

Judge GREENE. 1964.

Judge HALLECK. Congressman, there is one other thing, if I can be personal for a moment.

Mr. STEIGER. Yes.

Judge HALLECK. You talked about the problem of judges coming in and attracting people—I wouldn't for a moment suggest that I am one of those well-qualified people that someone would want to attract, but be that as it may, two years ago I came to the bench. I have seven children, and I have to educate those children. Had I stayed in my law firm instead of coming—a good law firm here in town—instead of coming to the bench I would have made last year \$4,000 more than I made last year in the court. Mr. Flannery and others know what the problem is. Mr. Canfield knows what private practice can bring. Now, for a young man like—I might say young—it depends on which side of 40 you are when you look at me, but running this court now is getting to be an active job. For example, during the riot the whole court, for a 12-hour period, all night long. This is a job that requires a man with a little bit of stamina, I think. That can generally be understood. We all have small children. We are going to have to educate them. The cost of living is catching up with us. I just bring this to your attention in line with your suggestion that perhaps we had all our vacancies filled, and there wasn't any real problem. Frankly, and I will be honest with you, I don't know how much longer, at the present salary, I can continue on in court and educate my children.

Mr. STEIGER. Judge Halleck, I am not unsympathetic. I don't want to give the impression that I am. The fact that you are coming in here and requesting what amounts to a 16 or 17 percent increase at a time when the President himself, in my opinion, is not famous for being penurious—recognizing that the past inequities as you see them, require this kind of an increase, I think that in recognizing the need that you cite as very valid, I am sure that the competition between the bench and private practice is common to all areas. I know it is a familiar one in my state. I am not unsympathetic. I do hope that you recognize that we have a judgment to make and it is that simple.

Judge GREENE. Congressman, I wonder if I may add something which I said before, and that is when we talk about a 16 or 17 percent increase that can be compared with a 25 percent increase that has been given to the two and a half million or more civil service employees. So that, again, we are talking about a less increase for an infinitesimal number of persons.

Judge HYDE. I just want to make one interruption, if I may, with respect to the figures. I might say that in the privacy of my chambers I have computed this many, many times in my own particular instance. As it now stands, under the present law, at the end of 10 years in my particular case, taking—and I will have to wait until age 62 to get congressional retirement—mine would figure out at \$14,926 under the present law. If the proposed amendment went through it would be \$16,750, roughly \$1,700 difference.

Mr. STEIGER. The combination of the congressional and the judicial?

Judge HYDE. Right. It would be a matter of about \$1,700 difference.

Mr. STEIGER. Well, that is interesting. As I say, I don't know even who is responsible for this computation.