

Stat. 1322; Pub. L. 101-194, title VII, §701(e), Nov. 30, 1989, 103 Stat. 1764.)

#### AMENDMENTS

1989—Pub. L. 101-194 amended section catchline generally and in text substituted “Commission with respect to rates of pay for” for “Commission of” and “December 15 next following the close of the fiscal year in which the review is conducted by the Commission.” for “December 15 of the fiscal year in which the review is conducted by the Commission.”

1985—Pub. L. 99-190 substituted “December 15” for “January 1 next following the close”.

#### 1985 FISCAL YEAR RECOMMENDATIONS ON PAY RATES OF OFFICES AND POSITIONS

Section 135(g) of Pub. L. 99-190 provided that: “Notwithstanding section 225(g) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 357), the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries shall not make recommendations on the rates of pay of offices and positions within the purview of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of section 225(f) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 356) in connection with the review of rates of pay of such offices and positions conducted by the Commission in fiscal year 1985.”

#### SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS

This section is referred to in sections 352, 358, 362, 363 of this title.

### § 358. Recommendations of President with respect to pay

(1) After considering the report and recommendations of the Commission submitted under section 357 of this title, the President shall transmit to Congress his recommendations with respect to the exact rates of pay, for offices and positions within the purview of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of section 356 of this title, which the President considers to be fair and reasonable in light of the Commission’s report and recommendations, the prevailing market value of the services rendered in the offices and positions involved, the overall economic condition of the country, and the fiscal condition of the Federal Government.

(2) The President shall transmit his recommendations under this section to Congress on the first Monday after January 3 of the first calendar year beginning after the date on which the Commission submits its report and recommendations to the President under section 357 of this title.

(Pub. L. 90-206, title II, §225(h), Dec. 16, 1967, 81 Stat. 644; Pub. L. 99-190, §135(d), Dec. 19, 1985, 99 Stat. 1322; Pub. L. 101-194, title VII, §701(f), Nov. 30, 1989, 103 Stat. 1765.)

#### AMENDMENTS

1989—Pub. L. 101-194 amended section generally. Prior to amendment, section read as follows: “The President shall include, in the budget next transmitted under section 1105(a) of title 31 by him to the Congress after the date of the submission of the report and recommendations of the Commission under section 357 of this title, his recommendations with respect to the exact rates of pay which he deems advisable, for those offices and positions within the purview of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of section 356 of this title.”

1985—Pub. L. 99-190 inserted reference to section 1105(a) of title 31, and struck out last sentence defining “budget”.

#### COMMISSION’S FIRST REPORT AFTER JULY 30, 1983, TO INCLUDE RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROPRIATE SALARY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS; PROHIBITION ON RECEIPT OF HONORARIA

Pub. L. 98-63, title I, §908(e), July 30, 1983, 97 Stat. 338, which directed Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries to include in first report required to be submitted by it after July 30, 1983, a recommendation for an appropriate salary for Members, which recommendation was to assume a prohibition on receipt of honoraria by Members, was repealed by Pub. L. 102-90, title I, §6(c), Aug. 14, 1991, 105 Stat. 451.

#### COMPENSATION AND EMOLUMENTS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

Pub. L. 94-2, Feb. 18, 1975, 89 Stat. 4, provided in part that the compensation and other emoluments attached to the Office of the Attorney General on and after Feb. 4, 1975, shall be those that on or after Feb. 18, 1975, attach to offices and positions at level I of the Executive Schedule (section 5312 of Title 5).

#### SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1989 INCREASES

Transmitted to Congress Jan. 9, 1989

H.Doc. No. 101-21, Cong. Rec., vol. 135, pt. 1, p. 251, Jan. 19, 1989

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President):*<sup>1</sup>

As required by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, Public Law 90-206 (2 U.S.C. 351 *et seq.*), the latest Quadrennial Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries (“Commission”) has submitted to me recommendations on salaries for Senators, Representatives, Federal judges, Cabinet officers, and other agency heads, and certain other officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

The statute requires that, in the budget next submitted after receipt of the report of the Commission, I set forth recommendations for adjustment of these salaries. Pursuant to section 225(i), as amended by section 135 of Public Law 99-190 [2 U.S.C. 359], these recommendations will be effective unless Congress disapproves the recommendation by a joint resolution within 30 days following the transmittal of my budget.

The Commission’s report, submitted to me on December 14, 1988, documented both the substantial erosion in the real level of Federal executive pay that has occurred since 1969 and the recruitment and retention problems that have resulted, especially for the Federal judiciary. The Commission is to be commended for its diligent and conscientious effort to address the complicated and complex problems associated with Federal pay levels.

The Commission found that Federal executives and legislators have experienced a decline of approximately 35 percent in real salaries since 1969. In contrast, the salaries of General Schedule employees have declined by only 8 percent over the same period. The Commission’s recommendations go a long way towards compensating for this salary erosion, but they do not make up the full gap. For example, for an official at Executive Level II, which is also the Congressional salary rate, the salary level adjusted for inflation since 1969 would be \$140,340, while the Commission’s recommendation is \$135,000.

Every one of the Commissions that has met over the past 20 years concluded that a pay increase for key Federal officials was necessary. Each Commission found that pay for senior Government officials fell far behind that of their counterparts in the private sector. They also surmised that we cannot afford a Government composed primarily of those wealthy enough to serve.

In accepting the Commission’s salary recommendations, I recognize that we are under a mandate to re-

duce the Federal deficit and hold the costs of Government to an absolute minimum. Thus, while I have decided to propose a pay increase that accepts in full the salary recommendations made by the Commissioners in their report to me last month, this proposal will not increase the deficit; the funding for the pay increase will be fully absorbed within proposed budget levels.

This increase fulfills my promise made in January 1987, that, assuming continued progress toward eliminating the deficit and favorable economic conditions, I would recommend another step toward overcoming the erosion of real income.

While this represents a substantial increase in salaries, it is coupled with the salutary recommendation of a ban on receipt of all honoraria in all branches of Government. Although my recommendation concerning honoraria has no legal effect, I urge the swiftest possible consideration of this important reform. The Commission further recommended that Congress enact legislation to bar officials in the three branches from receiving honoraria. I endorse these recommendations of the Commission as an appropriate step toward better government. A salary increase and a prohibition on receipt of honoraria together will help ensure that the Government is able to attract and keep talented senior officials and that the questions that arise from outside payments of honoraria are put to rest.

Accordingly, pursuant to subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of section 225(f) and section 225(h) of Public Law 90-206 (81 Stat. 643 and 644), as amended [2 U.S.C. 356(A)-(D), 358] [this section]:

For the Vice President of the United States	\$175,000
For offices and positions under the Executive Schedule in subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, as follows:	
Positions at level I .....	155,000
Positions at level II .....	135,000
Positions at level III .....	125,000
Positions at level IV .....	120,000
Positions at level V .....	115,000
For the Speaker of the House of Representatives .....	175,000
For the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, majority leader and minority leader of the Senate, and majority leader and minority leader of the House of Representatives .....	155,000
For Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates to the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico .....	135,000
For other officers and positions in the legislative branch as follows:	
Comptroller General of the United States .....	135,000
Deputy Comptroller General of the United States, Librarian of Congress, and Architect of the Capitol .....	125,000
General Counsel of the General Accounting Office, Deputy Librarian of Congress, and Assistant Architect of the Capitol .....	120,000
For Justices, judges, and other personnel in the judicial branch as follows:	
Chief Justice of the United States .....	175,000
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court .....	165,000
Judges:	
U.S. Courts of Appeals .....	140,000
Court of Military Appeals .....	140,000
U.S. District Courts .....	135,000
Court of International Trade .....	135,000
Tax Court of the United States .....	135,000
U.S. Claims Court .....	135,000

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

<sup>1</sup>**Editorial note.** This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, which were transmitted on January 9, 1989.

DISAPPROVAL OF SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1989 INCREASES

Pub. L. 101-1, Feb. 7, 1989, 102 Stat. 3, provided: "That the Congress disapproves in their entirety the recommendations transmitted to the Congress by the President on January 9, 1989, under section 225(h) of the Federal Salary Act of 1967."

SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1987 INCREASES

Transmitted to Congress Jan. 5, 1987

52 F.R. 4125; 101 Stat. 1967

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)*<sup>1</sup>

As required by Section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, Public Law 90-206, (2 U.S.C. 351 et seq.), the latest Quadrennial Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries ("Quad Commission") has submitted to me recommendations on salaries for Senators, Representatives, Federal judges, Cabinet officers, and other agency heads, and certain other officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

The statute requires that, in the budget next submitted after receipt of the report of the Commission, I set forth recommendations for adjustment of these salaries. Pursuant to section 225(i), as amended by section 135 of Public Law 99-190 [2 U.S.C. 359], these recommendations will be effective unless Congress disapproves the recommendations by a joint resolution within 30 days following the transmittal of my budget.

As referred to in my Budget Message, I am recommending increases in executive level pay for offices and positions within the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government. The Quad Commission's report, submitted to me on December 15th, 1986, documented both the substantial erosion in the real level of Federal executive pay which has occurred since 1969 and the recruitment and retention problems that have resulted, especially for the Federal judiciary. The Commission found that Federal executives and legislators have experienced a decline of over 40 percent in real income since 1969. The Quad Commission is to be commended for its diligent and conscientious effort to address the complicated and complex problems associated with Federal pay levels.

Every one of the Quad Commissions that has met over the past 18 years concluded that a pay increase for key Federal officials was necessary. Each Commission found that pay for senior government officials fell far behind that of their counterparts in the private sector. They also surmised that we cannot afford a Government composed primarily of those wealthy enough to serve. Unfortunately, the last major Quad Commission pay adjustment was in 1977—a decade ago.

In considering the Quad Commission's recommendations, I recognize that we are under a mandate to reduce the Federal deficit and hold the costs of government to an absolute minimum. In this environment, I do not believe that we can overcome the erosion of real income since 1969 of these senior government officials in one step and thus do not believe it would be appropriate to fully implement the Quad Commission's recommendations at this time.

Accordingly, I have decided to propose a pay increase, but have cut substantially the recommendations made by the Quad Commissioners in their report to me last month. This increase is but the first step in addressing the loss of real income documented by the Quad Commission. In addition to this pay raise, I anticipate submitting another salary recommendation prior to leaving office—in response to the recommendations of the next Quad Commission, which will be appointed and will make its recommendations in 1988. While I cannot pre-judge those recommendations, assuming continued

progress toward eliminating the deficit and favorable economic conditions, I would expect to recommend at that time another step toward overcoming that erosion of real income.

Moreover, I have decided to establish a Career Manager Pay Commission to review and report to me by next August on appropriate pay scales for our elite corps of career Government managers—those technically not included in the Quad Commission's mandate. The pay increases I am now proposing to Congress, together with responses to the recommendations of the new Career Manager Pay Commission and the next Quad Commission, are intended to constitute a significant advancement toward placing Government compensation on a fairer and more comparable footing.

Accordingly, pursuant to subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) of subsection (f) of section 225(h) of Public Law 90-206 (81 Stat. 644) [2 U.S.C. 356(A)-(E), 358]:

For the Vice President of the United States	\$115,000
For offices and positions under the Executive Schedule in subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, as follows:	
Positions at level I .....	99,500
Positions at level II .....	89,500
Positions at level III .....	82,500
Positions at level IV .....	77,500
Positions at level V .....	72,500
For the Board of Governors, United States Postal Service .....	10,000
For Speaker of the House of Representatives	115,000
For the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, majority leader and minority leader of the Senate, and majority leader and minority leader of the House of Representatives .....	99,500
For Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates to the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico .....	89,500
For other officers and positions in the legislative branch as follows:	
Comptroller General of the United States .....	89,500
Deputy Comptroller General of the United States, Librarian of Congress, and Architect of the Capitol .....	82,500
Public Printer, General Counsel of the General Accounting Office, Deputy Librarian of Congress, and Assistant Architect of the Capitol .....	77,500
Deputy Public Printer .....	72,500
For Justices, judges, and other personnel in the judicial branch as follows:	
Chief Justice of the United States .....	115,000
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court .....	110,000
Judges:	
Circuit Court of Appeals .....	95,000
Court of Military Appeals .....	95,000
U.S. District Courts .....	89,500
Court of International Trade .....	89,500
Tax Court of the United States .....	89,500
U.S. Claims Court .....	82,500
Special Trial Judges of the Tax Court <sup>2</sup> .....	72,500
Bankruptcy Judges .....	72,500
Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts .....	89,500
Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts .....	72,500
U.S. Magistrates (full-time) (maximum) .....	72,500
U.S. Magistrates (part-time) (maximum) .....	36,200

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

<sup>1</sup>**Editorial note:** This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, which were transmitted on January 5, 1987. The recommendations are effective at the beginning of the first day of the first pay period which begins for such office or position after the end of the thirty day period for congressional consideration (2 U.S.C. 359). The text is published in accordance with 2 U.S.C. 361.

<sup>2</sup>**Editorial note:** This is the text of identical letters addressed to William D. Ford, Chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and John Glenn, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs.

January 23, 1987

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As you undoubtedly realize, the recommendations for Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries accompanying the Fiscal Year 1988 Budget erroneously included one category of position that is no longer directly subject to the quadrennial review process. Under section 1556 of Public Law 99-514, the Tax Reform Act of 1986, Special Trial Judges of the Tax Court no longer have their pay set directly under the quadrennial review process, but are instead paid 90 percent of the salary paid to judges of the Tax Court, a position that does remain under the quadrennial review process. Thus, the inclusion of these positions in the report can be ignored since it was erroneous and of no force and effect.

Under the President's executive pay recommendations, the Tax Court Judges would be paid \$89,500; the Tax Court's Special Trial Judges would consequently be paid \$80,550, rather than the amount shown in the executive pay message (\$72,500).

Sincerely yours,  
**James C. Miller III,**  
 Director.

DISAPPROVAL OF SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1987 INCREASES

Pub. L. 100-6, §3, Feb. 12, 1987, 101 Stat. 94, provided that: "The recommendations of the President relating to rates of pay for offices and positions within the purview of section 225(f) of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 [2 U.S.C. 356], as included (pursuant to section 225(h) of such Act [2 U.S.C. 358]) in the budget transmitted to the Congress for fiscal year 1988, are disapproved."

[The recommendations became effective pursuant to section 359 of this title.]

SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1981 INCREASES

Transmitted to Congress Jan. 7, 1981

H.Doc. No. 97-6, Cong. Rec., vol. 127, pt. 1, p. 241, Jan. 9, 1981

To the Congress of the United States:

If the Federal Government is to meet successfully the enormous challenges it faces in these difficult times, it must be able to attract and retain men and women of outstanding ability and experience for its highest posts.

Monetary awards are not the principal attractions offered by the public service, and complete parity with private sector salaries is neither desirable nor possible. Those who serve at the highest levels of the Federal Government expect and are willing to make some financial sacrifice to serve their country. Nevertheless, compensation levels today have fallen below the point at which they provide adequate monetary recognition of the complexity and importance of top Federal jobs.

The financial sacrifice demanded of top Federal officials is becoming far too great. Since the last quadrennial adjustment in 1977, the salaries of those officials have increased only 5.5 percent. During that same period, the CPI has risen by about 45 percent, which

means that the purchasing power of these salaries has declined by about 28 percent.

I fully recognize that the salaries already being paid these officials look very large to the average taxpayer. But when we are seeking to fill an Assistant Secretary position, a Bureau Chief position, or one of the other top level policymaking positions in the Executive Branch, we want people who know the specialized field involved and who have had extensive experience and success in it. Usually, these people are already being highly paid, and there is a limit to the financial sacrifices they can afford to make.

Not only is the discrepancy between private sector executive pay large now; it is continuing to widen. Since 1977, for example, while Federal executive pay has risen only 5.5 percent, private sector executive pay has gone up about 25 percent. If this gap continues to widen, government service will be so unattractive that increasing numbers of the best qualified will refuse to serve.

These observations apply equally to the selection of judges. The Federal judiciary has traditionally drawn a substantial number of appointees from the top echelons of the legal profession. These individuals are mature, experienced, and often at the height of their career earnings. When they become judges, it is usually at a financial sacrifice. If the sacrifice we ask becomes too great, increasing numbers of those best qualified will refuse consideration for appointment. The Attorney General tells me we are already receiving many declinations from lawyers of the quality we desire. We must not allow that trend to accelerate.

In addition to the recruiting problem, there are important considerations of retention and of equity. Resignations from the Federal bench show a disturbing tendency: only seven Federal judges resigned in the 1950's, and eight in the 1960's; but 24 resigned in the 1970's. Three resigned in 1980 alone.

The Constitution wisely provided that Federal judges would be appointed for life. The founders believed, and experience has confirmed, that lifetime service enhances the integrity and independence of a judge's performance. It also strengthens public confidence that judges possess these qualities, and increases public respect for their decisions. When lifetime judges leave the bench because of inadequate salaries, the public loses more than their experience and efficiency. The public also loses the confidence in the judicial process that is central to the success of our Constitutional system.

Obviously, many judges will not leave the bench even for the much larger salaries they could earn by returning to private practice. But the devotion of these judges should not be rewarded by unfair treatment. Something must be done to encourage and reward continuous judicial service.

Turning now to career executives, you know that Executive Levels IV and V [5 U.S.C. 5315 and 5316] are by law the ceiling for career salaries. You know also that General Schedule salaries have risen by 31.9 percent over the period in which executive salaries rose by only 5.5 percent. As a result, more and more GS employees each year reach the executive pay ceiling.

Consequently, we now have a salary system in which up to seven levels of career executives and managers are all receiving the same pay. Career executives who are promoted to more responsible and demanding positions often receive no pay increase whatsoever to compensate them for taking on heavier responsibilities. Agencies with field organizations, which need to advance successful managers from district offices to regional offices to headquarters offices find it increasingly difficult to persuade capable employees to move their families for "promotions" that carry no pay increase.

One result of this compression is that many experienced and valuable career executives are retiring as quickly as they become eligible for retirement. For the twelve month period ending last March, a startling 75 percent of career executives in the 55-59 age bracket

who were at the executive pay ceiling and were eligible to retire, did so. The result is that talented, experienced and creative public servants are leaving when they are of maximum value to their agencies. Unless these trends are reversed, the nation cannot expect to retain a high quality senior career group.

Congress shares many of these salary problems. We all know that people do not run for office because of the salaries involved, and that many people would run for Congress even if the members drew no pay at all. But it is of vital importance to have Congressional salaries high enough to attract a broad range of people, including those who want their families to enjoy the same standard of living they would if they were carrying even moderately comparable responsibilities in other occupations.

Congressional salaries have experienced the same loss of purchasing power as those already discussed. Yet, Congressmen face even greater expense than the other groups because they must maintain two residences and have other expenses stemming from their unique responsibilities. So they, too, need pay increases.

As the law provides, a Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries has considered these and related salary issues. This Commission, which was composed of distinguished private citizens with no selfish interests in Federal pay scales, made the findings I have summarized above. To correct them, it has unanimously recommended salary increases averaging about 40 percent.

I have no doubt that the facts fully justify those recommendations. Nevertheless, I continue to be concerned that we balance compensation needs against Federal Government leadership in fighting inflation and in minimizing the overall costs of government. Consequently, I am recommending to you in my budget for fiscal year 1982 that smaller increases be allowed at this time, but—just as importantly—that we commit ourselves to allowing future increases annually to prevent these salary problems from continuing to worsen.

As you know, General Schedule employees received increases in fiscal year 1979 and fiscal year 1980 that totaled 16.8 percent. By operation of Public Law 94-82 [see Short Title of 1975 Amendment note set out under 5 U.S.C. 5312], the legal salaries of top level officials also increased by these same amounts. Congress, with my concurrence, enacted appropriation language that temporarily prohibited the payment of those increases to the top officials. Consequently, their payable salaries are now 16.8 percent below their legal salaries. Several judges sued over the application of that appropriation limitation to the judiciary and recently won a Supreme Court decision that means many judges will receive the 16.8 percent in question.

I believe the least we can do at this point is to give the Executive and Legislative branch officials the 16.8 percent already received by most General Schedule employees and already won by the judges. Just as important as the immediate increase, however, is adoption of the principle that we will allow whatever increase is granted General Schedule employees in October of 1981 and in subsequent years to be paid also to the top level officials, as Public Law 94-82 [see Short Title of 1975 Amendment note set out under 5 U.S.C. 5312] provides. Only by following this principle can we prevent the salary muddle from becoming worse every year. Experience has shown that if we wait four years to make salary adjustments in a time of rapid inflation, the needed catch-up will be so large as to be unacceptable to our citizens.

Because the case for a significant increase in the salaries of Federal judges is especially strong, I urge also that Congress give consideration to a salary scale for judges that would explicitly recognize the public importance of continuous judicial service; for example, by an annual or periodic increase for longevity in addition to the cost of living adjustments that are made from time to time.

In addition, I urge that Congress give careful consideration to the five non-salary recommendations made

by the Commission, especially their proposal for a special two year study of the complex and harmful compensation problems that now exist.

The Commission concluded that the conditions I have outlined constitute “. . . a quiet crisis, unperceived by most citizens of the nation but requiring an immediate response by the President and the Congress to safeguard the high quality of its senior officials.” I agree with that conclusion and urge you to act favorably upon my recommendations. President-elect Reagan has authorized me to say that he fully supports these recommendations.

Public Law 95-16 [probably should be 95-19, title IV, §401(a), Apr. 12, 1977, 91 Stat. 45, which amended section 356 of this title] provides that each House must within 60 days conduct a separate recorded vote on my recommendations for each branch of government. In addition, if you wish to accept my recommendation to make the current legal rates payable now, you should amend section 101(c) of Public Law 96-536 [Dec. 16, 1980, 94 Stat. 3167] accordingly.

In the event that you decide you do not wish to approve increases for your own Members, I strongly urge that you allow them for officials of the Executive and Judicial branches. The gravity of the “quiet crisis” those branches face requires you to do no less.

JIMMY CARTER.

DISAPPROVAL OF SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1981 INCREASES

The recommendations of the President for salary increases were disapproved by House Resolution No. 109, Ninety-sixth Congress, Mar. 12, 1981, Senate Resolution No. 89, Ninety-sixth Congress, Mar. 12, 1981, Senate Resolution No. 90, Ninety-sixth Congress, Mar. 12, 1981, Senate Resolution No. 91, Ninety-sixth Congress, Mar. 12, 1981, and Senate Resolution No. 92, Ninety-sixth Congress, Mar. 12, 1981.

SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1977 INCREASES

Transmitted to Congress Jan. 17, 1977

42 F.R. 10297; 91 Stat. 1643

As required by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, Public Law 90-206 (2 U.S.C. 351 et seq.), the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries has submitted to the President recommendations on salaries for Senators, Representatives, Federal judges, Cabinet officers, and other agency heads, and certain other officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

The statute requires the President, in the budget next submitted by him after receipt of the report of the Commission, to set forth his recommendations for adjustment of these salaries. Under the statute, the President's recommendations become effective 30 days following transmittal of the budget, unless in the meantime other rates have been enacted by law or at least one House of Congress has enacted legislation which specifically disapproves all or part of the recommendations.

Accordingly, pursuant to section 225(h) of Public Law 90-206 (81 Stat. 644) [2 U.S.C. 358], the President recommends the following rates of pay for executive, legislative, and judicial offices and positions within the purview of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of subsection (f) of that section [2 U.S.C. 356(A)-(D)]:

For the Vice President of the United States	\$75,000
For offices and positions under the Executive Schedule in subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, as follows:	
Positions at level I .....	66,000
Positions at level II .....	57,500
Positions at level III .....	52,500
Positions at level IV .....	50,000
Positions at level V .....	47,500
For Speaker of the House of Representatives	75,000

For the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, majority leader and minority leader of the Senate, and majority leader and minority leader of the House of Representatives .....	65,000
---	--------

For Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, Delegate to the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico .....	57,500
--	--------

For other officers and positions in the legislative branch as follows:

Comptroller General of the United States .....	57,500
--	--------

Deputy Comptroller General of the United States .....	52,500
---	--------

The Public Printer, Librarian of Congress, Architect of the Capitol, and General Counsel of the General Accounting Office .....	50,000
---	--------

The Deputy Public Printer, Deputy Librarian of Congress, and Assistant Architect of the Capitol .....	47,500
---	--------

For Justices, judges and other personnel in the judicial branch as follows:

Chief Justice of the United States .....	75,000
--	--------

Associate Justices of the Supreme Court .....	72,000
---	--------

Judges, Circuit Court of Appeals; judges, Court of Claims; judges, Court of Military Appeals; judges, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals .....	57,500
---	--------

Judges, District Courts; judges, Customs Court; judges, Tax Court of the United States .....	54,500
--	--------

Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts .....	54,500
--	--------

Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts; Commissioners, Court of Claims; referees in bankruptcy, full time (maximum) ....	48,500
---	--------

Referees in bankruptcy part time (maximum) .....	24,200
--	--------

SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1969 INCREASES

Transmitted to Congress Jan. 15, 1969

34 F.R. 2241; 83 Stat. 863

Public Law 90-206, approved December 16, 1967 [this chapter], established the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries. The Commission is required to make recommendations to the President, at 4-year intervals, on the rates of pay for Senators, Representatives, Federal judges, Cabinet officers and other agency heads, and certain other officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The law requires that the President, in the budget next submitted by him after receipt of a report of the Commission, set forth his recommendations with respect to the exact rates of pay he deems advisable for those offices and positions covered by the law. The President's recommendations become effective 30 days following transmittal of the budget, unless in the meantime other rates have been enacted by law or at least one House of Congress has enacted legislation which specifically disapproves of all or part of the recommendations.

At the request of the President, the first report of the Commission was submitted to him in December 1968. The report has been considered by the President and, in accordance with section 225(h) of Public Law 90-206, approved December 16, 1967, 81 Stat. 644 [this section], the President recommends the following rates of pay for executive, legislative, and judicial offices and positions within the purview of subsection (f) of that section:

A. Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico .....	\$42,500
--	----------

B. For other offices and positions in the legislative branch, as follows:

Comptroller General of the United States .....	\$42,500
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States .....	\$40,000
General Counsel of the United States General Accounting Office, Librarian of Congress, Public Printer, Architect of the Capitol .....	\$38,000
Deputy Librarian of Congress, Deputy Public Printer, Assistant Architect of the Capitol .....	\$36,000

C. For justices, judges, and other personnel in the judicial branch, as follows:

Chief Justice of the United States .....	\$62,500
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court .....	\$60,000
Judges, Circuit Court of Appeals; judges, Court of Claims; judges, Court of Military Appeals; judges, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals .....	\$42,500
Judges, District Courts; judges, Customs Court; judges, Tax Court of the United States; Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts .....	\$40,000
Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; commissioners, Court of Claims; referees in bankruptcy, full-time (maximum) .....	\$36,000
Referees in bankruptcy, part-time (maximum) .....	\$18,000

D. For offices and positions under the Executive Schedule in subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code [sections 5311 to 5317 of title 5, Government Organization and Employees]:

Positions at level I .....	\$60,000
Positions at level II .....	\$42,500
Positions at level III .....	\$40,000
Positions at level IV .....	\$38,000
Positions at level V .....	\$36,000

SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS

This section is referred to in sections 359, 360, 362 of this title.

**§ 359. Effective date of recommendations of President**

(1) None of the President's recommendations under section 358 of this title shall take effect unless approved under paragraph (2).

(2)(A) The recommendations of the President under section 358 of this title shall be considered approved under this paragraph if there is enacted into law a bill or joint resolution approving such recommendations in their entirety. This bill or joint resolution shall be passed by recorded vote to reflect the vote of each Member of Congress thereon.

(B)(i) The provisions of this subparagraph are enacted by the Congress—

(I) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, and shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(II) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedures of

that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(ii) During the 60-calendar-day period beginning on the date that the President transmits his recommendations to the Congress under section 358 of this title, it shall be in order as a matter of highest privilege in each House of Congress to consider a bill or joint resolution, if offered by the majority leader of such House (or a designee), approving such recommendations in their entirety.

(3) Except as provided in paragraph (4), any recommended pay adjustment approved under paragraph (2) shall take effect as of the date proposed by the President under section 358 of this title with respect to such adjustment.

(4)(A) Notwithstanding the approval of the President's pay recommendations in accordance with paragraph (2), none of those recommendations shall take effect unless, between the date on which the bill or resolution approving those recommendations is signed by the President (or otherwise becomes law) and the earliest date as of which the President proposes (under section 358 of this title) that any of those recommendations take effect, an election of Representatives shall have intervened.

(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term "election of Representatives" means an election held on the Tuesday following the first Monday of November in any even-numbered calendar year.

(Pub. L. 90-206, title II, § 225(i), Dec. 16, 1967, 81 Stat. 644; Pub. L. 95-19, title IV, § 401(a), Apr. 12, 1977, 91 Stat. 45; Pub. L. 99-190, § 135(e), Dec. 19, 1985, 99 Stat. 1322; Pub. L. 101-194, title VII, § 701(g), Nov. 30, 1989, 103 Stat. 1765.)

AMENDMENTS

1989—Pub. L. 101-194 amended section generally. Prior to amendment, section read as follows:

"(1) The recommendations of the President which are transmitted to the Congress pursuant to section 358 of this title shall be effective as provided in paragraph (2) of this section unless any such recommendation is disapproved by a joint resolution agreed to by the Congress not later than the last day of the 30-day period which begins on the date of which such recommendations are transmitted to the Congress.

"(2) The effective date of the rate or rates of pay which take effect for an office or position under paragraph (1) of this section shall be the first day of the first pay period which begins for such office or position after the end of the 30-day period described in such paragraph."

1985—Par. (1). Pub. L. 99-190 amended par. (1) generally, substituting provisions relating to the effective date of Presidential recommendations transmitted to Congress pursuant to section 358 of this title, for provisions relating to voting requirements and procedures for Presidential recommendations to Congress.

Par. (2). Pub. L. 99-190 amended par. (2) generally, substituting provisions relating to effective date of rates of pay for offices or positions under par. (1), for provisions relating to later operative dates of Presidential recommendations.

1977—Par. (1). Pub. L. 95-19 substituted provisions directing each house of the Congress to conduct a separate vote within sixty days on each Presidential recommendation with respect to the offices and positions described in section 356(A), (B), (C), and (D) of this title, with the votes to be recorded so as to reflect the votes of each individual member and with each recommenda-