

classification and pay specialists: those who emphasize the importance of internal relativity and tend to ignore the labour market, and those who emphasize the importance of the labour market and tend to ignore internal relativity. The first group is inclined to argue that, in the ideal classification and pay system, there is only one pay plan, into which all positions are slotted according to the principles of job evaluation and held thereafter in a fixed relationship, one to the other. The second group is inclined to argue that, in the ideal system, there are a great many different pay plans, each with a capacity to respond independently to changes in outside rates of pay. After careful study the Committee rejected both extremes. It recognized that some internal rate relationships are extremely important and should be changed only for the most compelling reasons. It recognized also that, in the outside labour market, the wages and salaries of all types of employees do not all change at the same time or in the same amount. It concluded that, when the new structure was being designed, both factors should be kept in mind.

The third objective was to permit different approaches to wage and salary administration, and to personnel administration generally, for different types of employees. There is an accumulation of evidence that some concepts and techniques of personnel administration cannot be applied with equal success to all types of employees. An approach to training that works well with service and maintenance employees may fail badly with professional engineers. The type of information that should be kept on tap in a manpower inventory may vary considerably as between research scientists and clerical personnel. Automatic progression through a salary range may make good sense for the bulk of the Service but, where certain types of professional and administrative personnel are concerned, progression based on an evaluation of individual performance may make a good deal more sense. The Committee concluded that the Public Service, like many large and progressive outside employers, should have a classification structure that would make it possible over time to develop a custom-tailored approach to personnel administration for different groups of employees.

The fourth objective was to provide attractive career patterns and strong incentives to superior performance. In the past 20 or 30 years, a large number of employers in Canada and the United States have experimented successfully with different systems of incentive pay, some related to employee output, some based on a periodic evaluation of employee performance. In recent years, the Civil Service Commission has applied some of the principles involved to limited areas of the Service, most recently to the Senior Officer class and to Research Scientists. The Committee concluded that the possibility of extending their application should be explored when the new system was being developed. The reference to career patterns can be illustrated rather well by a glance at the field of personnel administration. At the present time, officers engaged in this field may be classified as Personnel Administrators, Personnel Officers, Civil Service Commission Officers, Staff Training Officers, Administrative