

Jean Brimacombe, assistant to the secretary; Leo Smith, legal counsel; Bjarne Ericksen, president; and Virgil G. O'Neil, director of public relations. Also present was Mrs. Barsch, assistant attorney general, and writer of the attorney general's opinion. Department and employee representation was on hand from the offices of the Secretary of State, the Oregon State Highway Department, the State Printing Department, and the A. F. of L. State, County and Municipal Employee, Paul Walker.

O.S.E.A. speakers against the proposed changes were Forrest Stewart, Virgil G. O'Neil and Leo Smith. Mr. Walker also spoke against the proposals, and it is understood that written objections were handed in from the Highway Department, the A. F. of L., as well as from the Association. Only the Attorney General's representative favored the proposed changes.

The Commission was asked why the proposed changes were necessary and what is wrong with the present rules; with reference to the meaning of a "work day" and why the substitution of the term "business day." No answer was given except "to get away from confusion." Other reasons apparently are not to be made public.

Speakers Outline Points

Forrest Stewart spoke briefly in introduction, stressing the aims of the O.S.E.A., its recognized position as representing a majority of state employees and stressing that our objections to the attorney general's opinion were on the premise that it was rendered on a propounded question which was not entirely germane to or fully representative of the real issue involved.

Virgil O'Neil next spoke, stressing the inconsistencies, discrimination, absurdities and unfairness of the changes. He also questioned the ethics of the Commission in the method resorted to in trying to change the meaning of the law by the use of coined expressions in the rules.

Leo Smith then spoke on the history of legislative actions leading to the

creation of the Civil Service Act; pointing out that it is an *employees* measure, that the Commission's duties under it are to administer it fairly to the employees interests and protection. He showed that the present rules are consistent with the act and that the proposed change in interpreting "days" or "work days" would be in direct conflict with the expressed wording and intent of the act. He appealed to the Commission to remain above their own personal opinions, if and when in variance therewith, and to administer the Act in accordance with its clear intent.

Vacation Leave Practices Now in Effect

For state employees in California, a calendar week of vacation uses up five (5) days of their earned accumulation *regardless* of and entirely aside from the number of hours or days they work in a week.

In Federal Service, where employees accumulate 26 work days vacation per year, a calendar week of vacation counts a five (5) days of vacation leave. This is because they now work on a five-day week basis. Their vacation days earned are *work* days.

The Oregon State Highway Department, with 2,000 or more employees, has for years recognized one *working* day leave for each leave day earned. Also that deductions for leaves without pay should be for employees working days (to the nearest 1/2 day) NOT worked by the employee.

Industrial labor contracts are always based on the workman's work time. Some even say that Saturdays is *always* a time and one-half pay day and that Sundays are double-time days.

Some Oregon state departments and institutions have held for years to a policy that there are no half-working days when deducting from an employee's pay check for absence from work. Although expected to be on the job only one-half day on a Saturday (for instance), absence therefrom costs the employee a *full* days deduction from his pay. This principle of being liberal in *deducting* has also been applied to leaves with pay. Prior to civil