

"giving in" to organized workers may be expressive of a state of mind in which the real trouble is resentment against employee organizations. When the "heat" is on us in our official position, it is easy to forget that democracy in action consists of numerous pressures and pressure groups. It is this pressure group of organized workers which is achieving more than any other single element in our economic life today in remedying the "helplessness" of many workers. All of us decry abuses of power on the part of some labor groups just as we deplore abuses of power by any other organized group of citizens. The democratic method itself may be relied upon for the correction of such tendencies.

Mr. Richey further states "That legislative bodies are confronted only on relatively rare occasions with data comparing salaries in their governmental units with those paid by other organizations in the area may well be one of the reasons why securing action on pay schedule changes is frequently difficult even though it appears from such data that revisions are clearly in order. One can appreciate even an attitude of indifference on the part of legislators when a problem which may have been years in the making is suddenly dumped in their laps for practically an overnight solution."

Would it not be far more convincing if comparative data accumulated over a period of time showed a particular trend in the treatment of certain groups of employees? Shouldn't we know the actual extent of generosity and parsimony in pay matters? The ready availability of such facts would enable the law-makers to deal more intelligently with groups on wage and salary matters. Finally, comparative data of this nature probably would not have to be handed to newspapers in order to obtain further publicity

concerning the operations of existing pay policies.

The payment of salaries which compares reasonably well with those common in non-governmental employment raises some interesting questions. One of them is, "Are all public employees in a particular jurisdiction treated impartially with respect to compensation?" The answer to this is the negative since the most frequent practice is to give many "breaks" to the lower income groups, while the rule at the higher salary levels seems to be a progressive increase in the penalties for working for the government.

He questions "whether or not personnel workers have been preoccupied with compensation schedules which increase in neat little steps or which look nice when plotted on semi-logarithmic charts. It would seem far more logical for a particular governmental unit to pay employees as fairly as possible in comparison with outside standards, doing so up to the maximum salary payable under local conditions.

If such treatment is impossible at the present time, it would appear as though the periodic publication of comparative salary facts would enable progress in this direction and might ultimately lead legislative groups and the public to accept removal of artificial salary limitations."

In discussing salaries at these higher levels, the thought is not in terms of "Poor fellow. He has to scrape along on a measly \$5000 a year." Rather, consideration is being given to the observation that "No greater steps for real governmental economy could be taken than to increase salaries in the higher administrative and professional grades." Unless adequate salaries are paid to employees at the higher grades, we cannot expect to retain in the public service the kind of supervision and leadership capable of "administration

(Continued on Page 21)