

service. This is not consonant with civil service retirement legislation which provides for refunds with interest only when the person resigning has served for less than five years.

There is one additional provision in section 4 of the bills which we believe warrants comment. This provision, adding student-child survivorship benefits to the law, contains a four-month non-school interval feature. Past experience in administering student-child benefits under the civil service retirement law discloses that an interim of four months fails to cover students at schools on a trimester basis or in other circumstances (such as shifting from high school to college) where periods of absence between terms often exceed four months by a few days. To correct this problem, the civil service retirement law was amended by Public Law 89-407, approved April 25, 1966, to permit continuance of student-child annuity benefits over non-school intervals of up to five months. The District therefore recommends that there be substituted five months in lieu of the present four months non-school interval contained in this section of the bill.

The District also recommends that the bills be amended to include the judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court. The pay and retirement benefits of this judge have, for a number of years, been comparable to the pay and retirement benefits of a judge of the Court of General Sessions.

The basic intention of this proposed legislation is to improve the benefits of the Judicial Retirement Act. Of particular importance, a judge would not be entitled to apply retirement credits previously earned in a civilian or military capacity to his existing judicial retirement credit. The substance of the bills was largely drafted in consultation with the Court of General Sessions, and they are supported by the Board of Judges of the court. With the legislation to increase the number of judges on the court and to increase the salary of the judges, these bills on judicial retirement form one of the three principal legislative objectives of the District of Columbia Courts for this particular session of Congress. The proposed amendment will make a judicial career even more attractive to qualified persons, and implement the emphasis of this administration on crime reduction.

The District Government is generally in accord with the purpose of the bills, and if they be amended as the District has recommended in this report, it would favor the enactment of one of the bills.

The Government of the District of Columbia has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS W. FLETCHER,
Assistant to the Commissioner.
(For: Walter E. Washington, Commissioner).

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, May 1, 1968

The Honorable JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: The Government of the District of Columbia has for report H.R. 15678, 90th Congress, a bill "To increase the salaries of judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, and the salaries of judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals."

The purpose of the bill is reflected generally in its title. Under existing law (the Act approved August 14, 1964; D.C. Code, sec. 11-902), the Chief Judge of the Court of General Sessions is compensated in the amount of \$24,000 annually, and each Associate Judge receives an annual salary of \$23,500. The bill would increase the compensation of the Chief Judge to \$28,000, and that of an Associate Judge to \$27,500.

The increase in the caseload of the Court of General Sessions has become apparent as the effort to maintain a reasonably current docket in both the civil division and the criminal division of the Court has become more difficult. The judges have found that as they have attempted to attack the pressing problems of delay and congestion on the criminal docket, similar problems of delay and congestion have arisen in the civil division of the Court. The time between the