

ployment. Where qualifications are exacting, pay should be somewhat commensurate.

In the New York City Service, for example, we pay superintendents of large hospitals from \$1,800 to \$3,000 per year. Small wonder we cannot attract some of the highest type of professional men and women in the service when they are paid twice or three times as much in private institutions. The discrepancy between the qualifications and the pay would be comic were the effect upon the Service not so serious. If the attempt to standardize duties will result in proper valuation of services rendered by employees, it will advance Civil Service administration immeasurably. Inadequate pay for important and responsible service to the state is false and perverted economy.

We shall never succeed in making public service a dignified and honorable career until we have formulated a scheme of promotion in the Service by providing automatic increases in salary upon the basis of efficiency and seniority, for grades in the service which do not represent new duties but a higher degree of ability in the same duties. Where duties change, a system of practical promotion examinations should be provided for, always taking efficiency records into account. These records should be based upon a study of the factors involved in the duties, the weight attributed to these factors depending upon the nature of these duties.

If an employee does not obtain average efficiency, he should be dropped from the service or given an opportunity to make good at some other position within the grade. Some concrete basis for general inefficiency must be found to eliminate dead wood from the Service and to keep the workers alive and moving toward their goal.

Every enlightened employer offers an incentive to his employees for their advancement. The state has unusual

opportunities to provide such incentives. I need only direct your attention to the educational institutions supported by the state, which can cooperate with Civil Service Commissions by equipping students, either for open competitive or for promotion examinations.

I see no reason why the city government, as an employer, should not cooperate with the colleges and universities in the same way as private employers in Cincinnati co-operate with the City University there, permitting students to alternate between one week of work in the shops and one of study. Apprentices in government is as useful as apprenticeship in private employment. The city will in this way be enabled to provide not only the goal of advancement to city employees, but also the educational means by which it is reached. Progress, through constant effort, will react upon the employee and make him grow. This is essential, for where there is no growth, decay begins.

The element of incentive is supplied, not alone through educational facilities. It is also stimulated through the method of co-operation. Here, too, Civil Service Commissions can take their cue from the experiments of enlightened employers of labor. We hear of arbitration and mediation boards, in which employees are represented to help solve the labor problems of an industry. These employers do not use the method of the industrial despot to get results. They recognize the point of view of the man in overalls or the woman behind the counter. The human side of industry is receiving more attention today than ever before. The human aspect of Civil Service must likewise be the concern of Civil Service Commissions.

Mayor Mitchell has appointed a committee, consisting of three members of his cabinet, of which the President of the Civil Service Commission is Chairman, to consider the prob-