

which may fall in that group of employees varies according to the peculiar duties of the position. The rating for the month is multiplied by the relative weight and that gives the percentage. That percentage is entered on a card and all of these ratings are open to the candidates themselves. We hold promotion examinations of clerks or resident engineers as the case may be and send over to the department a list of those passing the routine work of which we have 50 per cent and the department have 50 per cent, and they find that John Smith has an average for the quarter or six months of so much above par. Transformed to the percentage rating, with 100 for perfect, he may have 90.01 per cent. It is automatic. It has just the one defect, that is the rating of the superior officer, whose judgment may be biased. But that is overcome to this degree: The members of the Board meet as a unit once a quarter and any aggrieved employee can appeal and you cut down that personal element as much as possible and you have this automatic system which works out, we think, to a very satisfactory degree.

Mr. MURRAY: I have listened to the discussion to-day with more interest than to any discussion on efficiency records I have ever heard. I have met men who were familiar with the general principles of Civil Service law and Civil Service administration. I have seen such men afterwards become administrative officers in Civil Service Commissions, and I never knew one of them to have the same idea after he took office as before. I will give an example. In New York our record system is not perfect. Up to the time Dr. Moskowitz took office, over ten years ago, the average length of service of the President was one year and four months. There are sixty-seven departments of New York City keeping efficiency records. There were never any two Presidents who had the same idea of efficiency records. In the year 1909 when the law was changed making effective our present system of records, the system had been based on daily contact with employees in the city government for ten years. When I devised that system I asked the views of employees over two years. It was the concensus of opinion of the employees of the city. The result was a new Commission took office on the 1st of January, 1910. We were just installing the system. In October we had a little trouble with the head of a department. The Commission, headed by a very clever lawyer, passed a resolution saying that under the law of the State of New York the Civil Service Commission had no power to compel the keeping of efficiency records in any form, and I was so notified. I paid no attention to the resolution. When the Civil Service Commission is on record as saying that you cannot do a certain thing you are bound by it. That ran along for a year. The new Commission came in and took a directly opposite view. I had never recognized that resolution and Civil Service records had been kept in the departments for ten months. The President went out and a new one came in. He kept it up about twelve months more. There was not one of those commissioners while in power who had a knowledge of the workings of a single city department. They did not have an opportunity. How could they have? They could not obtain a knowledge of sixty-seven departments. None of them was interested in the workings of any efficiency record system. How could they be? Finally a new Commission came in and instead of building up what had already been done, as usual they said everything was wrong. An army officer cannot explain to a lawyer how a battle was conducted because a lawyer has not had the training to understand military tactics. You cannot explain to a layman what is possible in Civil Service work and in Civil Service administration. Therefore I say that you will never have an efficiency record system in New York or any other place or your Civil Service examinations developed to the extent they might be,