

ficials feel the same responsibility, it is questioned why an *elective* official finds Civil Service so much more distasteful than do appointed ones. Of course, under Civil Service, an employee does not get a job through political influence, but rather on the basis of qualifications for the job. Is that principle bad for elective officials interested in efficient government?

An employee who feels that his superiors should make their own appointments without recourse to the Civil Service principle of "appointment by qualification and merit" immediately raises the question in his hearers' minds that compliance with Civil Service regulations might leave him ineligible. Under Civil Service, such ambitious employees and all employees who desire appointments to higher positions are equal in their opportunity to get the job. Each takes the same tests to show his abilities and the most qualified are given the first chance to accept and to be accepted for the job. That seems fair enough, but there is a second chance for some as, under Civil Service, the appointing authority does not have to accept the first chance employees (as determined by competitive tests) but may reject them within limits and receive new names from which to choose. That seems fair enough, also, to protect an appointing authority from being burdened with undesirable subordinates.

That the work of the Civil Service Department is enlarging is true. It has had to struggle along on a pitifully small budget and has been called on to meet ever-growing personnel needs of the State. Only because of administrative efficiency has it been able to do such a creditable job in putting the Act into effect while at the same time being unduly burdened with thousands of personnel changes and problems brought on by low pay scales. As to its cost, it is budget-limited and operates undermanned. Its wage scales are as relatively low as those of the rest of the State employees. The only way this Depart-

ment can be considered costly is that it has not been permitted to operate as fully as the Act intends it should. It has received too little help from administrator and employee alike. Oregon has a good Civil Service Act; it should be given a chance to fully operate before hasty, destructive criticism and judgment is passed upon it.

The objection that the higher paid workers get the larger increases smacks of envy and dissatisfaction. Very few of us *know* our own worth, but we all have *ideas* about it. The OSEA is on record as favoring higher salaries for top State Officials. It is also on record for parity pay for *all* employees. That does not mean \$15,000 a year for every employee if that amount is the top wage in State service. It is the OSEA policy that each employee's service is worth what other States and private industry are willing to pay for like service. If an accountant would like the pay given a professional doctor, it must be proven that others are willing to pay that accountant the doctor's wage scale. Under Civil Service, the principle is that of "a proper wage schedule for each classified position commensurate with the recognized standard scale for that position." It is granted that all wages paid by the State are comparatively low. It is not a fact that any single one of the present wage scales is too high. If one classification is raised to help overcome its deficiency, that is not in error. Many important positions in the higher brackets would be entirely unfilled today if some of the wage scales had not been materially increased. The unfortunate condition back of this particular complaint is that the State is very, very slow in correcting its errors of the past—all wages need raising in the interest of public service. There are many inconsistencies in effect which need correction. There is nothing gained by calling the *whole* rotten because some of its parts are wormy.

#### Retirement Act Prospects Are Favorable

In discussing objections to Oregon's