

when the Retirement Board withdrew its request to discontinue the excess contribution privilege.

4. We supported the Civil Service Commission proposal to blanket in present employees after learning that Veteran Organizations felt this would better aid the veterans than would the requiring of examinations.
5. We did not present a bill to establish the 5 day 40 hour week or one relative to overtime for State employees on the advice of our Legal Council, our Executive Secretary and others, all of whom told us the request would be denied and we would find ourselves in a worse situation than we are in at present. This advice has proved to be correct so far in the matter of the 5 day 40 hour week.
6. The A. F. S. & M. E. presented several bills which were not on our legislative program and which covered administrative matters that should have been presented to the Civil Service Commission. We were unjustly assailed as "opposing the

interests of the employees" when we maintained a neutral position.

7. The A. F. S. & M. E. also proposed to remove the "open back door" clause in the Civil Service Act. The Association pledged itself to support the "open back door" policy in 1945 and we reaffirmed the position in this instance.
8. Much of the Legislative Committees' and the Legal Counsel's time was taken up in defense of our present personnel legislation. A multitude of amendments were introduced, some harmful, some not harmful but few beneficial. This phase of our legislative work will increase in importance as time goes on.
9. The necessity for the constant attendance of our legal counsel at the session was proven at this session. Mr. F. Leo Smith, as our Legal Counsel, was invaluable and I wish to commend him to you most highly. I attach hereto a copy of his report.

Fraternally,
I. A. DEFRANCE

Counsel Tells of Difficulties in Pressing Legislative Program

To the Board of Directors
Oregon State Employees Association
At Salem, Oregon on April 20, 1947
Gentlemen:

The following is my report to you regarding matters effecting your interest as state employees, which were under consideration by the 44th Legislative Assembly. I was confronted with the task of working in support of some civil service bills, resisting other civil service bills, likewise supporting and resisting retirement bills and supporting and resisting wage and hour legislation. There was a total of 22 bills and in addition, several other issues, which did not ripen into bills, which required work and attention. In commenting upon the specific bills, I will divide them into four categories; Civil Ser-

vice, Retirement, Wages and Hours, and Miscellaneous.

CIVIL SERVICE

S. B. 127, a bill to amend the Civil Service Act, was prepared by the Civil Service Commission. The State Employees Association assisted the Commission in presenting the bill. The bill as adopted, provided:

First, that the Commission may, when it appears clearly to the best interest of the state, require that certain professional, technical or administrative positions be opened to competitive examinations rather than permitting them being filled by promotion.

Second, that in filling vacancies, the number of names to be certified shall be three in case of one vacancy, four in case of two vacancies, and for more