a denominational body known?

I suppose you are now aware of the fact that the House Committee on Un-American Activities has just issued a statement admitting certain errors in its film "Operation Abolition."

As far as I know no one is condemning the House of Representatives as a body. What we are doing, in this instance, is to say that listings compiled by the HUAC should not be released by Congressmen at the request of any citizen who happens to write in. As you must know, these "listings" are being used over the Nation as a form of public blackmail.

Your concern in this matter is greatly appreciated, but I feel that you are not willing to face up to the real issue expressed in the enclosed resolution.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY I. STUBER.

MARCH 5, 1962.

STANLEY I. STUBER, Th. M., D.D.,
Executive Director and Minister, Missouri
Council of Churches, Jefferson City, Mo.

DEAR REVEREND STUBER: I have delayed answering your January 10, 1962, letter because I wanted to be temperate in my reply.

It comes as a shock to find ministers of the Gospel calling statements of disagreement false statements. I hardly think my attribution of the resolution of the Council of the American Baptist Convention to the Missouri Council of Churches was false, even though it might be in error. Certainly you promulgated this resolution with the letterhead of the Missouri Council of Churches and signed the letter "Executive Director." Nowhere in the body of the forwarding letter is the reader's attention called to the fact that this resolution you ask be considered seriously was made by a different organization. As a matter of fact one can properly conclude that the purpose of disseminating this resolution on the stationery of the Missouri Council of Churches with the signature of the executive director was an act of approval and endorsement of the Missouri Council of Churches.

If you had desired to forward this resolution as a member of the General Council of the American Baptist Convention you could have done so and there would have been no misunderstanding. This you did not choose to do.

I shall try to clarify this point as you ask me to, by writing to the members of the Missouri Council of Churches to find out if you had authority to use its letterhead and to sign the letter of dissemination of execu-

utive director. If you had such authority, then I am not in error in attributing the resolution to the Missouri Council of Churches although it was originally promulgated by another organization. If you had no such authority, another point is in order to be raised.

If you would care to clarify this point yourself, I would be happy, because after all you are the one in the best position to clarify it.

To move on. Indeed it is no crime to make the views of a denominational body known to key Congressmen. Quite the contrary, it is more of an offense in representative government when our citizens or groups of our citizens fail to make their views known on the issues of the day. I commend both the General Council of American Baptist Convention and the Missouri Council of Churches for this phase of their actions.

Let me ask in return, don't you believe it is proper and responsive for a Representative to reply to such expressed views pointing out areas of agreement or disagreement if such exist? I believe it is through this kind of exchange that government by the people really begins to operate.

Our exchange of views can be quite healthy and move the debate forward if we will confine our attention to the issues raised and lay off smearing the motives of those with whom we are in disagreement. Indeed, that was the tenor of my first reply.

I have long been aware of the fact that the HUAC has admitted errors occurred in the film "Operation Abolition" which was compiled and edited by a private organization. This is not news. However, the HUAC has pointed out that these were not errors of consequence and occurred as the result of the job of editing and compiling which by its very nature is difficult. The HUAC has emphatically pointed out that the film is a fair presentation of the issues brought to a head in San Francisco at the time of the HUAC hearings. Having gone into this matter in some depth I am inclined to agree with the committee.

We are in agreement about one thing, and it is an important point. "Listings compiled by the HUAC should not be released by Congressmen at the request of any citizen who happens to write in." I go even further and so do the Rules of the House of Representatives which govern the action of the HUAC and other committees. Any information of a derogatory nature cannot be made public, in any manner, without a vote of the committee involved after executive session.

You state, "As you must know, these listings are being used over the Nation as a form of blackmail." This is reiterating your general charge. I do not know this to be a fact. I have pointed out in my letters that we need a bill of particulars which back up these generalities. You provide none. If any Congressman or the committee in an unauthorized manner has released material upon which such listings are based, then we have a specific violation about which we can do something. Or if there are listings which falsely say they are based upon such released material there is something we can do about these listings. I suspect the listings you refer to are the official listings of the committee or of the Attorney General setting forth the various Communist organizations operating in our society. These listings, however, are official and there are correct procedures established for listing such organizations and these procedures provide methods whereby the organizations accused or members thereof can set forth their case as to why the organization should not be so listed.

We come back to the basic point. The resolution makes some very general and very derogatory charges against the Congress of the United States, intentionally or other-

wise. I have asked for a bill of particulars to substantiate these charges. You have declined to present such a bill of particulars. Under these circumstances fairness requires that you do what you can through the two organizations of which you are a member to correct the damage you have contributed to by disseminating derogatory and unsubstantiated charges against the integrity of many individuals and the public institutions of our society.

I think we have now reached a point where this material, your letters, and enclosures, my replies should be a matter of public record. This is an important public issue which you have raised initially and publicly. I shall be pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any additional comments you may wish to make.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

NAVAL HOMES FOR TREATMENT IN THE FIELD OF GERIATRICS

(Mr. WILSON of California was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include a statement.)

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation that will establish two naval homes for treatment in the field of geriatrics, one to be located on the east coast and one to be located on the west coast.

To date, a very serious problem exists due to the inadequacies of existing facilities to meet the needs of the active and retired members of the Navy.

In my own congressional district, the naval hospital is experiencing serious difficulties in meeting the medical needs of active and retired personnel.

We cannot afford to jeopardize the whole naval career system by failure to meet the needs of these career men when they reach retirement. This is the situation we are faced with today.

The following statement by Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg III prepared for the retired naval personnel newsletter, succinctly sets forth the critical nature of this problem.

I urge immediate attention be given to this legislation.

GREETINGS FROM THE CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

The 6 years that the retired activities section has been in operation have seen an increase in the number of personnel transferred to the Fleet Reserve or retired, so that presently over 119,000 are in a retired pay status. This growth has affected and will continue to affect other areas of retirement living—retirement pay, benefits, and privileges.

As a matter of information almost 39,000 of these retirees live in California and nearly 10,000 in Florida. Large groups live in New York and around the Washington, Virginia, and Maryland area. Apparently, climate, recreation facilities, and accessibility to uniformed services hospitals, commissaries, and exchanges plus other advantages influence the choice of retirement homes.

These large concentrations of Navy retirees from the other services are causing serious overloading of some of the very service facilities which make many areas desirable for retirement homes. Hospitals and commissaries in California, Florida, Washington, D.C., and many other areas are operating well beyond their designated capaci-

ties. Since there is great difficulty in obtaining funds from the military budget to be earmarked specifically to increased hospital capabilities for retired persons and their dependents, this condition will worsen rather than improve as the numbers of retirees multiply.

As a consequence, your equity in retirement benefits which you expected at the completion of your military career is being diluted. As Chief of Navy Personnel, I can assure you all that the Navy as well as the Department of Defense is well aware of the seriousness of this problem and will continue to support and promote the interests of our retired military personnel.

W. R. SMEDBERG III.

INCREASING THE SIZE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, regardless of statements by proponents of this measure, it is so politically motivated that the public throughout the country is aware of the purely political and expedient nature of this bill. With the House being naturally unwieldy by its size an increase is impossible to justify.

It would be much more practical for us to devote our energies to streamlining House procedures to achieve more effective operation.

However, the political motivation of this measure is really the point since, if an increase in the size of the House is at all justifiable, it should have been planned early in 1961 rather than now, to solve the political problems of reapportionment in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. All the other States that were faced with reapportionment problems as a result of the 1960 census met their obligation through proper action by their State general assemblies. The failure of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania to solve their reapportionment in an acceptable fashion to a few individuals results in the sorry spectacle of the House increasing its size merely to accommodate a handful of individual Congressmen. This is bad legislation and bad politics.

In Illinois we were faced with a difficult reapportionment task and after a lengthy and certainly controversial debate, the State legislature met its obligation. As I have indicated, the very same circumstances prevailed in numerous other States.

I am opposed to this bill but if I were attempting to perfect it I would introduce an amendment calling it a bill for the personal benefit of certain Massachusetts and Pennsylvania Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. At least then, the title would fit the intent of the bill.

A SALUTE TO THE 4-H CLUBS OF AMERICA

(Mr. HARVEY of Indiana (at the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the more than 2 million young Americans who are presently members of 4-H Clubs. They are demonstrating every day their devotion to good citizenship by participating in various civic activities all across the Nation.

I am particularly proud of Miss Linda Markins, a resident of Delaware County, in my district. She was one of the six outstanding 4-H Club members in the Nation to come to Washington this week. She and the other five so chosen admirably represented their fellow 4-H'ers. They certainly represented the highest type of 4-H Club work and leadership.

It is a pleasure to salute all present and past members of 4-H for their valuable contributions to progress in our agricultural community at large.

RETRAINING OF INDIVIDUALS SUFFERING SPEECH OR HEARING IMPAIRMENT

(Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, disordered speech or impaired hearing, the most common disabilities of children in this country, may seriously handicap individuals of all ages in their efforts to profit from the educational opportunities offered by our schools, or to become self-sufficient and self-supporting members of their communities. More than 8 million Americans of all ages suffer from speech or hearing impairments. The consequences of a serious disability of communication may retard or frustrate completely a child's efforts to advance in school or may leave social or emotional scars on both the individual and his family.

Children and adults with speech and hearing impairments require the services of speech and hearing specialists who have acquired a high degree of clinical competence through study and experience. These noninstructional clinical specialists provide their services in a variety of environments including our elementary and secondary schools, hospitals and community centers. There is a desperate shortage of qualified personnel in the speech and hearing field to provide needed services. At the present time, there are only some 2,000 certified speech and hearing specialists and 5,000 noncertified specialists in this field. A minimum of 20,000 speech and hearing specialists are urgently needed to properly diagnose, train and rehabilitate these 8 million handicapped individuals.

In order to relieve this situation resulting from the critical deficit of adequately trained personnel, our universities should be graduating at least 1,500 properly trained speech and hearing specialists each year. Only 400 such specialists are currently being graduated each year.

The need for speech and hearing personnel is not peculiar to any area. Speech and hearing specialists are needed in all States. For each State

to provide the faculties and facilities needed to train these speech and hearing specialists would be a wasteful duplication.

The bill I have introduced today provides for a grants-in-aid program to assist our colleges and universities in the training of a supply of speech and hearing specialists needed to diagnose, train and rehabilitate our 8 million speech and hearing handicapped Americans.

TWENTY YEARS OF THE VOICE OF AMERICA

(Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America last month celebrated its 20th birthday. Henry Loomis, director of the Voice of America, delivered a most interesting, fact-filled speech before the National Press Club, outlining the work which the Voice of America is doing in the cold war. All those who heard and read this speech received a much clearer picture of the complicated task which this Agency is undertaking. His speech gives us a clear picture of the revolution in communications which is knitting the whole world together.

ADDRESS BY HENRY LOOMIS, DIRECTOR, VOICE OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1962

The Voice of America will be 20 years old next week.

For 20 years, the Voice, representing the U.S. Government and the American people, has talked directly to the people of the world—often over the objections of their governments. The Voice of America is the only mechanism available to the U.S. Government capable of such direct, universal, personal, and immediate communication.

Even though the Voice is 20 years old, it is little known and less understood by the American public—especially the fundamental and controversial issues involved.

Let's examine some of these issues as they affect the problems of what we should say on our direct shortwave programs.

What results can be expected from broadcasting—or any informational activity? Some seem to believe that when things are not going well all that is needed is more money and better people working on propaganda. This belief has the advantage of not requiring the development of new policy or the taking of direct action.

Others seem to believe that all propaganda is ineffectual, a waste of money, and should be dispensed with.

I believe the truth lies in between. Propaganda cannot supersede the facts of life. However, good propaganda can increase the impact and effect of favorable events and decrease the impact of unfavorable events. The mechanical act of broadcasting, in itself, will not affect people's actions. However, the facts described in the broadcasts and the interpretation and analysis of those facts can and do have an impact—if they are believed. The first requirement of any radio is to earn the audiences' trust—to be credible.

In my judgment, radio is primarily a strategic or long range tool. If you have a faithful and believing audience, you can provide them with much information and much food for thought on which they will rely, when, in a crisis, they must decide their course of action quickly and instinctively.