

fication of the duties. Such classification, I am sorry to say, does not exist at the present time in the City of New York. Moreover, it should be based upon a system of efficiency records which should be properly kept and adequately supervised by the civil service commission. This is not done at the present time. Efficiency records are meagre in content. They are kept in a perfunctory way, and the civil service commission has never reviewed them, in my judgment, with any degree of effectiveness. To this end, the commission has urged the establishment of a board of review. This board of review will consist of a civil service commissioner, an examiner and a representative of the department whose efficiency records are reviewed. The board of review will afford the employees of the service an opportunity to present their grievances if they have any, and it will give the civil service commission a chance to understand the employment problems of a particular department. It will also help to establish a uniform efficiency record system throughout the city, and, above all, it will enable the various city departments to receive the benefit of any experiment made in connection with the efficiency records in any other department. The civil service commission will thus be in a position to co-operate with the city departments in eliciting the maximum of efficiency from their employees. A proper classification of the duties is important to enable the employee to rise from one grade to another if he has rendered efficient service. The civil service should offer a career, but in order to offer a career it should afford the people of the service a goal which they can reach after having met the qualifications both of efficiency and in ability to enter the higher grade.

I have said that the municipal civil service commission is, or should be, the employment expert of the city.

The commission is not an esoteric institution, which is unrelated to the government. Its interest is not opposed to the interest of the board of estimate, or of any city department. It occupies, in my judgment, the same position to the city service that the large employment bureau of the large corporation or large department store occupies to those institutions. It is a very curious fact that the most efficient people in America, the business men, are abandoning the notion that the maximum of efficiency can be obtained through the methods of a despot or tyrant. The large railroads and the large corporations are making a study of their human material. They are attempting to give to their employees the opportunities which will develop their aptitudes and thus give to the corporation or the service the best that they can give. They have their grievance boards, their boards of arbitration, their employment experts, who do not accept the judgment of immediate superiors that a particular individual is undesirable for their institutions, because, forsooth, he did not give to that particular bureau head satisfactory service. In other words, the modern business man is learning to appreciate the necessity of team co-operation among his employees. He realizes that he can get the most out of them by treating them as human beings and by recognizing any justice in their claims. Nevertheless, we find city officials who profess to be democratic in their instincts maintaining that, in order to secure efficiency in a city department, administrative despotism is necessary. I, for one, do think so. I believe that it is very important to recognize the authority of the executive head. At the same time, I can conceive of considerable abuse of power on the part of a superior officer, and unless some opportunity is offered to the civil servant to present his claims before an impartial body, the efficiency of the