Mr. Chairman, we believe the provisions of this bill represent very reasonable steps to bring the judicial retirement law into line with other retirement legislation, and we respectfully urge that this subcommittee recommend its enactment to the full committee and to the House.

H.R. 15678; H.R. 12738—SALARY LEGISLATION

1. H.R. 15678 would increase the salary of associate judges of the Court of General Sessions from \$23,500 to \$27,500, and of associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals from \$24,500 to \$28,500. The chief judges of the respective courts would continue to receive \$500 more than the associate judges.

2. The President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia recommended that "the judges of the Court of General Sessions should receive substantial increases in salary." The Commission noted that "new judges are often obliged to relinquish established law practices, frequently far more lucrative than the position on the bench. The \$23,500 salary is less than the \$25,897 paid to government employees at the GS-18 level and less than the \$30,000 paid to the United States District Court judges, much of whose former jurisdiction now lies in the Court of General Sessions."

3. The Committee of the District of Columbia Judicial Council on the Administration of Justice likewise recommended that the "salaries of the judges of the [Court of General Sessions] should be increased. The judges receive \$23,500 per year and the Chief Judge receives \$24,000. Salaries in general trial courts in other jurisdictions with large municipal centers range between \$25,000-\$37,000, with the median range around \$27,000 to \$28,000. It is suggested that the salary should be \$27,500 for the associate judges and \$28,000 for the Chief Judge."

4. The Court of General Sessions now handles the bulk of the District of Columbia's civil litigation, most serious criminal offenses, and all petty offenses. While during the past sixteen years criminal prosecutions in the U.S. District Court did not significantly increase, they rose by over 100% in the Court of General Sessions. As a result of these developments, the Court of General Sessions is now one of the pivots around which the solutions to many of the problems of the District of Columbia revolve. Most criminal cases are tried in this court, and any war on crime which focuses on police protection at one end of the criminal process and on punishment and rehabilitation at the other, without strengthening the pivot in between, is not likely to be successful. As the judicial Council Committee stated, "... The judges on the Court of General Sessions handle 97% of all litigation in the District of Columbia, and proposals have been made to transfer still more jurisdiction to this court. With its growing workload and increased responsibilities, it is necessary to make service on this court more attractive and give its judges a status commensurate with their responsibilities. The proposed salary increase is an important step in this direction."

5. As the Crime Commission noted, civil servants at the GS-18 level are paid more than judges of the Court of General Sessions. This disparity has further increased since the Crime Commission report was written. Civil service employees have received a general pay increase since then, and the salaries of those in the upper grades now amount to \$27,055 for GS-18; \$23,788 to \$26,966 for GS-17; and \$20,982 to \$26,574 for GS-16. By July 1, 1968, the GS-18 salary will be \$30,239; GS-17 will be \$26,264 to \$29,764; and GS-16 will be \$22,835 to \$28,923. And it is expected that under the comparability legislation, these salary ranges will be as follows: GS-18—\$34,950; GS-17—\$29,965 to \$34,070; and GS-16—\$25,780 to \$32,655. Judges on the Court of General Sessions did not and do not participate in any of these automatic or comparability pay increases, and their salaries remain fixed unless changed by statute. For these reasons, and for the reasons stated by the District of Columbia Crime Commission and by the Judicial Council Committee, the increase in salary for the judges of the Court of General Sessions provided for in H.R. 15678 is appropriate and warranted.

Any increase in the salaries paid to the judges of the Court of General Sessions would logically call for a comparable increase to the judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

H.R. 15679; H.R. 14202—RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

1. The principal effect of H.R. 15679—which would amend the District of Columbia Judges' Retirement Act—would be to permit a judge, at the time he is eligible to retire from his judicial office, to receive credit also for any earned congressional, civil, and military service. This aggregation of judicial with all other service