Judge GREENE. Congressman Steiger, of course I don't believe, if I may, that the improvements in the retirement act are particularly dramatic.

Mr. STEIGER. Excuse me. Do you yield at that point?

Judge GREENE. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEIGER. I would point out that in your own case your retirement would go from some $8,000—I can't verify these tabulations—you are perhaps more familiar than I am. In your case if you retired at age 62, your retirement would go from $8,975 to $20,994. Now, I would call that a rather dramatic——

Judge GREENE. Well, Congressman Steiger, I have not made a computation, and truly I have not in my own case. I have had a computation made of the retirement benefits of older judges, at least I think it is all the judges who are covered under this present law, and I ask that they are designated simply by letter rather than by name so that I wuldn't particularly know who they are. It may well be true, Congressman Steiger, that there would be an increase of the kind that you mentioned in the individual cases, but that omits the fact, omits two which I think are relevant factors.

Mr. WHITENER. May I interrupt you. I think Mr. Farber may have some information on that.

Mr. FARBER. He also has some previous service and under a deferred anuity, he would get $6,252, which would bring his possible annuity up to $15,227. So the difference is not between $8,000 and $20,000. There are factors worked in since we worked the other figures, and we tried to determine what these judges would get as civil service retirees. So there is not a difference of $15,000.

Mr. STEIGER. I want to make it clear, Judge, that I am not quarelling when I selected you. I don't expect you to have to defend your own particular position. I don't mean to do that.

Judge GREENE. I understand.

Mr. STEIGER. It occurs to me that when you have some, for example, in your own court, how big is your backlog now?

Judge GREENE. I wonder, Congressman, if I may answer your first question first and then get to the backlog, if I may be permitted to do so?

I would first want to endorse what the gentleman just said that if you compare the present additional annuity with what it would be under the bill, to be accurate in comparing, one would also have to include any civil service annuity or military or congressional annuity a person will get which he will be entitled to in any event under the present law. If that is counted in the difference between the two in most cases would be relatively small, if any difference at all.

The other point I would like to make about that is that, from what I can gather from the figures that were given to me, and I haven't checked them, but at least those figures were given to me are reasonably accurate, it would show that under present law quite a number of the judges—several of the judges at any rate—had they remained for an additional 10 years in the civil service when they were appointed to the bench, they would have at that point been entitled to a far higher annuity than they are entitled to presently under the Judicial Retirement Act so that I think that the purpose of this bill is to remove this penalty which really comes about, a penalty at least insofar as