

As Congressman Steiger pointed out, they are on the horns of a dilemma. Would you choose one over the other? I don't think you can afford to choose. I think we are in a situation where we must do what is necessary and not pick and choose between a temporary remedy.

This is the general consensus of the members of the practicing board, at least in the Court of General Sessions.

Mr. GUDE. In other words, a piecemeal approach is not going to help the court.

Mr. CANFIELD. It never does, Congressman.

Judge GREENE. I hate to be a persistent witness, but if I may just add this. The court really is, at least as far as the criminal side is concerned, a part of the whole process which starts with the policeman and ends up with corrections and prison systems and so on. Millions of dollars are necessarily spent on police and law enforcement of that type. Millions of dollars are spent necessarily in terms of prison, probation, and parole, and so on. The court is right in between. If the court doesn't function adequately, either because there aren't enough judges or the judges are there are not of the caliber that they should be, then what you spend at those two ends is really wasted, because they all have to go through the court system. The court system has to be able to process them and the judges have to be able to do a good job in processing them. If that can't be done, and because of the expenditure of a relatively small amount that is necessary to do that, the court is weak in comparison with the other two parts of the system. Your entire system of criminal justice and law enforcement will not function properly. I really think it would be penny wise and pound foolish to concern one's self with the very limited funds that would be necessary to do the things—to upgrade the Court of General Sessions, when what is at stake here is the whole picture of law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHITENER. Gentlemen, is there any prepared statement that anyone wants to make a part of the record?

Mr. MOYERS. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask formally that the District reports on both of these bills be made a part of the record.

Mr. WHITENER. We have already done that.

Mr. MOYERS. I would just like to briefly state in capsule what the District's position is on the bill.

On the pay bill, of course the District supports the increased pay for these judges and makes the recommendation that the judge of the Tax Court also be included. On the retirement bill, the District points out several provisions in there which we feel each bit of modifying conforms more with the Civil Service Retirement System, mainly in the field of submitting interest on the funds that you move from the Civil Service Retirement Fund to the Judges' Retirement Fund. There is an additional small amendment which we recommend in that report.

Mr. STEIGER. I wonder if we could have Mr. Farber—if there is no objection—prepare a comparable anonymous identification of the increase in the retirement schedule and what effect it will have on the individuals, without identifying the individuals, in the manner that—I gather that you have already prepared something.

Mr. FARBER. Sir, I have it by name, but I can eliminate the name.

Mr. STEIGER. Well, if you could eliminate that name, that would serve the purpose if the Chairman has no objection.