

Mr. NELSEN. Would you yield further. You recall the bind we got into in previous sessions where the Appropriations Committee delayed action on approving the D.C. budget because they have to report a balanced budget. This always came about because they awaited prior approval of revenue authorization. Wouldn't it then be necessary for us to proceed to consider revenue proposals at an early date so we do not run into a similar bind again?

Mr. BROYHILL. I think I would have to agree with what the gentleman says.

Mr. NELSEN. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. BROYHILL. I did not mean to take this long, Mr. Chairman, but I did want to point out that there are very few basic differences in the four bills that I introduced.

The first bill, H.R. 14051, was the original proposal that was recommended by the Board of Education with the support of the District Government. Then subsequent to that, taking into consideration that a three-step pay increase had been granted the other employees of the District of Columbia Government, it was felt that it was fair to introduce a bill providing a two-step increase for school teachers. That brought about the second bill, H.R. 14526, which provided for the first step in the bill recommended by the Board of Education, and a second step, an increase of starting salaries to \$7,000. This particular proposal is practically identical to the bill which has been approved by a Senate Subcommittee as an amendment to our police and firemen's pay bill. The only difference is that in their bill the first phase is retroactive to October 1 and the second stage effective next July 1. My bill was intended to be just exactly that way, but it there was a drafting error.

The third bill is practically identical to my second bill, except that in the second step, which is to become effective next July, I felt that we should do a little bit more in the area of the more experienced teachers. We know we have a problem of recruitment, and that we must do something to make it a little less difficult to get young people to come into the District of Columbia school teaching system, but we also need to be equally concerned with those who have more experience and have obtained additional training and education, and the District of Columbia Education Association advised me that we should have a little greater increase in salaries for the more experienced teachers.

I introduced my fourth bill after we had made a more substantial pay increase for the policemen and firemen. I felt for this reason that this second step proposed in my original bills should become retroactive to October 1, 1967, and that is what H.R. 16747, the bill that I hope the Committee will approve, provides.

This bill is quite similar to the one sponsored by Mr. Fraser, the gentleman from Minnesota, except that it does have little higher increases for those teachers with additional experience and training.

If the Committee and the Chairman will look very quickly at the chart showing a comparison of teachers' salaries in the District and in the suburbs—Mr. Hilder prepared this at my request, I believe, so that we could compare these salary schedules—you will see that the minimum salaries, and the salaries at the top annual increment are all there, as well as the maximum salaries attainable at the top of the longevity steps. On separate sheets are the seals for the Bachelor's Degree, the Master's Degree, the Master's Degree plus 30 hours, and