

will not be working.¹⁶ This might still not be enough, however, to assure continued job security for employees if the total amount of construction to be done were not guaranteed to be such as to employ the full work force. A situation in which some workers had three-year contracts at lucrative salaries while others were out of jobs would hardly be attractive. Further, there would need to be assurance that the high level of employment would be maintained into the future.

Federal Support

These conditions are obviously beyond the reach of a private contractor to guarantee on his own. No contractor now has sufficient financial resources or assurance of future construction work to undertake such guarantees. Such guarantees could, however, be made possible if an intensive long-term program to rebuild our central cities and make them truly attractive places to live were undertaken by the federal government in a systematic manner with private participation in a partnership seeking to bring both public and private resources to bear. How this

could be done on a sufficient scale and what the benefits and prerequisites would be must now be considered.

Under the Constitution, the Congress has the power to appropriate funds for more than one year. The only restriction on the time appropriations may run relates to funds for armies.¹⁷ Indeed, in the Demonstration Cities Act, Congress has in fact committed itself to the principle that funds for rebuilding urban areas are to remain available until expended.¹⁸ The legal architecture thus exists for a long-term program upon which employment contracts for individual employees for more than one year could be based. Based upon long-term appropriations and programs, longer-term contracts could be made with contractors who, in turn, would be required to offer such contracts to employees.

In order to be effective in providing the necessary job security, the program would have to be large enough to assure—together with other clearly foreseeable construction—employment of the entire industry. This would require deletion of present limitations on amounts to be appropri-

¹⁶ See Franklin D. Roosevelt, State of the Union Message, January 3, 1938: "For economic and social reasons our . . . interest . . . lies . . . in regularizing the work of the individual worker more greatly through the year—in other words, in thinking more in terms of the worker's pay for a period of a whole year rather than in terms of his remuneration by the hour or by the day." 3 *State of the Union Messages of the Presidents* 2840-2841, Chelsea House 1966. See discussion by A. H. Raskin in "Pay by the Hour? The Week? The Year? For Life?" *New York Times Magazine*, September 4, 1966, p. 6. For a discussion of early work in this field see Jack Chernick, *Economic Effects of Steady Employment and Earnings: A Case Study of the Annual Wage System of George A. Hormel & Co.*, University of Minnesota 1942; Chernick & Hellickson, *Guaranteed Annual Wages*, Univ. of Minn.

paperback 1945; cf. Jones, "Guaranteed Pay Proposed by United States," *New York Times*, June 27, 1966, p. 35, col. 1. Concerning seasonality in the construction industry, see the joint Determination of Secretary Wirtz and New Jersey Commissioner of Labor and Industry Male, July 13, 1966.

¹⁷ "The Congress shall have power . . . to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years." U. S. Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 8, col. 12. Compare 61 Stat. 105 (1947); 61 Stat. 134 (1947) (advance funding of emergency foreign aid prior to actual appropriations by authorization for borrowing from governmental institutions).

¹⁸ Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, Secs. 108, 206(b), 111(c), 80 Stat. 1259, 1260, 1264 (1966).