Chiefs only. As a matter of principle which I discussed earlier in my comments regarding the 30-year advancement provision for all officers and members and in the interest of sound pay administration, this provision should be deleted from the present legislation.

REVISION OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD REQUIREMENT

It is proposed to amend the existing law relating to the probationary year of police privates. A recent District Court decision interpreted existing law as requiring that a police private must be retained for the full probationary year unless formal charges are brought against him before a police trial board. This procedure is inconsistent with the applicable to probationary firemen and all other District employees who are subject to dismissal for unsatisfactory performance at any time during the probationary year. The requirement that a probationary policeman with unsatisfactory service be retained for the full probationary year reflects unfavorably on the efficiency and economy of the Police Department and is not in the best interest of the District Government in terms of public safety. A provision is therefore included in the proposed substitute bill to bring dismissal proceedings for probationary policemen in line with those of all other District employees.

Estimated Cost of Legislation

COST AND FUNDING

The estimated cost for the proposed pay raise is $3.3 million excluding vacancies, on a full year basis. However, I propose that the proposed pay increase be effective retroactively to the first day of the pay period which began on December 31, 1967—and I might point out that this varies from the earlier urging which I now reinstate that this retroactive feature be made to become effective on October 1.

The problem that I have here is that the appropriated funds that are already allocated for this increase provide for a December 31 date. I am urging upon this Committee consideration of the October 1, 1967, date to conform it with that of the Classified Pay Bill.

Therefore, the additional cost of the balance of Fiscal Year 1968 will be approximately $1.6 million. The funds required for Fiscal Year 1968 to finance these pay raises have been reserved in the appropriation action for Fiscal Year 1968. The fiscal year 1969 Budget makes provision for these proposed pay increases.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have with me technicians that can deal with any question that you might wish to ask, and I would be glad to make myself available at this time for any comments. I appreciate your patience in hearing us out.

Mr. Whitener. Thank you very much, Commissioner Washington. Mr. McMillan.

Mr. McMillan. Commissioner, I want to congratulate you on your forthright and concise statement. You can rest assured that your suggestions will be given every consideration by this committee.

Mr. Washington. Thank you.

Mr. McMillan. I would like to ask a question. You suggest that this legislation be made effective December 31st, 1967.