DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL NOMINATIONS AND COMPENSATION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

NOMINATIONS OF: ROCKWOOD H. FOSTER, JERRY A. MOORE, JR., AND MARJORIE H. PARKER

AND

S. 3593

TO INCREASE THE COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

SEPTEMBER 25, 1972

Printed for the use of the
Committee on the District of Columbia

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
84-731 O WASHINGTON : 1972

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri, *Chairman*

DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, Illinois
JOHN V. TUNNEY, California

CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., Maryland
JAMES L. BUCKLEY, New York
_____, _____, _____

ROBERT HARRIS, *Staff Director and Counsel*
GENE E. GODLEY, *General Counsel*
SIDNEY H. HURLBURT, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL NOMINATIONS AND COMPENSATION

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1972

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C.

The U.S. Senate Committee on the District of Columbia met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 6226, New Senate Office Building, Senator Thomas F. Eagleton (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senator Eagleton.

Also present: Robert Harris, staff director; Gene E. Godley, general counsel; Robert B. Washington, Jr., counsel; and Sidney H. Hurlburt, minority staff director.

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

This morning we are holding hearings on nominations to the District of Columbia Council, and on S. 3593, to increase the compensation of members of that Council.

I understand that the Chairman of the City Council, Mr. Jack Nevius, will have to be in court, I am taking the liberty of calling him first so that he may introduce all of the nominees.

Good morning, Mr. Nevius.

STATEMENT OF JOHN A. NEVIUS, CHAIRMAN, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL; ACCOMPANIED BY NOMINEES: REV. JERRY A. MOORE, JR.; DR. MARJORIE H. PARKER; AND ROCKWOOD H. FOSTER

Mr. NEVIUS. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear here.

I am highly gratified at the President's nominations for new Council members. All three nominees are long-time personal friends, with whom, in one capacity or another as volunteers, I have worked for many years in common efforts to improve the lot of our home town and its citizens. I am very enthusiastic on their joining the Council, and I recommend then wholeheartedly to the Senate for favorable consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you please introduce the nominees for the committee?

Mr. NEVIUS. The first is Dr. Marjorie H. Parker; the second is Rev. Jerry A. Moore, Jr.; and the third is Mr. Rockwood H. Foster.

I would be glad to answer any questions you may have, and then the nominees, of course, are prepared to speak and to answer any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. We have, I take it, biographical sketches and financial statements on all of the nominees.

Mr. NEVIUS. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The biographical sketches will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The biographical sketches follow:)

BIOGRAPHY

ROCKWOOD HOAR FOSTER

Born May 7, 1923, Boston, Massachusetts

Married June 19, 1948
Marguerite Peet Foster of Kansas City, Missouri

Children

Name	Date of Birth
Reginald Candler Foster	March 30, 1950
Herbert Peet Foster	December 18, 1951
Adam Rockwood Foster	January 20, 1954
Charles Orin Foster	August 12, 1956

Religion Protestant - Episcopal--St. John's Church, Lafayette Square, Washington, D. C.

Education

Brooks School	North Andover, Massachusetts	1941
Harvard College	(International Gov.) AB	1945
National Institute Public Affairs	(Internship)	1948-49
Foreign Service Institute	(Mid Career Course)	1958
Control Data Institute	Programmer Technician	1967

Military Service

United States Navy World War II	1943-46

Employment

Consultant	Rockwood H. Foster Suite 102 1050 31st Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20007	1968 to Present
Not-for-Profit Corporation	Research Executive International and Social Studies Division Institute for Defense Analyses 400 Army-Navy Drive Arlington, Virginia	1967-68
Private Business		
	Executive Vice President Foster & Foster, Inc. (Investment Bankers)	1963-67
	Director New England Lumber Company	1964 to Present
	Director Aztech Corporation	1970 to Present

Department of State

Officer in Charge West Indian Affairs Bureau of European Affairs	1960-1963
Executive Assistant to Ambassador American Embassy London	1958-1960
2nd Secretary and Consul (Political Officer - Far East) American Embassy London	1956-1958
Officer in Charge Thai, Malayan, Seato Affairs Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs	1955-1956
Assistant Officer in Charge Malayan Affairs Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs	1954-1955
Assistant Officer in Charge Burmese Affairs Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs	1951-1954
Staff Assistant, Director Southeast Asian Affairs Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs	1949-1951
Internship, National Institute Public Affairs Division, Organization & Budget	1948-1949

84-731 O - 72 - 2

Political

Assistant Sergeant at Arms for the District of Columbia Republicans	1964
Treasurer, Committee for Forward Looking Republicans	1964-1967
Georgetown Republican Club	Member 1965-1967 Chairman, Precinct NW-6 9-22-65 to 10-27-67
Member, Finance Committee, District of Columbia Republicans	1964
Member, Commission on the City, District of Columbia Republican Committee	October 24, 1969 to 1971
Campaign Chairman Nevius for D.C. Delegate	1970-1971
Board of Elections, District of Columbia	1971 - present

Professional and
Community Activities

Washington Cathedral Fund Drive	General Chairman 1966 & 1967
St. John's Church Lafayette Square	Vestryman 1967-1969
St. John's Child Development Center	Trustee 1966-1971 President 1971
Health & Welfare Council	Committee on Membership & Budget 1963-1971
Foreign Policy Association	Member National Council 1967-1971
Washington Society of Investment Analysts	Member 1964-present
73rd Annual Diocesan Convention	Lay Delegate 1968
Downtown Convocation of Episcopal Diocese	1968
Citizens Association of Georgetown	Member 1960-present

Professional and
Community Activities
(continued)

Washington Society for the Performing Arts	Director 1968-1971 Co-chairman Annual Dinner - 1969
International Student House	Director 1968 - present
English-Speaking Union	Board of Directors 1969 - present
Washington Home Rule Committee	Board of Directors 4-22-65 to present
Travelers Aid Society	Board of Directors 1971 - present
House of Mercy	Director and Vice President 1972-present

BIOGRAPHY

JERRY A. MOORE, JR.
1612 Buchanan Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20011

Parents: Reverend and Mrs. Jerry A. Moore, Sr.
Date of Birth: June 12, 1918
Place of Birth: Minden, Louisiana

EDUCATION:

Elementary and High Schools, Webster Parish, Minden, La.
Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., B. A.
Howard University, B. D. and M. A.
American University, Professional Certificate in Management
University of Southern California, Post Graduate Study
Wesley Seminary, Post Graduate Study
The American University, Post Graduate Study

EMPLOYMENT RECORD:

Program Director - Assistant Manager USO, New Orleans, La., 1943
Boys' Work Secretary, Drydas Branch YMCA, New Orleans, 1944
Personnel Relations Officer, Port of Embarkation, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1944
Assistant to Pastor, Nineteenth Street Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., 1944-45
Pastor, Nineteenth Street Baptist Church, 1946-
Baptist Chaplain, Howard University, 1958 - 1972
Instructor, Washington Baptist Seminary, 1964
Councilman, District of Columbia, 1968 - 1972

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATIONS:

Board of Directors, Washington Bible Society
Baptist Ministers' Conference for D. C. and Vicinity
Vice President, Baptist Convention for D. C. and Vicinity
Executive Committee, Baptist World Alliance
National Conference of Christians and Jews
Council of Churches of Greater Washington
National Council of Churches of Christ, USA
Trustee, International Society of Christian Endeavor
National Baptist Convention, USA, Inc.
Interchurch Club
District Baptist Convention

BIOGRAPHY - Jerry A. Moore, Jr.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS:

Board of Directors, Educational Resource Foundation
Board of Directors, Stoddard Baptist Home
Board of Directors, Northwest Settlement House
Board of Directors, Uplift House
Board of Directors, Area K Commissioners' Youth Council
Board of Directors, Opportunities Industrialization Center
D. C. Citizens for Better Public Education
Rock Creek Park Neighborhood League
Washington Urban League
Twelfth Street Branch, YMCA
Washington Chapter, NAACP
Mayor's Committee on the Handicapped
Chairman, Transportation Planning Board, Council of Governments
Board of Directors (First Vice Chairman), Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
Board of Directors, Chairman, Nineteenth Street Baptist Church Housing, Inc.
Board of Directors, St. Paul Baptist Church Housing, Inc.
Board of Directors Vice Chairman, Jet Foods, Inc.
Past President, School of Religion Alumni, Howard University
Past President, Morehouse College Alumni, Washington Chapter
Member, Advisory Committee, Nursing Education Program, Federal City College
Member, Advisory Committee of the Friends of the D. C. Youth Orchestra Program
Board of Directors, Gestalt Environmental Products, Inc.
Drug Abuse Committee, Health and Welfare Council
Chairman, Transportation Committee, District of Columbia Council

POLITICAL AFFILIATION:

Republican Party
D. C. Republican State Committee
a. Former member, Executive Committee
b. Presidential Elector 1969
c. Alternate Delegate to Republican National Convention 1969

FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS:

Phi Beta Sigma
Scottish Rite Masons, 32°
United Benevolent Order of Elks of the World
Rotary Club
Pigskin Club

FAMILY:

Wife - Ettyce H., Assistant Superintendent in charge of Academic Achievement, D. C. Public School System

Sons - Jerry A. (III), Lt. U. S. Navy, Law Student, Georgetown Law School

Juran D., Junior, Ohio University

BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

Marjorie Holloman Parker, (Mrs. Barrington D. Parker)
3115 Fessenden Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C., 20008 - (202) 244-1858

EDUCATION

Public Schools, Washington, D. C.

B.S., Magna Cum Laude, Miner Teachers College, Washington, D. C.

A.M. and Ph.D., The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois (majoring in the History and Philosophy of Education)

Additional Study - The American University and George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

PRESENT EMPLOYMENT

Professor of History and Philosophy of Education and Chairman of the Department of Education and Psychology, District of Columbia Teachers College, Washington, D. C., 1965 -

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Bowie State College, Bowie, Maryland, Director of Student Teaching, 1959 to 1965

Miner (Later District of Columbia) Teachers College, Washington, D. C., Associate Professor of Education, 1949 to 1959

Public Schools, Washington, D. C., Elementary Teacher, 1936 to 1949

OTHER PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Howard University, Washington, D. C., Visiting Lecturer, Department of Education, 1957 to 1962

Dumbarton College of the Holy Cross, Washington, D. C., Visiting Lecturer, Department of Education, 1964

Washington, D. C., Head Start Program, Director of Staff Training, Summer 1969, 1968, 1967

Project Head Start, Bowie State College, Director, Summer 1966, 1965, 1964

North Carolina College, Durham, North Carolina, Visiting Professor, Department of Education, Summer 1962

Phelps-Stokes Fund Project for the Improvement of Secondary Education - Evaluation Workshops Staff, Summer 1958

Albany State College, Albany, Georgia, Reading Consultant Workshop Staff, Summer 1953

Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Visiting Professor, Departement of Edcuation, Summer 1952

CIVIC AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES (Washington, D.C.)

Member, Second Baptist Church

Former member, Board of Directors, Phyllis Wheatley Branch, Y. W. C. A.

Vice President, Board of Managers, Hospital for Sick Children (formerly Children's Convalescent Home)

Board of Trustees, National Ballet Society

Board of Trustees of Stoddard Baptist Home; founder and first President of Women's Auxilliary to the Stoddard Baptist Home.

CIVIC AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES (Washington, D.C.) Continued

Former member, Executive Committee of D. C. Citizens for Better Public Education; Chairman of DCCBPE Committee on Teacher Education; member Committee for Passow Study Implementation; DCCBPE Speakers Bureau.

Member Barristers' Wives, Inc. and Lawyer's Wives of D.C.

Former member, Board of Directors Homemaker Service of the National Capital Area, Inc.

Former member, Board of Directors, Camp Fire Girls, Potomac Area Council

Former member, Women's Committee, Eastern Branch Boys' Club

Former member and President, Baker's Dozen, Inc. (Teen Age Center)

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Alternate Republican National Committee Woman for the District of Columbia, 1968 - ; Member Executive Committee, Republican Committee for the D. C.

Member Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority since 1937, and General President from 1958 to 1963.

Member Pi Lambda Theta, honor society for women in Education.

Member Board of Directors and formerly National Parliamentarian of the National Council of Negro Women, Inc.

PUBLICATIONS

Alpha Kappa Alpha 1900-1958; Chicago: Bankers Press, 1959.

Alpha Kappa Alpha: Sixty Years of Service; Chicago: Bankers Press, 1962

PERSONAL

Residence . . . . . Washington, D. C., 1917 to date.

Married . . . . . Barrington D. Parker, Judge, U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia; two sons, Jason, Foreign Service Officer, U. S. Department of State; Barrington, Jr., Attorney at Law, New York City

Social Security Number - [redacted].

Washington, D. C.
May, 1972

84-731 O - 72 - 3

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask each of the nominees what his particular position is with respect to home rule—starting with Reverend Moore and going down the table.

Reverend MOORE. Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the District of Columbia should have home rule, and that includes the ability of the people to elect its own representatives, as well as to have fiscal autonomy over the financial affairs of the District of Columbia.

Without a strong home rule, I do not feel that the District of Columbia government can operate adequately on behalf of the District residents.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Dr. Parker.

Dr. PARKER. I, too, would like to add my endorsement to the various advocates of home rule for the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been a member and director of the Home Rule Committee for many years, and I am on the Board of Elections now. I am totally in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the support of each of you, for the concept of home rule, include the power to raise taxes locally?

Reverend MOORE. Yes; I feel fiscal autonomy deals with the ability to raise taxes, as well as to work conjunctively with the United States Congress for the Federal share to the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Parker.

Dr. PARKER. At the risk of being repetitive, I would say yes, I would echo what Reverend Moore said.

I believe along with self-government, and self-determination, there are definite responsibilities that individual citizens and groups of citizens must bear. I think participation in the process of budgetmaking and revenue determination is basic to a genuine exercise of home rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I do, sir. I think both responsibility and authority go hand in hand.

The CHAIRMAN. Reverend Moore, you have served on the District of Columbia Council for how many years?

Reverend MOORE. Three years.

The CHAIRMAN. You have an excellent background of diversified experience, which I am sure commended you originally to serve on the Council.

I see no reason why that same experience should not qualify you to serve a second time.

Reverend MOORE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. And your politics is Republican?

Reverend MOORE. Yes, sir; it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Parker, do you have an identifiable political affiliation?

Dr. PARKER. I, too, am a Republican.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Are you a Republican likewise, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. If all nominees are confirmed, Mr. Nevius, what will that make the political alinement on the District of Columbia Council?

Mr. NEVIUS. It will be the legal maximum. It will be six Republicans and three Democrats.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any of you have any outside activities, business interests, and so forth, which in any way might compromise your service to the Council?

Reverend MOORE. I have none, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a full-time member of the ministry?

Reverend MOORE. I am a full-time minister of the 19th Street Baptist Church.

The CHAIRMAN. How about you, Dr. Parker?

Dr. PARKER. I am an attending professor at the District of Columbia Teacher's College, and for the past year I have been chairman of the Division of Education and Psychology.

I think that the Senate District Committee, of course, is very well acquainted with the District of Columbia Teacher's College. Hoping not to be premature, but in anticipation of such a possibility as this, I have with regard to service on the Council, arranged to be a part-time employee at the District of Columbia Teacher's College to continue in that service.

At our college, we do not have designated budgetary positions of division chairmen, but this is a position of delegated responsibility. In a small college, the chairman has certain ongoing obligations, which I felt that I had a reason to continue to discharge. But there is no conflict as far as areas of service to the District of Columbia, and the chairmanship responsibilities are those that I can discharge with complete freedom of choice of time and this I expect to do.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it you will retain your position as chairman of the Department, but you will not undertake a teaching load.

Dr. PARKER. There will be no teaching assignments at all; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. Mr. Nevius, approximately how much time does one typically devote to activity on the District of Columbia Council based on your experience.

Mr. NEVIUS. It differs. Not speaking of the chairman, which is strictly full time, it differs between individual councilmen, depending on his or her availability.

Few councilmen have worked the equivalent of full time, although some have.

Some have probably devoted less than half time, but it averages out to at least 20 hours a week, plus ceremonials, the lunch hour in the evenings.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, what are your outside activities, and how would they affect your participation as a member of the City Council.

Mr. FOSTER. Essentially, I do two things right now. I do investment work, and I serve on the District of Columbia Board of Elections.

This being an election year, a great deal more time has been spent on election matters than on investment matters.

I would, of course, resign from the Board of Elections should I be confirmed, and I plan to spend at least as much time if not much more on Council matters than I have on the Board of Elections.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, gentlemen.

Thank you, Mr. Nevius, and I thank you, Dr. Parker.

Mr. NEVIUS. We thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness will be Dr. Donna Allen, Women's Institute for Freedom of the Press.

I see you have an extensive prepared statement, Dr. Allen.

Feel free, if you can, to give us the high points of your statement, and your statement will be entered in the record as though delivered.

Dr. ALLEN. The entire statement only takes 10 minutes. If there are some parts I can skip, I will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Please proceed, Dr. Allen.

STATEMENT OF DR. DONNA ALLEN, WOMEN'S INSTITUTE FOR FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Dr. ALLEN. I am Dr. Donna Allen, director of the Women's Institute for Freedom of the Press. Our interest in these appointments is twofold.

First, we are concerned about the District of Columbia Council because this Council's Economic Development and Manpower Committee, which is studying cable television in the District of Columbia, is made up of Council members—or has been in the past. We believe that cable television will, in the future, become the major means by which Americans communicate with each other and exchange the valuable information and views they each have, possibly more important than the printed word.

We believe it important that everyone's right to a free press, as provided for in the first amendment to the Constitution, be protected, regardless of the medium through which information and ideas are communicated. Anybody that makes decisions affecting what others shall know, must be a representative body that reflects the general public.

Second, women make up half the population of the District, and, like all citizens, we desire self-representation, self-government. We know from past experience that men do not represent all of the interests of women.

However good their intentions, they cannot see things as women do. Women, and indeed all people, must speak for themselves. They must represent themselves. It is the very meaning of democracy.

It is for these reasons that I am here today.

We believe that it is essential for all of us to start at once to work toward the day when women are fully represented. It is essential not only to women but also to society and its children. And it is equally essential to men that women's views be taken into account and accommodated in our public policies.

The society as a whole needs the particular talents women have for seeing the personal aspect of problems, sensing what is viable, and resolving conflicts. Be they innate or taught, these qualities and others that women have, are greatly needed by a people who are governing themselves, if we are to live in peace with each other.

The District of Columbia Council is made up of nine members appointed by the President with the Senate's consent and advice. Approval of these three appointments would give us a Council of one woman and eight men.

We would like the Senate to consent to the one woman, but also to advise the President that we need more women on the Council. We request you recommend that the Senate advise the President to reconsider two of these three appointments.

We have no objections to the two men. We understand that they are fine men and would do a fine job as members of this appointive council. But, if so, they would do just as well on the Council at a subsequent appointment time.

However good they may be, their presence on the Council at this time would violate section 201B of the District of Columbia regulations, which requires that the Council be representative of the District of Columbia community. Their presence on the Council at this time would deny District of Columbia citizens adequate representation, especially of the needed qualities that women contribute to the resolution of problems of which they have particular understanding and knowledge, from welfare to the business world.

We believe that these two gentlemen themselves would disclaim any assertion that there is no woman living in the District of Columbia who is as qualified as they are for the Council.

There are, in fact, many highly qualified women whose knowledge and ability are needed on our Council today. To adhere to a quota of one woman to eight men, as we had on the last full Council, would be to select our Council members not on the basis of the best qualified person but on the basis of sex.

We are taking less qualified people for our Council as long as it is not representative of the natural population. Anything significantly different from the natural population is an artificial quota.

We believe that all of you, both Republicans and Democrats, have an obligation to advise the President that these two men should be held back until the Council is more representative. We believe that the President has an obligation to accept such advice.

We wish to point out the fact that these three proposed appointments were decided upon in early August, when their names appeared in the press, before the Republican National Convention had written its 1972 platform plank on the subject.

Had he to make the appointments now, we believe the President would have appointed women. I would like to quote from the party platform on which he is now campaigning for reelection.

Incidentally, I was in Miami Beach. I sat through all those sessions. which took up until 1:45 in the morning, and I remember the feeling of the people there. It was sincere.

I would like to quote from the Republican Party platform on which he is now campaigning for reelection:

> We fully endorse the principle of equal rights, equal opportunities and equal responsibilities for women.
>
> We are proud of the contributions made by women to better government. We regard the active involvement of women on all levels of the political process, from precinct to national status, as of great importance to our country. The Republican Party welcomes and encourages their maximum participation.

We believe that the President would acknowledge that one woman out of nine Council members is not maximum participation. We think you would agree that appointing three women to the Council, though

it constitutes only a third, would be welcoming and encouraging women's political participation, as the platform promises.

The Republican Party platform is even more specific in its commitment. The platform says:

> This Administration has done more than any before it to help women of America achieve equality of opportunity.
>
> To continue progress for women's rights, we will work toward:
>
> Appointment of women to highest level positions in the Federal Government, including the Cabinet and the Supreme Court.
>
> Elimination of discrimination against women at all levels in Federal Government.

The majority of you in the Senate are Democrats. Your Democratic Party platform also deals with the appointment of women to the highest posts in the Government. Your platform reads:

The Democratic Party pledges the following:

> Appointment of women to positions of top responsibility in all branches of the Federal Government to achieve an equitable ratio of women and men. Such positions include Cabinet members, agency and division heads and Supreme Court Justices; inclusion of women advisors in equitable ratios on all Government studies, commissions and hearings.

No Democratic Senator who stands on his party's platform can vote to perpetuate an appointive Government body of one woman and eight men as the convention intended. It is no motion toward that goal at all.

It is not unreasonable for us to insist upon visible progress toward goals that you yourselves acknowledge should be reached as soon as possible.

We say that three women appointments to the District of Columbia Council is possible now. We hope you will advise the President that it is possible and advisable.

I would like to add one last word about the timing of these appointments.

The work of the cable television committee of the District of Columbia Council has been stalled by the vacancies on the Council. Margaret Haywood was its chairwoman. It would be a serious mistake, if these appointments were confirmed, for the committee to go ahead now and to make decisions on this important matter with only one woman in its membership.

The accurate representation of people must be programed into the cable television system itself, whatever kind of system that will be.

It is in the media that our images are made. Stereotypes form when people don't speak for or represent themselvs.

The public's freedom of the press must extend to all forms of communication, to all of the sources of information upon which people base their political, social, and economic judgments.

Any governmental decisions made regarding freedom of the press must be as democratically representative as we can devise.

The Women's Institute for Freedom of the Press sees here a particular urgency for making the next four or five appointments women—starting immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Allen, for your presentation.

Our next witness will be Ms. Elizabeth Whitaker, Women's National Abortion Action Coalition.

Is Ms. Whitaker with us?

All right. Perhaps she will be here a bit later.

Mr. John W. Hechinger, former Chairman, District of Columbia City Council.

Mr. Hechinger is not here.

Mr. J. C. Turner, former members, District of Columbia City Council.

None of these witnesses are here as yet. Perhaps they will come later.

Mr. Edmund Pendleton, Jr., chairman, District of Columbia Republican Committee; and Rev. L. W. White, minister, Mt. Bethel Baptist Church; have submitted prepared statements which I now place in the record.

(The prepared statements follow:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF EDMUND PENDLETON, JR., CHAIRMAN, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee this morning to support the nomination of Reverend Jerry A. Moore, Jr., to the D.C. City Council.

The Reverend Moore is truly a citizen of Washington. For 28 years he has lived here and served the people of Washington in numerous positions as both leader and follower.

Washington is many cities. To some it is the "last colony" where full political equality is denied its citizens, where the leadership must drive for greater self-government single mindedly.

To the career military and foreign service and to the federal appointees, Washington is a place to come to for longer than a Christmas holiday or summer vacation, but to which you don't transfer your church membership or right to vote, from your home state.

To the federal contractor Washington is a city with a five-day week; your residence is a hotel room, your place of business is a hallway on Capitol Hill or in the Pentagon.

To others the District of Columbia is a federal jurisdiction, a buffer zone around the federal mall, a North American "Panama Canal Zone", established to protect the Federal Government and its national and international activities To these all that count are "Foggy Bottom" and countless Embassy receptions; the White House and its unending struggle to stay astride the bureaucratic dinosaur, providing direction to that fourth branch of government, the strongest of all, though not anticipated by the founding fathers. It is the city where rhetoric on national issues displaces calm discussion on community questions.

None of these is the city of Jerry Moore. The city of Jerry Moore is the people who live here, all of the people who live here and call it their home, and have called it their home for most of their lives. These are the people that Reverend Moore has served as a spiritual advisor and counselor and friend. These are the people who will ride the subway which Jerry built, perhaps made possible, in his transportation committee leadership on the City Council. Jerry Moore's Washington is every family of the city whose child or neighbor is hooked on drugs. That insidious menace is not barred from any neighborhood by poverty or wealth, by color of skin, by language spoken in the house and Jerry Moore knows this.

Mr. Chairman, the background of Jerry Moore is well known to all of us and better presented by others than by me. But I am proud to present the Reverend Jerry Moore as our candidate and the President's nominee for the City Council, councilman who will speak for all our residents to find solutions for the problems of our home town—the city we love.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REV. L. W. WHITE, MINISTER, MOUNT BETHEL BAPTIST CHURCH

To the distinguished members of this committee, it is my privilege and honor to address my remarks to you on behalf of my personal friend and brother in the

ministry, Rev. Jerry Moore, who was nominated by our President Richard Nixon to serve on the City Council of Washington, D.C. Mr. Moore does not need to be recommended by anyone. His previous record on the City Council is an open book well documented for all to read.

Permit us to recall to your attention to the tremendous good he has done in promoting "Good-Will" toward all peoples in Washington, by helping to improve the economic conditions of citizens in the city.

He is a man of integrity, sound judgment and wise counciling.

He has won the admiration and respect of all races for his fair play and honest dealings.

As a fellow minister we have sought his advise on the local and on National matters pertaining to the spiritual and moral development of our people. You can depend on Rev. Moore to maintain the highest standard of leadership that makes for good government. We pray that your consideration will be guided by the record he has made, the good he has done and the need for such a man in our City Council.

The CHAIRMAN. At this time we will begin taking testimony on S. 3593, a bill to increase compensation of the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and other members of the District of Columbia Council.

I now place in the record a copy of this bill.

(The bill referred to, S. 3593, follows:)

92D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3593

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 10, 1972

Mr. EAGLETON (for himself, Mr. STEVENSON, and Mr. TUNNEY) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

A BILL

To increase the compensation of the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and other members of the District of Columbia Council.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the District of Columbia Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum, the Vice Chairman of such Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $18,000 per annum, and each other member of such Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

II

84-731 O - 72 - 4

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. John W. Stadtler, president, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. STADTLER, PRESIDENT, METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE

Mr. STADTLER. In the interest of your time and the committee's time, I know that you are hearing several bills this morning, I would rather than present the testimony supporting the additional compensation for the District of Columbia City Council, just submit this prepared statement and make it a part of the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Your prepared statement will be printed in full in the record. We appreciate your presentation this morning, Mr. Stadtler.

(Mr. Stadtler's prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. STADTLER, PRESIDENT
METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE
BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
UNITED STATES SENATE
REGARDING S. 3966
SEPTEMBER 25, 1972

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. I am John W. Stadtler, President of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade. I think by this time the credentials of the Board of Trade are well enough established that I need not review them with you.

As you know, the Board has long been an active supporter of a subway system for the residents of Metropolitan Washington. The record shows a long history of testimony and support for this type of transportation system. I think the members of the Committee know that recently we worked very actively on behalf of appropriate funding for METRO. We have also supported the acquisition of the area bus companies in order to provide an integrated and orderly transportation system.

We in the business community are quite excited about the prospects of the METRO and what it will do for the national capital area. This morning I would like to add the endorsement of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade for S. 3966, a Bill providing additional rapid transit facilities in the District of Columbia and environs.

The Arlington National Cemetery, to which this additional stop is proposed, has substantial historical significance in this community. Last year over 17 million people visited Washington - most of whom visited the Cemetery. With the Bicentennial year approaching, we are certain that the

number of tourists and visitors to this site will be substantially increased. To provide easy and economical transportation to such an historic site should be a key criterion in expanding our already well planned METRO system.

We hope the Committee will give favorable attention to this Bill and that the appropriate planning machinery can be implemented so as to add this station to the system within a reasonable period of time.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hechinger, will you please come forward. Please proceed, Mr. Hechinger.

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. HECHINGER, FORMER CHAIRMAN, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

Mr. HECHINGER. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I am here to testify in favor of S. 3593, a bill introduced by you to increase the salaries of the City Council.

As you will remember, when I appeared before you as a witness in the confirmation hearings of now Chairman Nevius, I called attention to the urgent need of an upward adjustment of the salaries in order to fairly compensate the dedicated citizens who have been selected and have agreed to accept service on the City Council.

The City Council is the main legislative body of our municipal government. It was my privilege to serve as the Chairman of the City Council, and can speak firsthand about the burden and the time-consuming characteristics of the job as chairman.

To give you an idea of the multiplicity of the functions of Chairman, allow me to quickly catalog it.

The Chairman must set the weekly agenda of the Council, he must study and approve all regulations, and resolutions, many very controversial, but an enormity of routine material.

He must supervise the day-to-day activity of the Council's staff. He must mastermind the intricacy of the budget processes between the councilmen and other District of Columbia Government bureaus.

He must act as a catalyst between the councilmen to create a harmonious, creative body.

He must act as liaison with the Mayor and the department heads. He must be the focal point of many petitions of all District citizens and their organizations, he has a multiplicity of concerns that arise daily.

The Council Chairman must research and interpret background material in order to set long range goals for the Council. He must carry the burden of ceremonial duties, attending breakfasts, luncheons, dinner for evening and weekends.

It is fun for the first 3 months, and then it is a bloody bore, and then there are other duties outside the Council. For example, Vice Chairman of the Zoning Commission, and this job, if it really were done properly, might be a full-time job in itself.

He is a member of the Board, and there are many committees of the Metropolitan Council of Governments and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority, and still I could go on and on.

Actually, it is an 18-hour-a-day job. classified as a part-time job. Yet, I stress that it must remain officially part time, in order to retain the flavor of citizen involvement, of drawing into Government people from all walks of life, lawyers, executives, teachers, ministers, butchers, bakers, and candlestick makers.

The Mayor and Deputy Mayor, should be professional. But the City Council, as it is in most cities, of the United States, should have in the best sense of the word amateur representatives to reflect the makeup and diversity of views of the community, but the salary of $10,000,

in relation to the responsibilities of the Council, that the Chairman carries, is not only unfair—it is ridiculous.

The present Chairman, for example, was promoted by the President to the position, from the prior position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, where his salary was well over three times as much as he now earns. You may observe as relevant the fact that in this case of having withdrawn from law practice earlier to accept that appointment, he now has no earnings except his Council salary, and no opportunity to earn anything else, because the chairmanship is an 18-hour-a-day job in itself. Because we are former Council colleagues and still good friends, I happen to know also, that his combined income from Council salaries and other sources is nowhere near enough to carry his financial responsibilities. Of course, it is clearly wrong to expect that one who serves as a Council Chairman, as Chairman Nevius is doing, must have an independent means of support.

In proportional matter, the same testimony is applicable to the Vice Chairman and to the City Council members. So I endorse and urge you to pass the bill to increase the salaries for the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and the Council.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Hechinger. We always appreciate your appearance before this committee.

Mr. HECHINGER. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it, Mr. Turner is still not with us. Is there anyone else who wishes to testify on S. 3593, the salaries of the members of the District of Columbia Council?

If not, we will conclude our hearings on that portion of this morning's presentation.

Also, pertinent to S. 3593, let me put in the record at this time some letters that we have received from past members of the District of Columbia City Council, which relate to the amount of time they spend or did spend as members of that Council, and which would be pertinent insofar as the question of salaries are concerned.

These letters will be placed in the record.

(The letters follow:)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

1330 LONGWORTH BUILDING
(202) 225-8050

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

May 3, 1971

The Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Eagleton:

First, I wish to thank you for inviting me to testify before your Committee on the crucial question of home rule for the District of Columbia. I also want to tell you how much I value your commitment to securing self-determination for the people of this City and the courtesy you showed to me in my appearance before your Committee last week.

In addition, I have your letter of April 28th in which you ask several questions regarding my views on the structure of the proposed city council. As you know, I was vice-chairman of the District of Columbia City Council from November, 1967 to March, 1969. While I had major and important responsibilities beyond my duties as vice-chairman of the council, I spent on the average about 50 hours each week on council business, though all of us on the council received only part-time pay. There is no question that even with the limited jurisdiction of the present city council, the job of councilman requires full-time attention. This would be doubly true for a councilman serving on a council with expanded powers as is provided for under S. 1603.

As for the compensation for city councilmen, it would seem to me that this is a matter best left to the Council itself, which will be accountable to the citizens of the city. S. 1626, introduced by Senator Mathias, takes this approach. I have prepared tentative home rule proposals, which appear at E3772 of the Congressional Record of April 30, 1971. I am enclosing a copy of my remarks for your information and comment. This draft proposal follows Senator Mathias' bill on the question of compensation.

With regard to the number of members on the city council, my proposal would create a fifteen member council, with seven members elected at large and eight members elected--one from each of eight wards. As I indicated in my testimony the other day, a city council with broad legislative authority ought to have more than eleven members. At the same time, as you indicated in your remarks, if the city council is too large, there is a danger that it can become too unweildy and parochial. I think that fifteen members strikes something of a balance, particularly with seven members being elected at large.

Again, I thank you for all the help you have been to me and the people of this City.

Sincerely yours,

Walter E. Fauntroy

WALTER E. FAUNTROY
Congressman, D. C.

JOHN A. NEVIUS
1000 VERMONT AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005
DISTRICT 7-6900

May 25, 1971

The Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton
Chairman
United States Senate
Committee on the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Eagleton:

Please forgive my delay in replying to yours of April 28 kindly inquiring of my experience and views regarding the position of D.C. City Councilman.

While it has been a little over two years since I left the Council, and hence my memory is not fresh, I believe it is accurate to say I averaged well over 30 hours a week on Council duty in those early days. While I managed a couple of hours a day at the law office on the average, usually during the lunch hours, as a practical matter it amounted to nearly full-time work, because of the frequent evening and weekend ceremonials during those early days of the new institution. Moreover, since we all distributed the work load as considerately as possible and some members had no other employment, it must be said that to a considerable degree others carried part of my share of the time load, and at least one put in less time than I did.

All in all, I would say it worked out to a full-time job for a Council member with 9 of us and a lot more for the Chairman.

As for compensation, I think $15,000 for members and $20,000 for the Chairman annually would be fair, because a reasonable financial sacrifice is justified for high earners and truly dignified compensation is deserved by the others.

The Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton
May 25, 1971
Page 2

As for the number of Councilmen, I think that with such compensation the present nine are enough for the work load, and any additional funding should go towards more staff resources than we had. On the other hand, this presents a problem because we have 8 election wards each of which should have one councilman, and I feel that there should be at least 3 at large seats as well. Hence an 11-member Council would be a good compromise in my opinion.

Hoping that this information is not too late to be useful, I am,

Sincerely,

Jack Nevius

John A. Nevius

JAN:c

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

3 May 1971

The Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton
Chairman, Committee on the District
of Columbia
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The following responses are in reference to the queries of your letter of April 28, 1971:

(1) I spend an average of forty to forty-five hours per week on Council business. This work is exclusive of the numerous hearings which often run into the wee hours of the morning. I also find it necessary to spend a good deal of time not only in City Hall but out in the City pursuing the work of the Council particularly in matters relating to Housing and Urban Development and around problems of Police/Community relations. I find that staying in close contact with the community in this way, we encourage considerable community involvement which keeps a kind of communication going and reduces the problems faced in City Hall once they come to our offical attention.

(2) I have mixed feelings on the question of whether or not Council positions should be full time jobs. I suppose the question is less whether or not the job should be full or part time but the issue as I see it

. . . continued . . .

is rather whether those who serve in the positions can devote the time and attention that the job requires. In any event, the salaries of councilmen should be raised. Hence, those who can afford to give full-time attention, at an increased salary, would then be available -- persons who would otherwise not be available to serve now. On the other hand, those who can devote forty to fifty hours per week to the job, but whose income needs are greater than the salaries available and who would be permitted to earn outside income, could still function effectively as members of the Council. In this way we would be able to attract candidates representing a broad spectrum of the community -- a field of candidates which would assure a representative and effective Council.

(3) Regarding the level of compensation, I would suggest the following: Chairman - $18,000; Vice Chairman - $17,000; Council Members - $15,000. Again, these sorry recommendations assume that the determination would be made as to the time each individual councilman puts in beyond what is regarded as reasonable service.

(4) I would accept the provisions of the proposed Fauntroy bill regarding the number of members on the Council which would establish the membership at fifteen-- eight of whom would represent wards and seven which serve at-large. I would further suggest that the officers of the Council be elected in one of two ways:

a. Elected by the membership of that body

b. The person receiving the largest number of votes from the public election would be designated chairman and the runner-up would assume the position of vice chairman

. . . continued . . .

I would be very happy to discuss this whole question further if you so desire. In the meantime, I hope you will find these responses useful.

Sincerely,

Sterling Tucker

STERLING TUCKER
Vice Chairman

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004

May 4, 1971

Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton
Chairman
Senate Committee on the District
of Columbia
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Eagleton:

Thank you for your letter of April 28, 1971, requesting my views on the D.C. City Council as it relates to home rule. I have listed my answers below:

1. My councilmanic duties, which generally consume approximately 45 hours a week, go in three general directions: Legislative; Ombudsman; and Community speeches and meetings.

2. Once the city is given home rule, it will mean that we will be assuming full responsibility for legislating for the District of Columbia and this will mean full time staff work and study.

3. Because of tremendous responsibilities that we have experienced in the City Council, assuming that it is a full time responsibility, I would recommend that level of compensation be between $15,000 and $20,000.

4. I would recommend that the City Council be made up of nine members with each functioning through a committee chairmanship.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide you with my views on the City Council and home rule for Washington, D.C.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

Stanley J. Anderson

Stanley J. Anderson
Councilman
D.C. City Council

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

May 10, 1971

Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton
Chairman, Committee on the District
of Columbia
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Eagleton:

I am in receipt of your letter of April 28, 1971 which you have raised various questions about the amount of time and salaries of the District of Columbia City Council.

1. As to the number of hours per week that I spend on City Council duties it is difficult to give a hard and fast figure. In my own situation it is necessary for me to give primary consideration to my full time job on the AFL-CIO. I try to do the best I can and respond to the maximum amount of time I can devote to the many problems of the City Council.

2. As to whether ot not it should be a full or part time job. As an institution from the experience in this "shake down" period strong arguments could be made both ways. It would be my opinion that with more professional full time staff planning and participation and also a clear cut understanding of officers who call for the various hearings and meetings that the Council could function as a parttime council.

   I would think with a more homogeneous viewpoint by the members of the Council on what we give priority to the present system would work. However, if you have parttime people who must work

their other job it makes it too dificult to do both, then you will wind up with those who are independently wealthy or those who for some reason don't have to make a living. This would not be good for the city.

3. As to the level of compensation the members of the Council should receive it would be my opinion and I so stated in my testimony before your Committee on Home Rule that $15,000 per year would be in the ball park. As you know the Prince Georges County Council recently enacted a reorganization and pay their parttime Councilmen $15,000 per year. Montgomery County pays $10,000 per year and their President, $12,000.

   I understand in Honolulu which has a comparable type council as ours, as of 1968 they pay their Councilmen $10,005 and their Chairman, $12,000. San Francisco pay their Councilmen $10,000.

4. As to numbers on the Council it would be my opinion that the nine member council as presently constituted would be sufficient.

Trusting this answers your questions and if I can be of further help please feel free to call on me.

With all best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely,

Phil

Philip J. Daugherty

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

May 6, 1971

The Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Eagleton:

I apologize for not having responded sooner to your letter of April 28th. We have, however, been working around the clock in connection with the last two weeks' demonstrations.

I will answer your questions as follows:

(1) On the average, how many hours per week have you allotted to your City Council duties?

Answer: Although some weeks it may run as low as 40 hours, my typical hourly per week duties run to about 80 hours, and sometimes higher.

(2) Do you believe the job should be full or part-time?

Answer: While a certain number of cities have full time Councilmen, I believe that the job of City Councilman ought to be part-time. I believe that the people who serve respond to the community that elected them best in that way.

(3) What level of compensation should City Council members receive?

Answer: I think some increase is warranted but not a substantial amount. I think the tradition in this country for City Councilmen is that it does involve a sacrifice to handle the job and should be only partially compensated.

(4) How many members should be on the Council?

Answer: I believe that nine, the present number, is the proper number. I think that a large City Council is a lot easier controlled by a Mayor and more subject to parochial interest. While this may be desirable from the point of view of some, it is not my idea of a City Council. If you create a body which is to be an independent equal body, then a small body is desirable. If it were thought that the importance of the Council should be diluted by making it a large unwieldy body subject to parochial interest, then I would suggest that we go to another form of City Government.

In reviewing my testimony before you the other day on your Home Rule Bill, I rather regret one aspect of it.

In context, I would have wished I had said much more in compliment of the bill and expressed my unreserved support of it.

I shall look for a second opportunity to do this and indicate that I am correcting my original position.

Sincerely,

GILBERT HAHN, JR.
Chairman, City Council

MAY 3

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

April 30, 1971

The Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton, Chairman
U. S. Senate Committee on The District of Columbia
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Eagleton:

Thank you for your letter of April 28, 1971, and for your continuing genuine interest in the District of Columbia.

1) In order to perform the kind of service I feel warranted as a Councilman, I have found it necessary to spend between 40 and 50 hours per week on the average. This includes time away from the desk, in the community, participating in services of varying kinds important to the citizens, and includes service on other boards as Council delegate.

2) It has been my feeling for quite sometime that the City Council should be a full time job. One reason is the fact of the many hearings which give the people an opportunity to make their wishes known and guide the Council in its legislative sessions. I have no doubt that there always will be areas demanding this kind of attention.

The second reason is that true representation cannot come about if the persons selected as Councilmen must be those whose independent income is sufficient to sustain them. In order to perform adequately, any other means of livelihood is impaired, and in some instances conflicts of interest may develop, also impairing the members other means of livelihood.

The Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton, Chairman
U. S. Senate Committee on The District of Columbia
Page 2
April 30, 1971

3) I would think that a full time Councilman should be compensated at a $20,000.00 to $25,000.00 per annum level.

4) The ideal size of the City Council, in my opinion, would be not less than 9 members and not more than 11. We have functioned very well with nine members. As a part-time Council, absenteeism due to conflicts, illness, etc., could be less hampering if there were eleven members. A full-time Council should have no difficulty with 11 members.

I hope this will be of some help to you and I thank you for the opportunity to contribute to your Committee work.

Sincerely,

Margaret A. Haywood

MARGARET A. HAYWOOD

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

May 7, 1971

The Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton
Chairman
Committee on the District of Columbia
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Eagleton:

Thank you for your letter inquiring about "whether the members of the City Council should be full or part-time officials and what salary they should receive were Congress to give home rule to the District of Columbia." The following are brief answers to the four questions raised in your letter:

1. It is very difficult to work out an allocation of time formula for City Council duties. The work is accomplished as demand arises. Some weeks require many more hours of work than others. I believe the work averages easily forty hours a week. Some weeks require more time. The job is by no means part-time in its demands.

2. The job is full-time and should carry a full-time salary.

3. In my opinion the level of compensation should be commensurate with that of any top executive in City Government. Executive positions range from $18,000 to $25,000. If the positions are to continue under the theory of part-time responsibility the compensation should be $12,500 to $15,000.

4. Eleven members would be sufficient to operate the City Council.

If I may be of further assistance please feel free to call on me.

Very truly yours,

Jerry A. Moore, Jr.

Jerry A. Moore, Jr.
Councilman, D. C.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

May 6, 1971

The Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Eagleton:

Thank you for your letter of April 28, 1971. I am pleased that my opinion and experience may prove helpful to you in your deliberations on home rule for the District of Columbia.

I have given much thought to the questions that you asked. First, on the basis of my nineteen months with the Council, I find that I spend from thirty five to forty hours per week in Council activities, excluding a two month period in the summer. The time includes regular meetings, hearings, community representation and special activities.

Although my work load is a heavy one, I feel strongly that Council members should continue to be part-time. I believe that a continuing commitment to a different job or profession helps to ensure freshness in outlook and it will help to screen out those who might be attracted by salary considerations alone.

I think the minimum compensation per annum for this position should be $15,000 to $20,000 which is about one half the salary of the Mayor and Congressmen.

I feel that nine Councilmembers is adequate for the operation of the City Council and sufficient to insure geographic representation and occupational diversity.

I hope my opinion will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

Henry S. Robinson, Jr.
Councilman

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

GILBERT HAHN, JR.
Chairman
STERLING TUCKER
Vice Chairman
STANLEY J. ANDERSON
PHILIP J. DAUGHERTY
MRS. MARGARET A. HAYWOOD
REV. JERRY A. MOORE, JR.
DR. HENRY S. ROBINSON
REV. CARLTON W. VEAZEY
JOSEPH P. YELDELL
Councilmen

May 10, 1971

Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton
United States Senate
Committee on the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Eagleton:

May I thank you for your inquiries of April 28, 1971, regarding my duties as a member of the D.C. City Council.

Because of my extremely busy schedule which includes pastoring a church and my job at the Opportunities Industrialization Center, I generally spend from two to three hours each day in my Council Office and about ten hours per week attending various evening meetings in the Washington community. Additionally, my attendance is required for Regular and Special Council Meetings, as well as special hearings which may average from eight to ten hours per week. I therefore estimate that I am spending approximately thirty-five hours per week on City Council duties.

There is no doubt in my mind, and many of my colleagues agree, that most of us, are in fact, working full-time in responding to the numerous inquiries we receive from our constituency, as well as the business related to the normal and special functions of the Council. I firmly believe that our job should be full time, as it is in most jurisdictions with over 500,000 population.

I have been advised that most full-time Councilmembers serving jurisdictions similar to the District of Columbia are paid from $15,000 to 18,000, in addition to private automobiles and liberal travel expenses.

Based on the above assessment of what full-time Councilmembers are receiving throughout the country, I feel that the level of compensation for a full-time D.C. City Councilmember should be in the $20,000 range.

I also reel that our nine member Council functions rather efficiently, therefore I would recommend that our Council remain at nine members, and I might add, who should be elected for four year terms.

Thank you for permitting me to comment in this matter. Your interest in our Council is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Carlton W. Veazey

CARLTON W. VEAZEY

WASHINGTON BOARD OF REALTORS, INC.

1511 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C., 20005 NATIONAL 8-4494

May 25, 1972

Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton
United States Senate
New Senate Office Building, Room 4102
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Eagleton:

The Washington Board of Realtors is aware of your recommendation to increase the salaries of members of the D. C. City Council, and we would like to go on record endorsing this recommendation.

We feel that members of the Council would be inclined to devote more time to their positions if they were paid a realistic salary. We further feel that individuals with higher qualifications would be more willing to serve on the Council.

Sincerely,

Foster Shannon
President

FS/dw

The CHAIRMAN. Is Ms. Whittaker with us now?

Does anyone else wish to testify with respect to the nominations to the City Council, of the Reverend Moore, Dr. Parker, or Mr. Foster?

We have exhausted our list of announced witnesses.

Is there anyone else who wishes to add something for or against those nominees?

If not, that concludes the hearings on the nominations and on the bill S. 3593.

Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at 10:45 a.m.)

○