

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

13509

PHILIP L. GRAHAM

Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post Co., would have excelled in whatever field commanded his energy and ability. He chose journalism, and leaves as his legacy an independent newspaper with an international reputation, an impressive range of achievements in public service and a host of memories of a gallant figure. It is a legacy that will endure.

To his associates on this newspaper, Mr. Graham was as much a friend as an employer. There was no detail of journalism he regarded as too trifling to engage his sympathetic attention and no person beyond reach of his concern. His rangy figure and quicksilver wit were as familiar a part of our enterprise as the fonts of type in our composing room. In all that he dealt with at the Washington Post and its related ventures, he was broadly liberal, eminently practical and endowed with an intuitive grasp of coming needs.

Trained as a lawyer, Mr. Graham served as law secretary to both Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Reed; he never lost his concern with law and justice—or a capacity for generous anger when either was ignored. After rising from private to major in the Army Air Force, he returned to the Capital after the war and gave his full energies to the Washington Post. The record speaks for itself.

In 1946, Mr. Graham became publisher of a newspaper then ranked third in circulation in Washington and that incurred draining deficits. In collaboration with Eugene Meyer, Mr. Graham gave a secure foundation to the Post. A new plant was built, the Times-Herald purchased, and a television and radio division, including WTOP in Washington and WJXT in Jacksonville, was formed. The partnership of Mr. Meyer and Mr. Graham transcended normal business relations and family ties; there was a fraternal affinity between two persons of complementary character whose closeness assured executive continuity when, in 1959, Mr. Meyer died.

Growth continued in recent years as the Post expanded its facilities, acquired Newsweek and Art News, and established a news service in partnership with the Los Angeles Times. The range of Mr. Graham's interest and acquaintanceship was extraordinary, and though his contribution of signed articles was infrequent, his suggestions were not. They gave depth and authority to much that appeared under the name of others. If the Post today is both prosperous and influential, a full measure of credit is owed to Philip L. Graham.

His country and city commanded much of his time. Through his father, who was an influential State senator in Florida, Mr. Graham early in life acquired an insight into the skills of politics. He could combine moral courage, wit, and tact in dealing with others, and his ability profited a bewildering diversity of causes—everything from the Advertising Council, the United Givers Fund, the Federal City Council, the Committee for Economic Development, and George Washington University to the Communications Satellite Corp.

Mr. Graham invested the full capacity of his mind and heart in anything that deeply moved and interested him. He was not a person given to qualified commitments to his country, his enterprise, or his friends. It was this quality that precipitated the illness that led to his death.

Our sense of loss is total; he was a man neither easily forgotten nor found again.

OPERATION SWIFT STRIKE

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a 2-day inspection trip of Operation Swift Strike III down in the Carolinas. When I returned home last night I was surprised and shocked to see a story in the Washington Post attributed to the Associated Press that gives what I consider to be a mistaken impression of this combined military training operation involving 100,000 men.

Mr. Speaker, I want to report to the Members of this House, as a trained observer of military operations, I think Operation Swift Strike III is not only excellently planned but has been superbly executed. Our soldiers, officers, and men participating in this realistic operation show that they are well trained, well directed, and are doing their jobs enthusiastically.

I want to remind those who would dwell upon a few accidents such as a fallen bulldozer and a couple of jeeps that came to the ground without the benefit of parachutes, that a great majority of the equipment air-dropped into this operation landed intact within the drop zones and that the fighting capabilities of our soldiers were not impaired by the small amount of accidents that occurred. It is my belief that the injury rates of the parachutists were extremely low in this very realistic military operation. I believe we have every reason to be proud of our Armed Forces as they have been displayed in this training operation in the Carolinas.

Americans should be assured that their top military and civilian leaders have been diligently examining the state of training and readiness of our Armed Forces during this arduous test. I observed Gen. Paul Adams, Commander in Chief, U.S. Strike Command, Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, and key members of their staffs, actively inspecting, examining and evaluating our personnel and equipment under realistic battlefield conditions. Our able Secretary of the Army Cyrus Vance, and key civilian personnel of the Department of the Army, were in the area vigorously carrying out their duties and responsibilities.

I feel that I should report to Congress that our Forces are ably led, adequately equipped, and sufficiently trained to give a fine accounting for themselves should the need arise. I hope that Americans, as well as our enemy, will not be misled by inadequate newspaper reporting.

PHILIP GRAHAM, 1915-63, SHAPER OF OUR NATIONAL CHARACTER

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I was stunned by the unexpected death of a close personal friend, Philip L. Graham, last weekend. His passing is not only a deep loss to all of us who loved him but also a temporary setback for the defense of a free society.

Phil was one of those few people who cared deeply about ideas and handled them with both skill and pleasure. He

once said, "I am insatiably curious about the state of our world," and this attitude seemed to motivate him toward the field of communications. Phil felt deeply, I think, that democracy can fall when a government fails to explain itself thoroughly and candidly to its citizens and that success rests upon the newspapers to interpret what the government is saying. As an influential shaper of our national character, Phil attempted continually to determine the quality of life in the society he served. He regarded his readers as free persons who need to be informed, not as objects of propaganda. We shall all miss this man; a man neither easily forgotten nor found again.

Those who knew Phil Graham will find that the August 12 issue of Newsweek captured some of his greatness in an article which I ask leave to extend below:

PHILIP L. GRAHAM, 1915-63

A few short months ago, Philip Leslie Graham, the controlling voice and informing spirit of this magazine, spoke about himself to a group of Newsweek editors and correspondents. "I came to journalism quite by chance," he said, "from another ancient and honorable calling—that of the law." It is said—in explanation of the inner torment of that minority of very good lawyers—that the law is a jealous mistress.

"No doubt that is a true statement of what stretches good men who engage in any precariously intellectual vocation. When I think of a few serious journalists I have known, I know that the jealous demands of excellence in our calling have borne down on them heavily and deeply while also elevating and enlarging them."

"I am insatiably curious about the state of our world. I revel in the recitation of the daily and weekly grist of journalism. Much of it, of course, is pure chaff. But no one yet has been able to produce wheat without chaff. And not even such garrulous romantics as Fidel Castro or such transcendent spirits as Abraham Lincoln can produce a history which does not rest on a foundation of tedium and detail—and even sheer drudgery."

"So let us drudge on about our inescapably impossible task of providing every week a first rough draft of a history that will never be completed about a world we can never understand."

To the many who will hold his memory dear, this is pure "Phil." When he spoke, he had a wit which could dissolve pomposity and lighten tedium; a high seriousness which could endow the most trivial problem with dignity; a certitude that stemmed from an instinct for the highest standards; a sympathy which extended to the great and to the weak alike. He was always electric, with a kind of complex, stormy humanity that somehow led him, last Saturday afternoon, to take his life at his farm in Virginia, just a short drive from Washington, D.C., where his career in law and letters began.

Washington was Mr. Graham's city. It was there, in 1940, that he married Katharine Meyer, daughter of the late Eugene Meyer, who then owned the Washington Post. It was there they raised their four children. In the 23 years he lived in Washington, he saw it change from a national capital, which was just one among many to the prime center of political, economic, and military might in the world. When he visited Newsweek's weekly editorial meetings in New York, he always conveyed a sense of high excitement about the power and responsibility that he lived with.

Mr. Graham came to Washington by way of Terry, S. Dak., where he was born; Florida where he grew up and went to high school and college; and Cambridge, Mass., where he attended Harvard Law School and became president of the Law Review. This distinc-

tion led him to serve as law secretary to both Justice Stanley Reed and Justice Felix Frankfurter. In 1946, Mr. Graham became publisher of the Washington Post. Behind him were 4 years in the Army and a Legion of Merit for his service in the Pacific.

Working with Mr. Meyer, Mr. Graham built the Post into one of the most prosperous and influential newspapers in the country. Though he had no journalistic experience before, he had a natural and extraordinary feel for news, as well as a business sense which led him to a widening series of ambitious and successful ventures. A new plant for the Post was built in 1951, the Times-Herald was purchased, a radio and television division was established, and in 1961 Newsweek was added to the organization. More recently, Mr. Graham acquired Art News and Portfolio and launched a news service with the Los Angeles Times.

But these activities consumed only a part of Mr. Graham's restless energies. Over the years he gave himself to a great variety of private and public causes. In an unofficial way he plunged deeply into the political and diplomatic life of the Nation. To list his friends in Government—not to speak of business, the professions, and the arts—would be to sound a rollcall of almost all who are distinguished in American life. Informed of his death as he cruised on the *Honey Fitz*, President Kennedy made the statement: "The death of Philip Graham is a serious loss to all who knew and admired his integrity and ability. It is a personal loss to me and all of his friends. He was a distinguished publisher, a man whose quiet and effective leadership contributed so much to this community and his Nation. He will be greatly missed by all of us."

Philip Graham will be missed by all, but there is a special poignance of the grief of those who knew him long and intimately. As the Washington Post, which was so much a part of his life, said: "Mr. Graham invested the full capacity of his mind and heart in anything that deeply moved and interested him. He was not a person given to qualified commitments to his country, his enterprise, or his friends. Our sense of loss is total; he was a man neither easily forgotten nor found again."

REQUIREMENT FOR CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES AFTER 30 YEARS WITHOUT REDUCTION IN ANNUITY

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement that I submitted to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of the proposal to allow civil service employees to retire after 30 years without a reduction in annuity and without regard to age:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE ON CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AFTER 30 YEARS' SERVICE, JULY 31, 1963

"Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation for this opportunity to speak in support of the legislation before you to allow civil service retirement on a full annuity after 30 years of service."

For a number of years I have introduced legislation to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to allow employees to retire at any age after 30 years service without reduction of benefits. This year I introduced H.R. 718 and H.R. 719 to this effect which are presently before this committee.

Although the bills I introduced carry no minimum age and would allow Federal employees with 30 years of service to retire at any age, I would also like to express my support for other bills before this committee to allow full annuities to 80-year employees at age 55. I would prefer to see one of my own bills enacted but I realize that they face stronger opposition from the Civil Service Commission than the age 55 bills. Since the latter bills obviously have much better prospects for approval, I am most happy to lend them my full and complete support.

These bills carry on a gradually evolved process of liberalizing the Civil Service Retirement Act to make it a more effective instrument in attracting and holding capable workers in the Federal service. When the Retirement Act was first enacted in 1920 it carried no provision for early retirement. The law was amended in 1930 to allow for optional retirement 2 years before the required age. It was later amended in 1942 to provide a reduced annuity at age 55 with an actuarial reduction of approximately 6.5 percent of the annuity for each year the employee was under 60 years of age. This actuarial reduction was itself reduced to 3 percent a year in 1948 and again to the present 1 percent a year in 1956.

The present bills, then, would carry out this process of liberalizing the law by eliminating the reduction in the annuity altogether, and bills of the type which I have introduced would in addition do away with the age 55 requirement to allow a full annuity after 30 years of service.

I do not think that this is such a tremendous change in the law. Its actuarial cost is only sixteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of payroll. Most employees who remain in service for 30 years would not exercise the option. It offers to retire early, just as most do not exercise the present option. Only about 8 percent of those eligible to retire before age 60 with 30 years' service are doing so. The change made by these proposals—eliminating the 1 percent a year reduction—would not be enough of an inducement to increase this rate substantially.

At the same time, the proposals would improve the retirement system considerably for those who have good reasons to retire before age 55. The majority of those who retire after 30 years' service before age 60 do so for reasons of ill health or inability to keep pace with their duties. It is an unfair penalty to reduce the retirement benefits of these workers as the present law requires.

Moreover, I feel that the cost argument against these bills has been overemphasized. It is true that the cost to the retirement system will be increased slightly. But it is also true that the Government will benefit from many of these early retirements in a number of ways. They will allow the Government to replace older, in some cases partially disabled, workers with younger more vigorous workers. These younger workers will in almost all cases be paid less than their predecessors for performing the same duties. And even in the case of those older workers who retire to take another job, the Government is going to realize some return of its funds in the form of income tax that they will pay on their combined salaries and retirement benefits.

I believe that these amendments for full annuities after 30 years of service—with or without the age 55 requirement—would improve the Civil Service Retirement Act considerably at very little cost. They would improve the situation of those choosing to retire before age 60 and they would benefit the Government, first, by making it possible to replace workers who are partially disabled or who have slowed down in their work, and secondly, by liberalizing the retirement system so that it would become a more effective instrument for recruiting capable people into the Federal service.

CRISIS FOR COTTON

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I explained briefly the crisis facing our entire cotton industry and why if we fail to enact the Cooley bill, H.R. 6196, the virtual destruction of the industry will jeopardize many other parts of our agriculture and industry. I presented telegrams in strong support of the Cooley bill from the director of the California Department of Agriculture and from the general manager of the firm marketing one-third of the cotton grown in California. Labor and consumers have an equal stake in stabilizing the cotton industry.

That organized labor recognizes this is shown by the following telegram I have just received from Mr. William R. O'Rear, secretary of the Central Labor Council of Fresno and Madera Counties, Calif.

FRESNO, CALIF.
Hon. W. R. SISK:
Central Labor Council of Fresno and Madera Counties AFL-CIO went on record August 2 urging you to support H.R. 6196, the Cooley cotton bill. The cotton industry under present legislation would reduce acreage which will cause additional unemployment. The Cooley bill provides price protection for small growers but simultaneously larger growers would take a price cut under increased acreage. The cut plus the equalization fee provided in the bill would cause fair competition and increase consumption. The council believes that all of California would benefit by passage of H.R. 6196.

W. R. O'REAR,
Secretary, Central Labor Council of Fresno and Madera Counties

OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1963

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced my bill to be known as the Older Americans Act of 1963. Its stated purpose is:

To provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the Administration of Aging.

With the introduction of this bill, I must express my deep concern that action has been so long delayed in an area so vital to the social and economic status of the Nation's 18 million persons over age 65. It is my honest conviction that few issues have come before the Congress that have such a great potential, not only for the individuals affected by the legislation but also for the Nation that can only benefit from the untapped manpower reserve that is represented among the ranks of our older citizens.

The Older Americans Act has six major titles, each of which is designed to implement the findings of almost

ILLEGIB