

The two principal reasons for these inequalities in compensation are as follows:

1. The absence of any system of graded classification in the Government service.
2. The different methods used by Congress in making appropriations for salaries, one of which is known as the "lump sum" and the other as the "statutory."

The extreme discrepancies shown in Table 1 and on figure 2 would not be possible if there existed even an approximately adequate system of grading of positions.

A considerable number of engineering positions, particularly in the lower grades, are on the "statutory roll"—that is, the salaries for the positions are fixed annually by Congress in the bill which carries the appropriation for the department. With few and unimportant exceptions, these statutory salaries have not been changed since the date they were first fixed by Act of Congress, ten, twenty, or forty years ago. Hundreds of statutory positions are now vacant, and the money appropriated for them is turned back into the Treasury because it is impossible to fill them at the rates which Congress has fixed. The salaries of the greater part of the technical positions, however, are paid from "lump-sum" appropriations and are fixed by the head of the Department, although Congress ordinarily limits the amount which may be paid as salary under a lump sum appropriation—for example, the \$4,500 maximum limit in the Department of Agriculture. Notwithstanding these limitations, the general scale of salaries on the "lump sum" roll is less inadequate than that on the "statutory" roll. This explains in part the variation in salaries paid for similar positions in different bureaus. For example, the salaries for engineering positions in the General Land Office and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, where there are many statutory positions, are less than those in the Bureau of Standards and in the Geological Survey. Furthermore, compensation in the younger bureaus, such as the Bureau of Mines and the Interstate Commerce Commission, is generally higher than in the older bureaus.

The most striking inequality disclosed by the questionnaires is that between the several civilian bureaus and the four bureaus of the Navy Department. With the exception of Grades 1 and 2, the positions reported for the Navy Department are filled by civilian employees. In 1915 the average salaries in the Navy bureaus in Grades 3 to 7, inclusive, exceeded the average in the civilian bureaus by 2 to 20 per cent. The excess in 1919 is from 40 to 64 per cent. The highest average increase in any grade for the civilian bureaus for the four-year period 1915-1919 is \$265 in Grade 3, or \$66 a year. The highest average increase in the Navy bureaus is in the same grade and amounts to \$1,576, or \$394 a year. This inequality is due to the fact that the salary schedules fixed by the Labor Adjustment Board in its decision of October 24, 1918, were made applicable to the Navy Department, but to none of the other bureaus covered by this report.

Inequalities of this character can be eliminated only by the establishment of a properly graded classification with definite salary limits and having clear definitions of the duties and responsibilities involved and of the amount and character of training and experience required for the several grades.

INADEQUATE COMPENSATION FOR SERVICES.

One of the principal objects of the work of the committee has been to determine an adequate compensation scale for engineering positions in the Government service. In the determination of such a scale, two principles are controlling:

1. No position should pay less than a reasonable living wage.
2. Every position should pay the amount necessary to secure for and retain in the Government service employees capable of conducting the business of the Government with an efficiency and a spirit of initiative equal to that required in private business.

By a "living wage" is meant the amount which will maintain in decency and comfort both the incumbent of the position and his dependents. There are certain positions which are ordinarily occupied by young men and women who are starting on their life work and who have not yet assumed family responsibilities. In so far as the incumbents of these positions fill them temporarily as a means of advancement to positions of greater compensation—are in effect serving as apprentices—the living wage need not be based on a "family" standard. When, however, any position is likely to be occupied more than temporarily by individuals of an age at which they should naturally assume family responsibilities, the minimum