believing that recognition should be given changes in living costs only after consideration of other factors which would also affect salary level determinations.

In developing the structure of the pay plan it was believed that the first step should be to get all classes of employment into comparable pay groupings, based on an evaluation of their relative responsibility. As a result all classes were assigned to one of 26 pay levels, each of which carried a spread of approximately 30 per cent from minimum to maximum, ranging from a basic minimum rate of $130 per month to a maximum of $600 per month in the classified service. It was recognized that this salary range concept was not completely consistent with prevailing methods of salary or wage payment for certain types of workers. It was believed, nevertheless, that while special adjustment could be made if necessary, it was a matter of first importance that all employees in the classified service be compensated according to similar conditions as a matter of uniform state policy. Both the classification and pay plans underwent public hearings. As a result of final hearings many changes were made. The final plan resulted in a substantial increase in governmental cost for the state but was given complete approval by the legislative at its last session.

Provision was made in rules and regulations that deviations from regular salary adjustment practices should receive the joint approval of the civil service department and the budget director before becoming effective. While the law provided that salary advancements within ranges should be based on merit rather than being automatic, it did not specify the means by which the normal tendency to automatic increases (which are believed undesirable) would be avoided. The commission decided that the best insurance for salary advancements based on merit lay not in integration of the salary plan with a service rating system (which method has been found universally wanting), but to limit salary advancements to a biennial percentage of total payroll, such percentage to be fixed by the budget director.

This method does not ordinarily allow sufficient funds for advancement of all employees every time they be-