

Y 4
P 84/11

1044

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Se 4
P 84/11
11/11/80
17A06

Se 4 COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM EMPLOYEES

GOVERNMENT

Storage



HEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE OF THE COMMITTEE ON OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETIETH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 555

A BILL TO EXTEND THE APPLICATION OF THE CLASSIFICATION PROVISIONS OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, TO CERTAIN POSITIONS IN, AND EMPLOYEES OF, THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

FEBRUARY 15, 1968

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1968

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Oklahoma, *Chairman*

RALPH YARBOROUGH, Texas
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
GALE W. McGEE, Wyoming
DANIEL B. BREWSTER, Maryland
VANCE HARTKE, Indiana
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina

FRANK CARLSON, Kansas
HIRAM L. FONG, Hawaii
J. CALEB BOGGS, Delaware
PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona

POST

JOHN M. BURZIO, *Staff Director*
DAVID MINTON, *General Counsel*
FRANK A. PASCHAL, *Professional Staff Member*
HUGH B. KEY II, *Professional Staff Member*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia, *Chairman*

VANCE HARTKE, Indiana
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina

HIRAM L. FONG, Hawaii
PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona

CONTENTS

	Page
Text of S. 555-----	1
General Accounting Office—Agency report-----	2
STATEMENTS	
Brewster, Hon. Daniel B., a U.S. Senator from the State of Maryland-----	3
Geller, Irving I., director, legal and employee relations, National Federation of Federal Employees-----	22
Griner, John F., national president, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO-----	20
Hershey, Lt. Gen. Lewis B., Director, Selective Service System; accompanied by Col. Bernard T. Franck III, Chief, Office of Legislation and Liaison-----	7
McCart, John A., operations director, Government Employees' Council, AFL-CIO-----	36
Macy, Hon. John W., Jr., Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission-----	4
Walters, Thomas G., legislative representative, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO-----	17
Wolkomir, Nathan T., president, National Federation of Federal Employees-----	26
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	
National local board salary and staffing schedule No. 1-----	12
Salaries of local board employees for years 1967, 1968, and under proposed national pay plan for selected cities—A table-----	10

CONTENTS

1
2
STATISTICS	
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM EMPLOYEES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1968

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 6202, New Senate Office Building, Senator Vance Hartke presiding.

Present: Senator Hartke.

Also present: David Minton, general counsel; Frank A. Paschal, minority clerk; and Hugh B. Key II, professional staff member.

Senator HARTKE. This hearing is convened to take testimony on S. 555, a bill to extend to employees of the local boards in the Selective Service System the rates of pay provided by the General Schedule of the Classification Act.

At this point I will insert in the record a copy of S. 555 and a report from the Comptroller General of the United States.

(S. 555 and the report follow:)

[S. 555, 90th Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To extend the application of the classification provisions of title 5, United States Code, to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5102(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Except as provided by subsections (c) and (d) of this section, this chapter applies to all civilian positions and employees in or under an agency, including positions in local boards and appeal boards within the Selective Service System and employees occupying such positions."

SEC. 2. So much of section 10(b)(4) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 460(b)(4)) as precedes the words "That any officer" is amended to read as follows: "(4) to appoint, and to fix, in accordance with the classification provisions of title 5, United States Code, the compensation of such officers, agents, and employees (including employees of local boards and appeal boards) as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided,*,"

SEC. 3. The rate of basic pay of each employee appointed to a position in a local board or in an appeal board within the Selective Service System prior to the effective date of this Act shall be adjusted, as of such date, as follows:

(1) If the rate of basic compensation of such employee is equal to any scheduled rate for the grade to which the position of such employee is allocated, such rate of basic compensation shall be the new rate of basic compensation for such employee;

(2) If the rate of basic compensation of such employee is less than the minimum scheduled rate for the grade to which the position of such employee is allocated, such minimum rate shall be the new rate of basic compensation for such employee;

(3) If the rate of basic compensation of such employee falls between any two scheduled rates for the grade of which the position of such employee is allocated, the higher of such two rates shall be the new rate of basic compensation for such employee; and

(4) If the rate of basic compensation of such employee is greater than the maximum scheduled rate for the grade to which the position of such employee is allocated, such rate of basic compensation shall be the new rate of basic compensation for such employee.

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect at the beginning of the first pay period which begins more than ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1967.

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of January 30, 1967, requests our report on S. 555.

The bill would amend section 5102(b) of title 5, United States Code and section 10(b) (4) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act so as to require that the classification of positions of employees of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System be governed by the provisions of sections 5101-5115 and their compensation fixed in accordance with the General Schedule of title 5, United States Code. Also, the bill would set forth the rules for adjusting the rates of compensation of employees appointed to a position in a local board or in an appeal board prior to the effective date of the act.

We understand that the compensation of employees of local and appeal boards of the Selective Service System is now fixed to accord with the rates prevailing in a particular locality for similar work. While generally we do not see any objection to placing such employees under the General Schedule it may be that the circumstances of their employment are such that the present method of compensation is more realistic than the salary structure of the General Schedule. We have no information in that regard and consequently are not in a position to make any definite recommendation either for or against the proposed legislation.

We point out that the proposed amendment to the Universal Military Training and Service Act would be sufficient to accomplish the desired purpose of the bill without the necessity of also amending section 5102(b) of title 5, United States Code.

We have one recommendation of a technical nature to make. We suggest, for clarification, that in the title of the bill as well as on page 2, line 4, the phrase "classification provisions of title 5" be changed to "classification provisions of chapter 51, title 5."

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

Senator HARTKE. Our first witness this morning is the Honorable Daniel B. Brewster, senior Senator from the State of Maryland, and the sponsor of S. 555. Senator Brewster, you are going to testify out there, are you?

Senator BREWSTER. With your permission, Mr. Chairman.

Senator HARTKE. Senator Brewster is a distinguished member of the committee and one of the hardest working and most dedicated members of the committee concerned with the welfare of all employees and especially those who live in the State of Maryland.

I just want you to know before you become too enthused I have General Hershey here and General Hershey is a product of the great State of Indiana.

STATEMENT OF HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM
THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Senator BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your gracious introduction and also for allowing me to appear before the subcommittee. I, of course, would like to testify in favor of S. 555, which I introduced on January 19 of last year.

It has long been my desire to have a public hearing on this legislation to bring to light the dubious position of these clerks in the Federal service. In every sense of the word, they are dedicated Federal employees.

They are appointed under all the provisions of the Civil Service Act, are selected from a register resulting from a competitive examination, have the same leave, retirement, life and health insurance benefits, and rights of tenure as all other Federal employees.

Yet, here the similiarity ends—they are not afforded the right of a classified rating and therefore do not enjoy an orderly pay scale with regularly advanced increases. Determination of a local board clerk's salary is made by the State Director of the Selective Service System, who uses the circumstances akin to that particular area and the local rates of pay for comparable work as a basis for this decision.

Mr. Chairman, I contend that these are Federal employees performing Federal work and that they ought to be paid salaries comparable to other Federal workers.

I should like to point out that no other Government activity presently relies so heavily on a single group of people to perform such a controversial function as the Federal Government does upon the selective service employees.

Doubtless, the local board system performs a vital service—one which daily increases in importance to our Nation. And the local board clerk is the lifeblood of the local board system. A selective service board clerk must possess a myriad of talents. He must be a diplomat, an office manager, an amateur psychologist, and must have that special quality needed for getting along with an entire community.

He is responsible for public acceptance of our selective service laws and for the cooperative spirit so necessary to the efficient functioning of our program of mandatory military service.

At this time of world strife and United States involvement, constant focus is on our military system and every facet of its operation. The increased efforts and value of the selective service clerks who form the basis of the procedure to provide the needed manpower, forces us to recognize the plight of the local and appeal board clerks—and it is most glaring.

I have received innumerable letters from clerks attesting to their years of service in the same capacity on a selective service board without increases in compensation. They have a most complex Federal act to administer and do so with the accuracy demanded by the Selective Service System and the compassion demanded by the individual circumstances they must deliberate.

Too many clerks have not had a raise in many years, too many clerks are existing on salaries that most of us would think impossible, and too many clerks are working longer and more diligently today than ever before, with only the hope that we in Congress will remedy the situation and take favorable action on this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you and the other members of this subcommittee to give this legislation your fullest and most favorable consideration. A need exists to correct the disorderly and seemingly inequitable pay system under which the selective service clerks labor, and S. 555, reported from the subcommittee as quickly as possible, would accomplish this end.

Mr. Chairman, I again thank you for allowing me to testify and for your gracious and kind remarks.

Senator HARTKE. Thank you, Senator Brewster, for an excellent and concise statement. We will proceed now to match the forces.

Senator BREWSTER. May I be excused?

Senator HARTKE. Yes, sir, you certainly may.

The next witness we will hear is the Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission—no stranger to this committee. We certainly welcome you this morning, Mr. Macy.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN W. MACY, JR., CHAIRMAN, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. MACY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you this morning to express the views of the Civil Service Commission on S. 555, introduced by Senator Brewster, a bill "To extend the application of the classification provisions of title 5, United States Code, to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government."

S. 555 would bring executive secretaries and clerks of local and appeal boards of the Selective Service System under the classification provision of chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, and under the pay scales of the general schedule.

At present the pay of these Federal employees is fixed administratively under broad guidelines established by the Director of Selective Service. Within these guidelines, each State director is free to establish such rates or system of rates as he believes desirable.

At the request of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Commission and the Selective Service System conducted a joint study of the compensation of clerks of local and appeal boards in 1966 and submitted a report to that committee in January 1967. This study showed a great variation in salary rates among clerks doing essentially the same job in different locations in the country.

On the average, but with many variations from city to city, salaries for clerks in metropolitan areas approximated those for employees doing a similar level of work under the general schedule.

But in smaller cities and rural areas the average salary for local board clerks was significantly lower than general schedule salaries. The different salary rates did not, in general, bear a rational systematic relationship to prevailing rates in the different localities.

The report showed that pay and pay systems varied widely among States. In different States average salaries for positions with substan-

tially the same duties ranged from \$4,500 to \$6,000 in metropolitan areas and from \$3,800 to \$5,000 in rural areas.

In a number of localities, salary rates for local board clerks were found to be very low. Even though their duties were judged to be of a level about equal to GS-4, their pay, in some instances, was equal to the lowest rates in the GS-1 salary range.

Last November, Mr. Chairman, I testified before the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in favor of H.R. 10718 and H.R. 3902, bills similar to S. 555, which would put local board clerical personnel under the general schedule. I pointed out at that time that, in light of the established principles for fixing the pay of clerical personnel in the Federal Government, the regular classification system and the general schedule should be applied to the clerical personnel of local boards of the Selective Service System.

Since that time we have been advised that the Selective Service System plans to install a new administrative pay plan for local board clerical personnel. On the basis of the information which was made available to us, we concluded that the new plan would provide a rational system for compensation of salaried personnel of local boards, and would eliminate the major deficiencies of the existing situation as they were revealed by the joint study.

It would make for rational pay relationships among employees doing similar work and would do away with what we considered to be unjustifiably low salaries paid to employees in many locations.

While it is still the Commission's position that these clerical employees, in the long run, should have their positions classified under the general system and have their pay fixed under the general schedule like other clerical employees of the Federal Government, we have decided that in light of the proposed administrative plan we will not now press for legislation to do this.

Should your committee, Mr. Chairman, decide to take favorable action on S. 555, I should like to suggest substitute language, which, from a technical point of view, I believe would be preferable to that in the bill.

The substitute language is in the attachment to my statement. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have. (The aforementioned attachment follows:)

SUGGESTED SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE FOR S. 555

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 10(b) (4) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (50 App. U.S.C. 460(b) (4)) is amended by striking the first proviso and the word "further" in the second proviso and by amending the language preceding the first proviso to read:

"(4) to appoint officers, agents, and employees as he considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and to fix their compensation:"

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall become effective on the date specified by the Director of Selective Service, but not later than the first day of the first pay period which begins more than twelve months after the date of enactment of this Act.

Senator HARTKE. Does the substitute language in substance modify the effect of the bill presented by Senator Brewster?

Mr. MACY. No; it would merely provide a language which is more in conformity with the text of title 5 and the language that is used with respect to the Classification Act.

Senator HARTKE. Mr. Macy, do we have any other group of Federal employees who are not subject to the general schedule or who are not paid in accordance with the general schedule, or who are not subject to a specific wage rate established similar to the Army-Air Force wage board system?

Mr. MACY. No; I believe, Mr. Chairman, this is the only group that would be outside of the coverage that you specify. The intent in the Selective Service Act was to provide discretion for the Director of Selective Service and for the State directors in the compensation of clerical personnel used in the operations under the System.

Increasingly it has been evident that the duties that are performed by those clerks are comparable to duties performed by other clerical personnel in the Federal service and that in actual fact the jobs could be classified under the Classification Act.

The alternative to the Classification Act is provided in the proposal now advanced by selective service, which would be administratively operable and would provide rates that are roughly comparable to rates in the general schedule but would be subject to the discretion of the Selective Service System in actual administration.

Senator HARTKE. Last year we passed S. 2303 in the Senate. This is a bill establishing a new wage board pay system which would be applicable to our 700,000 skilled tradesmen and craftsmen. If this is enacted or if the new Civil Service Commission wage board program becomes effective, would the principles which are applicable to either of those systems apply to selective service board employees without additional legislation?

Mr. MACY. The Senate-passed bill and the Civil Service plan relate to manual jobs, jobs in the crafts and trades, and therefore neither of those plans would be relevant to this type of personnel, which are administrative and clerical.

Senator HARTKE. As I understand, your recommendation is to follow the plan which is being recommended, as a result of your study, by the Selective Service System?

Mr. MACY. Yes, sir.

Senator HARTKE. You are not basically opposed to this type of legislation?

Mr. MACY. No.

Senator HARTKE. The fact of the matter is you are in sympathy with the general purpose of the legislation.

Mr. MACY. That expresses it exactly. We believe the positions properly come under the general schedule. However, the steps that have been taken to design a new administrative plan we feel eliminate the conditions which we criticized in the joint study.

Senator HARTKE. All right. Thank you, Mr. Macy.

The next witness is a distinguished Hoosier, a longtime public servant and dedicated American, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, who is Director of the Selective Service System. He has with him Col. Bernard T. Franck III, Chief of the Office of Legislation and Liaison. Good morning, gentlemen.

STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. LEWIS B. HERSHEY, DIRECTOR, SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM; ACCOMPANIED BY COL. BERNARD T. FRANCK III, CHIEF, OFFICE OF LEGISLATION AND LIAISON

General HERSHEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I certainly was very, very proud of what Senator Brewster said. He said much better than I could the debt we owe to the local and appeal board clerks. I wouldn't want to take issue with my friend Mr. Macy, but when he says other agencies have people that are comparable to these people he doesn't know these people because, first of all, we call them clerks but, as the Senator has testified, they are diplomats, they are managers, they are a lot of things.

The Selective Service System is engaged in carrying out a vital Federal program essential to our national defense. Throughout modern history the operation of selective service has been charged to the States and communities in response to the lessons of our history that the confidence of the community is necessary to the success of a compulsory military service program and that community confidence is insured only so long as the community itself operates the program.

It is in furtherance of this proven philosophy that the law has, since 1940, provided that the compensation of local board employees shall be determined administratively. This is one method of insuring that the clerks of the local boards, as well as the members who serve without pay, shall have community identification and responsiveness and be subject to local control.

During the year or so preceding enactment of selective service extension legislation last June, extensive studies were conducted by two citizens' commissions, as well as by the Congress itself, all aspects of selective service.

As a result of the report made by the President's Advisory Commission on Selective Service, one of these study groups, the President early last year requested the Congress to extend the induction authority and to consider certain other aspects of selective service operations for possible legislative action.

The President did not suggest any change in the method of employment or compensation of local board employees. The Congress took note of the studies that had been made and specifically endorsed time-proven practices with respect to employment and compensation.

In its enactment of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, while the Congress left untouched the statutory provision for administra-

tively determined pay rates for local board employees, it enacted, in addition, a provision to further enhance and insure local control of the principal local board employee and to further promote community identification and responsiveness of this key Selective Service System official.

The provision I refer to is that amending section 10(b) (3) of the act, designating the chief clerical employee of every local board and of every group of two or more boards as the executive secretary, and limiting the tenure of the person appointed to this position to a maximum of 10 years, subject to reappointment.

The purpose of this amendment was to give to the State and local selective service officials complete control over the appointment, reappointment, tenure, and separation of these employees.

This 1967 amendment, together with the historical provision excluding these employees from the Classification Act, effectively insures that they shall be completely a part of the community team made up of the local board members and their advisers who must operate Selective Service in a manner which retains community confidence.

The Director of Selective Service has delegated to the State directors his authority to administratively determine pay rates for local board employees. Almost universally, State directors have in the past been guided in establishing pay rates by the prevailing rate in the community for comparable work.

While we have not always been able to maintain pay rates under this system at the levels we would have desired, nevertheless, Congress has always provided authority and funds to adjust local board clerical pay on occasions when classified employees have been granted pay increases. The authority to increase the pay of these employees was included in the recent classified employee pay bill, Public Law 90-206, and those raises have been put into effect.

The creation of the position of executive secretary, with its limited tenure and inevitably increased responsibility, in my judgment made it imperative that some substantial pay raises be provided for the persons who would be selected for this position, as it was intended by the Congress that only fully qualified individuals would be appointed or retained in the position of executive secretary.

Since the enactment and approval of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, I have had conducted extensive surveys of existing methods of determining local board employee compensation and have gathered information from State directors as to their estimate of what the position of executive secretary required in the way of salary in the various communities.

As a result of these studies, and again with the objective of seeking a substantial pay raise, not only for executive secretaries but for other clerical help, I have developed a national pay plan which I hope to

fully implement as soon as funds are available which will meet the objective of attaining greater uniformity of local board pay, involving substantial raises in some cases, providing for regular increases, and which will be effective in permitting State directors to attract and retain qualified persons for the positions of executive secretary. The national pay plan has been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and has the Bureau's approval.

Concurrently with the development of a proposed pay schedule for executive secretaries and their clerical assistants, I have drafted proposed regulations governing the appointment, reappointment, tenure, and separation of executive secretaries.

I have not issued these regulations because I felt it was important that the System be able, when putting the executive secretary pay plan into effect, to also provide appropriate salary adjustments.

I believe that, in addition to the traditional reasons for excluding local board employees from the Classification Act, the recent legislation enacted by the Congress creating the position of executive secretary, to replace the chief clerk of every board, the drafting of proposed regulations to put this provision into effect, and the development of a national pay plan for local board employees, make it untimely that S. 555 should now be enacted.

Not only would classification of these employees be a step away from local control, a direction opposite to that taken historically and just recently by the Congress, but might well result in a pay schedule not so well adapted to selective service local board positions with respect to workload and responsibility as the pay plan I propose to put into operation.

I respectfully suggest that S. 555 not be favorably reported.

That is the end of the statement, Mr. Chairman, and I am obviously available for any questioning.

Senator HARTKE. Thank you for a very fine statement, General Hershey, and a good presentation. I would like you to submit for the record the wages which are paid to local boards. I am going to submit a list of these to you.

General HERSHEY. The new pay plan?

Senator HARTKE. I wanted the wages which are presently paid to the local boards and the clerks in the following cities and also in addition to that, if you do have it, what would be their pay under the proposed administrative plan.

General HERSHEY. The pay plan is very easy to furnish and the other information we will make available.

Senator HARTKE. Yes; just put it in the record.

General HERSHEY. The other isn't quite as well set up as the present pay plan is.

(The following information was subsequently submitted by General Hershey:)

SALARIES OF LOCAL BOARD EMPLOYEES FOR YEARS 1967, 1968, AND UNDER PROPOSED NATIONAL PAY PLAN FOR SELECTED CITIES

State, city, and local board No.	1967 rate	1968 rate	Proposed rate	State, city, and local board No.	1967 rate	1968 rate	Proposed rate
INDIANA				MARYLAND			
Evansville:				Easton:			
80 -----	\$5,326	\$5,565	\$7,384	61 -----	\$4,479	\$4,680	\$4,995
	4,989	5,211	5,493	Salisbury:			
	4,219	4,406	4,615	64-65 -----	4,989	5,211	5,565
270 -----	3,975	4,154	4,995	Silver Spring:			
271 -----	3,853	4,028	4,995	53 -----	6,589	6,885	7,184
81 -----	3,731	3,902	4,995		4,113	4,298	4,615
276 -----	3,853	4,028	5,565		4,289	4,466	5,565
279 -----	3,853	4,028	4,995		3,937	4,114	4,466
	3,853	4,028	4,466	TEXAS			
Indianapolis:				Austin:			
49 -----	6,228	6,508	8,054	119 -----	6,653	6,952	7,184
	4,795	5,010	5,327	120 -----	5,603	5,856	6,734
202 -----	4,341	4,532	5,565		5,277	5,509	6,123
205 -----	3,975	4,154	5,565		4,921	5,143	5,493
208 -----	3,975	4,154	5,565		4,798	5,014	5,211
210 -----	4,341	4,532	4,995		5,464	5,710	5,937
213 -----	4,097	4,280	4,995		4,097	4,280	4,615
214 -----	4,219	4,406	4,995	Denton:			
50 -----	4,463	4,658	4,995	33 -----	5,277	5,509	5,751
216 -----	3,975	4,154	5,565	Houston:			
221 -----	4,341	4,532	5,565	56 -----	7,729	8,084	8,323
226 -----	4,097	4,280	5,565	57 -----	5,603	5,856	6,123
51 -----	3,975	4,154	5,565	58 -----	4,798	5,014	5,565
229 -----	3,975	4,154	5,565	59 -----	4,798	5,014	5,565
52 -----	3,853	4,028	4,466	60 -----	4,921	5,143	5,565
233 -----	3,853	4,028	5,565	61 -----	4,521	4,725	5,062
	3,853	4,028	4,466	62 -----	4,398	4,596	4,913
	3,853	4,028	4,466		4,521	4,725	5,062
	3,853	4,028	4,466		4,521	4,725	5,565
Gary:					3,975	4,154	4,466
44 -----	5,540	5,789	6,734		3,975	4,154	4,466
	4,463	4,658	5,565		3,975	4,154	4,466
162 -----	4,219	4,406	5,565		3,975	4,154	4,466
165 -----	4,856	5,067	5,565		3,975	4,154	4,466
166 -----	4,341	4,532	5,565		3,975	4,154	4,466
	4,097	4,280	4,615		4,740	4,953	5,211
170 -----	3,975	4,154	5,565		3,975	4,154	4,466
	3,853	4,028	4,466		4,097	4,280	4,615
Shelbyville:					4,097	4,280	5,565
73 -----	4,441	4,640	4,995		3,975	4,154	4,466
Nappanee (Warsaw):					4,097	4,280	4,615
41 -----	4,841	5,058	5,565		5,683	5,937	6,734
					5,220	5,455	6,734
MARYLAND					5,907	6,173	6,547
Baltimore:					5,907	6,173	6,495
1 -----	5,442	5,686	5,991		5,683	5,937	6,137
2 -----	4,808	5,024	5,327		6,445	6,735	6,959
	5,608	5,860	6,157		4,740	4,953	6,137
	7,303	7,630	7,859		4,740	4,953	5,565
	4,799	5,015	5,327		5,907	6,173	6,495
	4,058	4,245	4,995		5,220	5,455	5,659
	5,608	5,860	6,123		4,740	4,953	5,565
	7,053	7,370	7,630		4,398	4,596	4,995
	3,925	4,108	4,995		3,975	4,154	4,466
	4,413	4,615	4,995	Winkler:			
	7,010	7,325	7,630	105 -----	5,277	5,509	5,751
	4,941	5,163	5,565		4,097	4,280	4,615
	5,576	5,825	6,123	OKLAHOMA			
	5,736	5,991	6,309	Oklahoma City:			
3 -----	4,269	4,466	5,565	55 -----	6,562	6,858	7,184
	4,989	5,211	5,493		5,896	6,157	6,495
	5,736	5,991	6,309		4,269	4,466	4,764
	4,942	5,164	5,565	56 -----	7,090	7,409	7,630
	4,269	4,466	4,764		4,269	4,466	4,995
	4,269	4,466	4,995		3,925	4,108	4,466
	4,557	4,764	5,062	57 -----	6,877	7,184	7,572
5 -----	3,925	4,108	5,565		4,413	4,615	5,565
8 -----	4,413	4,615	4,995	116 -----	4,269	4,466	5,565
11 -----	6,056	6,323	6,681		4,097	4,280	4,615
	3,925	4,108	4,995		4,269	4,466	4,764
15 -----	5,203	5,437	5,751	119 -----	5,096	5,327	5,565
17 -----	5,421	5,658	5,937		3,925	4,108	4,995
20 -----	4,942	5,164	5,565	Durant:			
22 -----	4,798	5,014	5,565	7 -----	4,557	4,764	4,995
26 -----	4,269	4,466	5,565				

SALARIES OF LOCAL BOARD EMPLOYEES FOR YEARS 1967, 1968, AND UNDER PROPOSED NATIONAL PAY PLAN
FOR SELECTED CITIES—Continued

State, city, and local board No.	1967 rate	1968 rate	Proposed rate	State, city, and local board No.	1967 rate	1968 rate	Proposed rate
OKLAHOMA—Con.				OKLAHOMA—Con.			
Sapulpa:				Tulsa: 76—Continued---	3,925	4,108	4,466
19-----	\$5,256	\$5,493	\$5,751		3,925	4,108	4,466
	4,341	4,532	4,764	KANSAS			
Tulsa:				Salina:			
74-----	6,877	7,184	7,409	66-----	5,059	5,287	5,565
	5,256	5,493	5,751	Kansas City:			
	4,058	4,245	4,466	83-----	5,683	5,937	6,137
	3,925	4,108	4,466		3,925	4,108	5,565
75-----	6,877	7,184	7,367	84-----	6,035	6,309	6,547
	4,219	4,406	5,565		4,219	4,406	5,565
	3,925	4,108	4,466	Topeka:			
76-----	6,877	7,184	7,409	71-----	5,683	5,937	6,734
	4,341	4,532	5,565		3,925	4,108	5,565
	4,341	4,532	4,764				

NATIONAL LOCAL BOARD SALARY AND STAFFING SCHEDULE NO. 1

Staffing group No.	Active registration	Number of personnel			Rates and waiting period for next administration pay increase										Over 136 weeks		
		Executive secretary supervising grouped boards	Executive secretary single board	Clerk	Intermittent ¹	Number of hours	Entrance to 52 weeks										
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		9	10
SS-1	0-500		1			20	\$4,995	\$5,161	\$5,327	\$5,493	\$5,659	\$5,825	\$5,991	\$6,157	\$6,323	\$6,489	
SS-2	501 to 1,500		1			28	4,995	5,161	5,327	5,493	5,659	5,825	5,991	6,157	6,323	6,489	
SS-3	1,501 to 2,500		1			32	4,995	5,161	5,327	5,493	5,659	5,825	5,991	6,157	6,323	6,489	
SS-4	2,501 to 3,500		1			40	4,995	5,161	5,327	5,493	5,659	5,825	5,991	6,157	6,323	6,489	
SS-5-A	3,501 to 5,500		1			40	5,565	5,751	5,937	6,123	6,309	6,495	6,681	6,867	7,053	7,239	
SS-5-B			1			20	4,466	4,615	4,764	4,913	5,062	5,211	5,360	5,509	5,658	5,807	
SS-6-A	5,501 to 7,500		1			40	5,565	5,751	5,937	6,123	6,309	6,495	6,681	6,867	7,053	7,239	
SS-6-B			1			20	4,466	4,615	4,764	4,913	5,062	5,211	5,360	5,509	5,658	5,807	
SS-7-A	7,501 to 10,000		1			40	6,137	6,342	6,547	6,752	6,957	7,162	7,367	7,572	7,777	7,982	
SS-7-B			1			40	5,565	5,751	5,937	6,123	6,309	6,495	6,681	6,867	7,053	7,239	
SS-7-C	10,001 to 13,500 ³		1			40	4,466	4,615	4,764	4,913	5,062	5,211	5,360	5,509	5,658	5,807	
SS-7-D			1			20	4,466	4,615	4,764	4,913	5,062	5,211	5,360	5,509	5,658	5,807	
SS-8-A	10,001 to 13,500 ³		1			40	6,734	6,959	7,184	7,409	7,634	7,859	8,084	8,309	8,534	8,759	
SS-8-B			1			40	5,565	5,751	5,937	6,123	6,309	6,495	6,681	6,867	7,053	7,239	
SS-8-C			2			40	4,466	4,615	4,764	4,913	5,062	5,211	5,360	5,509	5,658	5,807	
SS-9			4			40	6,734	6,959	7,184	7,409	7,634	7,859	8,084	8,309	8,534	8,759	
SS-10		8			40	7,384	7,630	7,876	8,122	8,368	8,614	8,860	9,106	9,352	9,598		
SS-11		16			40	8,054	8,323	8,592	8,861	9,130	9,399	9,668	9,937	10,206	10,475		

¹ \$4,466 minimum rate of pay per annum. To be used in absence of executive secretary or as required.
² \$4,466 minimum rate of pay per annum.
³ 1 additional full-time employee for each 3,500 active registration above 13,501.
⁴ Supervision of 2 through 5 executive secretaries.
⁵ Supervision of 6 through 10 executive secretaries.
⁶ Supervision of 11 executive secretaries and up.

Senator HARTKE. Do you evaluate any industry or activity which does not pay rates at least equivalent to the Federal minimum wage?

General HERSHEY. Maybe I didn't get the question.

Senator HARTKE. When you make these judgments do you evaluate any industry or activity? Have you evaluated any industry or activity?

General HERSHEY. We tried with the information we had from the States to set up the pay plans for these different sizes of boards, taking into consideration size of the boards, the number of affected registrants in each board, and a great many other things to try to have enough spread so that there was enough flexibility left for the State director.

For instance, an executive secretary who has 40,000 registrants is in quite a little different situation from one who has 2,500.

Senator HARTKE. I think that would be recognized. Let me ask you would there really be any significant change in duties from the present chief clerk's position to that of an executive secretary, or would it be a new title?

General HERSHEY. Well, it is a new title and they are trying to enhance the prestige, which is long overdue. I do believe that we will probably try, if we have the additional money and the additional prestige, to make every executive secretary as good as the 90 percent or so of the best now.

Senator HARTKE. How many Selective Service Board employees do you have at the present time?

General HERSHEY. Somewhere between 7,000 and 9,000. I would be glad to furnish it.

Senator HARTKE. All right, if you would furnish that for the record. (The requested information follows:)

As of December 31, 1967, there were 7,761 employees, including about 1,800 part time, of Selective Service local and appeal boards whose salaries are determined administratively.

Senator HARTKE. Now, the position of the Selective Service System in regard to this legislation has, as you have indicated, been traditionally to keep the local status and character of the Selective Service System intact. There are those who believe that this also helps to preserve along with it, unfortunately, the very low clerical wages so that a young lady who is employed in the selective service office will not make a much higher wage than maybe a ribbon clerk or a 10-cent-store employee.

What is your response to this kind of analysis of your local wage system?

General HERSHEY. I am not so well informed necessarily perhaps as some of the people who are working in sales. I am afraid that we have never paid as high in the Selective Service System for some of the individuals that I consider much more important than some of the individuals in some other Federal agencies, but some other Federal agencies have come under quite a lot of attack at times by setting up jobs, especially in our rural communities, where the pay is quite out of line with what everybody else pays for a like sort of service.

I don't want in any way to leave any impression that I yield to anybody or any agency because, in the first place, there isn't any other agency in Government like ours, and it is quite easy to prove because we are the result of the experience of 200 years of conflict between the Federal Government and the State on the question of who uses men

for survival. I think that since 1917 there has been a pretty good adjustment there and for that very reason, while we are Federal employees, there is no other agency wherein the Governor is the head of a Federal agency who is in the Selective Service System, and I think there is very good reason for it.

I think there could be some subject of debate on this, but I believe we are in a position to pay the people who are good faster than the Civil Service Commission can. I think, on the other hand, if they are not worth so much we get the criticism of not paying so much.

Senator HARTKE. Let me ask you this. Do draft board employees exercise any discretion generally speaking? Aren't most of the decisions made by the boards themselves?

General HERSHEY. Well, there is no question about the decision being made by the board, but there is the fact that the board rarely sees a registrant unless he happens to be one of these who is dissatisfied. The person who keeps him satisfied is the local board clerk and I think most of the time it isn't the decision that causes the trouble. It is the way somebody told the person about the decision, and that is where the great skill of these local board clerks comes in because, in the first place, they have been able to bare bad news to registrants in a way that has, I think, been outstanding.

I think they have done a marvelous job in making each individual think he is an individual even though some of these girls have listened to the same story 10,000 times and smiled and said, "You certainly have an unusual circumstance," and they must do that, but as far as making the decision the place where they are going to influence decisions is the place where somebody says, "What are the regulations that govern this?" and the clerk is the one that says, "This comes under 203 or 406," and that saves the local board the time of trying to sit down and to look it up themselves.

To that extent there is no question about the fact that anybody who brings facts has some influence. And another thing, I think the public is not aware of the fact that we have literally thousands of classifications and that there is nothing we can do about them. When a fellow is inducted into the service he becomes 1-C. And you don't have to have the local board spend a week moving him from 1-A over to 1-C because there is no other place for him to go and when he goes out he goes from 1-C into 4-A or some other place.

There is no reason in the world why the local board clerks couldn't bring in a pile of papers, and say, "These are the people we inducted in the last month. They should be classified from 1-A to 1-C." And they say, "Make it so."

We have dozens of classifications. When fellows don't pass the examination and the clerk brings in five or six or a dozen of those and says, "These were all rejected at the induction station and have been recommended for 4-F," the local board can make it so, but there isn't any use of them getting into consideration of it.

Senator HARTKE. Let me ask you, has there been any attempt made either by these study groups or otherwise to make any determination as to comparable civil service classifications?

For example, has there been any effort made as to whether their duties would fall within the classification of, say, a GS-4, as Mr. Macy said?

General HERSHEY. We thought about that a great deal and therefore there is going to be some disagreement. Mr. Macy and I would not agree on that because I wouldn't consider that a person who is civil service is capable of exercising all these judgments at a GS-4. I can think of a lot of 4's that are classified as 4's. I wouldn't trade one of these girls who are here for half a dozen of them.

Senator HARTKE. Of course, I think this raises a problem. I mean I think I begin to see now where part of the problem is. What you are really saying is that you do not really subscribe to the basic classification of Federal employees.

Let me ask you if this isn't a fair interpretation of what I glean from what you said. You are saying that you frankly think some of these people in the Federal service system are rated higher than they should be so far as ability comparable to what these girls are doing, and frankly are overpaid.

General HERSHEY. Probably that is an inference that I couldn't deny. On the other hand, believing in living and let live, I don't want to make any judgment on the others. I just have better people.

Senator HARTKE. In other words, you don't want to take on any of them.

General HERSHEY. Well, one of my problems has been trying to get enough money to pay these girls what I think they are worth, but we do find girls at times that we have to keep a little longer before we think they are worth quite as much.

Senator HARTKE. Let me ask you, in that regard do you have a timetable for the administrative plan?

General HERSHEY. Well, no. The one I am going to put in effect?

Senator HARTKE. Yes.

General HERSHEY. I have a timetable but I am up against a supplemental.

Senator HARTKE. This is what I was going to ask you. Have you submitted a budget?

General HERSHEY. Well, one of the problems is, I think, that the Budget—I believe I am correct in this—ruled that I have to get specially appropriated money in order to raise the pay and create the jobs of executive secretary. I could create the jobs and couldn't give them any money because the legislation is authorizing legislation but not appropriation legislation, and I have no money appropriated to pay the executive secretary.

Senator HARTKE. I think in all fairness to these people they shouldn't be held waiting in anticipation of something. In other words, if you are just going to give them a title that is one thing. I think we can give them a new title without any problem.

But what I was wondering was whether you have submitted a budget request to the Budget Bureau?

General HERSHEY. Yes. In fact, I don't want to criticize anybody again, but this has been one of the most horrible things that I have had to deal with in the last 6 or 8 months. You see, we have had this Executive directive all this time and I have not been able to put it in.

First of all, there were a lot of reasons why the supplementals didn't move before Christmas. They happened to be the unusual things, but the supplemental didn't get anyplace.

At the present time I have a supplemental in, but the best I can hope for is probably April before we will get any money on it.

Senator HARTKE. Let me ask you. What if we enact your plan, the administrative plan? What if we put it into law? Will you be in favor of that?

General HERSHEY. Would I put it into law?

Senator HARTKE. In other words, instead of doing it administratively, what if we took your proposal and enacted it as legislation?

General HERSHEY. We legislate today on the best knowledge we have and tomorrow everything that we did may change. I have to live with the possibilities of change very, very suddenly, and one of the reasons why we have lived for 27 years has been the flexibility, and we haven't tried to legalize every detail.

Therefore, I obviously believe in our business you have to leave more to administrative trust, and in fact you should, but I do not favor putting all of these details into law because the next thing that happens is the situation changes and then you have to change the law, and that isn't nearly as easy to change as an Executive order, and that takes long enough.

Senator HARTKE. Let me ask you this, General. Do you have an estimate of the amount of money that it would take to put your administrative plan into operation?

General HERSHEY. I believe I am going to get about \$1.3 million or something like that for this short period, but for the year it will run around \$4 million, \$2 to \$4 million. I talked to Mr. Macy just before I came up and I think his remembrance was that somewhere around \$2 or \$3 million would put us under the classification. I don't want to make any claim even though I am not trying to save Government money.

I have saved quite a little more than I would like to at times, but this was an attempt to try the best we could to maintain flexibility, to maintain our community relationships, and to try to do something for the people that I yield to nobody in having the highest regard for, because what has made the Selective Service System in theory, and probably in practice, has been the local board.

What has made the local board possible has been the local board clerks, because they are the ones that see 90 percent of the people. None of the rest of us sees anywhere near that number.

Senator HARTKE. Those are all the questions I have. I want to thank you for your testimony. Thank you for taking your valuable time to be with us this morning. Take care of Indiana, General.

General HERSHEY. Yes, sir. I was flattered to be in your city before you were on earth.

Senator HARTKE. That's right. That is when I was mayor. We are talking about a few days ago.

All right. The next witness we have this morning is Mr. John F. Griner, president of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO; who is accompanied by Mr. Thomas G. Walters, legislative representative; and Mr. Carl K. Sadler, assistant legislative representative. Are they here?

STATEMENT OF THOMAS G. WALTERS, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO

Mr. WALTERS. No, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for their having other commitments.

Senator HARTKE. Only the boss works, is that right?

Mr. WALTERS. You said that. I didn't.

Senator HARTKE. All right. I am just making your load a little easier for you when you get back to the office.

Mr. WALTERS. I enjoy what you said. I just didn't want to say it myself. Thank you.

Senator HARTKE. I understand.

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. Chairman, the American Federation of Government Employees appreciates the opportunity and privilege of appearing before this committee to represent our 270,000 members, and I might say that we have a goodly number of members in the selective service throughout the country.

I am persuaded to say that in my humble opinion General Hershey made a better witness than I can make in favor of this bill that is pending before this committee because he admitted, I think very frankly, that he preferred to continue to have some say-so in the pay that is paid these people, and of course if every head of every agency in the Government had that same privilege then we would, I think, have chaos in a double measure.

Having served as the first chairman of my local draft board down in Georgia when it was reactivated in the early 1940's, I think I know from experience some of the pitfalls and some of the reasons why these salaries have been a hodgepodge patchwork setup, because at least when the thing was first reactivated we were instructed when we were appointed by the Governor—at least I was—to contact the officials of the county “and work out your salary scale to pay your people.”

That we did. Shortly thereafter the chairman of the local board in an adjoining county came to see me and said that he would like for us to cut our top man \$35 a month, and I asked him why and he said, well, he couldn't get his county officials to pay that much.

I said, “Well, I'm certainly not going to recommend that we cut salaries. You go back home and raise your salaries if you want to equalize it.”

Also, Mr. Chairman, I cannot for the life of me see that these people are any closer to the community than a post office clerk, or a letter carrier, or a rural carrier, or anybody else who works in the county or small town, and if we are going to set the wages and salaries just to keep a community happy then I think we are missing the boat as far as the individual and the employees are concerned.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to file our statement and just touch on one or two high spots of it so that you can move on with the hearing.

Senator HARTKE. The entire statement will appear in the record at the conclusion of your statement.

Mr. WALTERS. Thank you. As I recall, back in the early days of this, the reason for having salaries set by individuals rather than by law was that they thought it would be a temporary setup for the draft boards.

Well, it has proven that it is not temporary and it doesn't look like in the future that it is going to be temporary.

Senator HARTKE. I would like to do something to make it temporary.

Mr. WALTERS. I agree with you there, Senator, very much, but I don't think it is in the cards at this moment. I would hope so. I would hope we could do away with all draft boards, but that is another question, a big one.

Senator HARTKE. I am not so interested in doing away with draft boards. I am just interested in doing away with the reason for the draft boards being in existence.

Mr. WALTERS. We are in agreement.

Senator HARTKE. All right. I just wanted to stay on the same side with you.

Mr. WALTERS. Talking about not being able to get money, if these people were under the Classification Act they would get salary adjustments and classified salaries the same as any other employees when you good folks up here pass laws to give them those increases, and from my experience—I think that there was something said about grade 4—I think that would be a good slot to begin to think about putting the secretaries and the stenographic people in.

Now, the so-called managers of the local draft offices, the top people, of course, would need to go in a higher slot in my opinion, and I am sure they would if they were placed under the Classification Act and the Civil Service Commission made the survey and put the people in the slot where they thought they belonged.

On page 2 of our statement down near the middle I would like to quote from General Hershey on November 7, 1967. He stated:

I continue to support the present provisions of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 which exempts these employees from the Classification Act of 1949.

He continued:

Briefly, the philosophy behind this exception is that it is important to the successful operation of Selective Service that every measure be taken to preserve and enhance the community orientation of the local board made up of local unpaid citizens and compensated clerical help.

We in the AFGE don't believe that that statement is any more applicable to these people than it would be to people who work in the post offices or any other Government establishment that is in that community because I am sure that all Federal employees desire to be a part of their community and a part of the civic organizations and so forth.

Then in the 1966 hearings I quote from General Hershey:

I do not believe that the rest of the Government has a comparable person that has the individual responsibility that a local board clerk has, with the knowledge that he has to have, and the fact that he is pretty near an office manager.

I am sure if you talked to people who were in the Internal Revenue Service and many other complicated services in our great Government you would get very few people to agree with that statement that these folks have a peculiar sense of intelligence, or know-how, or whatever you might want to call it.

This joint study that the House suggested, and all parties agreed to, brought forth some very startling figures.

A joint study by the Selective Service System and Civil Service Commission of the pay of local and appeal board clerical personnel of the System made in 1966 indicated clearly the need for bringing these positions under such a uniform pay system as that provided by the Classification Act. The detailed report of the findings of this study appears in the appendix to the hearing by the Subcommittee on Manpower of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on November 7, 1967.

This study brought out the fact that pay varies from county to county. For example, in four counties in New York State salaries of local board clerks ranged from \$4,463 to \$4,856. In ten counties in Wisconsin local board clerk salary rates ranged from \$3,560 to \$4,856. In Texas, such salaries in four rural counties varied from \$4,056 to \$5,464.

I apologize for not having any figures from Indiana, Mr. Chairman, but we can get them.

Senator HARTKE. That is a fatal error. It detracts from your testimony, incidentally.

Mr. WALTERS. We will certainly load up the record with facts on Indiana. I am quoting now Chairman Macy in the hearing last November, and he made reference to it this morning I might add:

The Commission's position has been changed since the study was conducted because the study revealed that there is no rationale, or systematic method by which the prevailing rates are determined and there are widespread differences in variations from locality to locality; that there is not a regular system for adjustments; that this is left entirely to the discretion of the local management.

Now, in this day that we are living, in this age, I can hardly fathom anyone that would want to continue a practice such as described by Chairman John Macy in this statement.

These selective service board employees are just as much Federal employees as are other workers in the Government service, and they should be treated as such. In many communities these draft board employees have close contact with other Federal employees in the course of their daily work. They have lunch with them, and in many instances they occupy the same buildings. They are working for the Federal Government. But there is one respect in which they differ. They do not receive the same pay for the same type of work.

Preceding hearings on legislation having this objective have included statements showing that the pay of these selective service employees varies. In different communities they receive rates of pay which may reflect rates in the communities. The rate-fixing method in use was thus described by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission at a hearing on a similar bill in April 1966:

Since there is no law specifying how the salaries for employees in these positions must be determined, the Director of Selective Service may fix their pay by the method he finds best suited to meet the needs of the organization. Because of the emphasis which selective service officials place on the need to preserve the community character of the boards, salaries of the clerks have been related to rates paid in the localities which they serve. To the extent that appropriations are available, the Director may change the pay of these employees at any time without further action by the Congress.

We don't think that that is a good thing. We don't think it is the humane thing to do. We just oppose that type of procedure in the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the opportunity of the American Federation of Government Employees appearing in support of the intent of this legislation. We trust that this committee will move fast to bring about a great need, in our opinion, to these approximately 8,500 employees in selective service boards. We in the AFGE will be happy to do whatever we can to assist in bringing this much needed legislation out in the open so that the public will realize it and I am sure that the public would support you and the members of this committee in bringing these people under the Classification Act.

I thank you, sir.

Senator HARTKE. Thank you a lot. I have no questions.

Mr. WALTERS. Thank you.

(The complete statement of John F. Griner, national president, American Federation of Government Employees, follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN F. GRINER, NATIONAL PRESIDENT, AMERICAN
FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The intent of S. 555, introduced by Senator Brewster, is to make the positions and employees of the local boards and appeals boards of the Selective Service System subject to the provisions of law governing the Classification system of compensating Federal employees.

Salaries would be fixed in accordance with the rates provided in the General Schedule which determines the rates of pay for classified employees.

The American Federation of Government Employees endorses the purpose of this bill. Contrary to statements made about this bill and prior bills having the same intent, this proposal is logical from an administrative standpoint and equitable for the employees involved.

There is no sound reason for continuing the exclusion of these employees from the benefits of an orderly system which dictates the grade and pay of nearly 1.2 million other Federal workers. It has been said in opposition to this item of legislation that these employees should continue to remain outside the general classification system because they are serving local communities. But why should they be identified with a community in any way that is different from that of thousands of other Federal employees who are recruited from communities in which they live and work?

Employees of the local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service system are appointed by State Directors, but apparently rates of pay reflect the wishes of local board members. We might as well be frank, Mr. Chairman, and recognize the fact that members of local boards are in many, many cases local politicians. Thus, the operation of the board, as it relates to personnel, is bound to have political overtones.

We should not have politics in the operation of these boards—that is, in the selection and compensation of their personnel. It is not fair to the employees.

General Lewis Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, in his statement to a House Subcommittee on Civil Service of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on April 18, 1966, stated his opposition to this legislation by saying "we believe it to be unnecessary."

Testifying before the Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service of the same House Committee on November 7, 1967, General Hershey stated that "I continue to support the present provisions of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 which exempts these employees from the Classification Act of 1949." He continued:

"Briefly, the philosophy behind this exception is that it is important to the successful operation of selective service that every measure be taken to preserve and enhance the community orientation of the local board made up of local unpaid citizens and compensated clerical help."

This is no valid reason for denying these employees the rates of compensation to which they are entitled.

At the 1966 hearing, General Hershey, though opposing classification of these positions, emphasized their importance and in effect stated a sound reason for their coverage by the Classification Act. He said:

"I do not believe that the rest of the Government has a comparable person that has the individual responsibility that a local board clerk has, with the knowledge that he has to have, and the fact that he is pretty near an office manager."

Perhaps these remarks that the legislation is "unnecessary" reflect the latent fear that this Bill might disrupt the clerical staffs of local boards. This impression should not exist because it is the expectation that present local board employees will qualify under the Classification Act at least as TAPERS who can, after a required period of further service, become full-fledged Classified employees.

It is our understanding that these Selective Service employees are appointed upon the recommendation of local board members and that the salary of such employees reflect the wishes of the members. While these employees receive such benefits as retirement and annual and sick leave, as do other Federal employees, they do not share the same right of appeal, particularly when it relates to the classification and compensation of their positions. Their status is tenuous and subject largely to the decisions of board members many of whom apply divergent standards.

A joint study by the Selective Service System and Civil Service Commission to the pay of local and appeal board clerical personnel of the System made in 1966 indicated clearly the need for bringing these positions under such a uniform pay system as that provided by the Classification Act. The detailed report of the findings of this study appears in the appendix to the hearing by the Subcommittee on Manpower of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on November 7, 1967.

This study brought out the fact that pay varies from county to county. For example, in four counties in New York State salaries of local board clerks ranged from \$4,463 to \$4,856. In ten counties in Wisconsin local board clerk salary rates ranged from \$3,560 to \$4,856. In Texas, such salaries in four rural counties varied from \$4,856 to \$5,464.

Chairman Macy of the Civil Service Commission at a hearing before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee last November made the following comment on the need for uniformity of pay-rate fixing for these boards:

"The Commission's position has been changed since the study was conducted because the study revealed that there is no rationale, or systematic method by which the prevailing rates are determined and there are widespread differences in variations from locality to locality; that there is not a regular system for adjustments; that this is left entirely to the discretion of the local management."

The persons affected by this legislation are clerical employees. They are not members of Selective Service Boards. They are performing clerical duties much like the duties performed by thousands of Federal employees who do the office work for numerous other governmental activities. They are drawn from Civil Service registers and after appointment they enjoy such other employee benefits, such as leave and retirement, but they do not have the benefit of the uniform salary system which determines the compensation of the large group of white-collar employees. In other words, they are Federal employees except for their rates of pay. That, Mr. Chairman, make little sense.

These Selective Service board employees are just as much Federal employees as are other workers in the Government service, and they should be treated as such. In many communities these draft board employees have close contact with other Federal employees in the course of their daily work. They have lunch with them, and in many instances they occupy the same buildings. They are working for the Federal Government. But there is one respect in which they differ. They do not receive the same pay for the same type of work.

Preceding hearings on legislation having this objective have included statements showing that the pay of these Selective Service varies. In different communities they receive rates of pay which may reflect rates in the communities. The rate-fixing method in use was thus described by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission at a hearing on a similar bill in April 1966:

"Since there is no law specifying how the salaries for employees in these positions must be determined, the Director of Selective Service may fix their pay by the method he finds best suited to meet the needs of the organization. Because of the emphasis which Selective Service officials place on the need to preserve

the community character of the boards, salaries of the clerks have been related to rates paid in the localities which they serve. To the extent that appropriations are available, the Director may change the pay of these employees at any time without further action by the Congress."

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this kind of pay determination for a group of employees working for the Federal Government for which Congress appropriates the funds for its operation is nothing short of preposterous. What other government agency could draw public funds to operate under a Federal law and be conceded the right to fix the salaries of its employees according to the whim of its officials? It would seem that the facts concerning the method of rate-fixing and the utter lack of uniformity, to say nothing of simple fairness, in themselves prove the need for bringing the entire Selective Service System under the General Schedule which provides the rates of pay for the bulk of Government's white-collar employees.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to present this plea for equity for this fine group of government employees.

Senator HARTKE. The next witness is Mr. Nathan Wolkomir, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees. With him is Mr. Irving I. Geller, director of legal and employee relations. Is that right?

STATEMENT OF IRVING I. GELLER, DIRECTOR, LEGAL AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. GELLER. I am Irving I. Geller, director of the legal and employee relations department. Mr. Wolkomir, president of our organization, is unavoidably out of town. He is very much interested in this legislation, S. 555, and he asked me to present the testimony of the National Federation of Federal Employees.

Our organization has many members in virtually each agency of the Government, and in particular we enjoy a substantial membership among the selective service employees and have secured both exclusive and formal recognition for such employees.

We believe that our activity on behalf of selective service employees was the forerunner to the introduction of this bill. Later I would like to take time out to read a few letters from the people in the field. I think it would be useful. I will try to synthesize the complaints. Many of them have been touched on here at the hearing.

Senator HARTKE. Mr. Geller, there is an old adage in the law business that I learned very early: that if the judge is inclined to be sympathetic, don't overstate your case.

Mr. GELLER. Thank you. I appreciate that observation.

There are, the General testified, close to 7,000 employees who are compensated under this system. I think, sir, that you asked some pertinent questions with regard to the President's direction to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission in terms of his efforts in coordinating wage board activities throughout the Government.

The reason that came about is the very reason that we are here, Mr. Chairman. Under the wage board system almost every agency pays a different salary for comparable work in the same locality of the country. This is the situation that we are faced with.

The selective service employees work along with Veterans' Administration contact representatives, Public Health Service representatives, Department of Agriculture employees, and Internal Revenue Service employees, in the same area.

However, they do not receive the benefits of the Classification Act. The Classification Act was originally passed for this very reason, that each of the agencies, and frequently within the agency, paid employees different rates of pay. The General has been very complimentary of the selective service employees in the field.

We cannot understand why that respect for the employees is not reflected in a system that has been established for all Federal service employees.

The passage of the Classification Act led to a uniform system and this has permitted all employees performing substantially equal work to receive substantially equal pay.

Senator HARTKE. Let me ask you a question. I have looked through all these statements that you people are submitting on behalf of these employees. What is their comparable situation to the classification employees? The only person who came here that even came close was Mr. Macy.

Quite frankly, I don't mind listening to all the descriptions of the history of the Classification Act, but most of the members of the committee are familiar with that. What I do not see in any one of these statements are two significant factors.

No. 1, what should these people be? What in your opinion should they be? What do they think they should be? What classification are we talking about? Then how much money is involved? We are talking about the facts of life. You are asking for legislation in generalities here without giving any specifics to back it up.

You expect my staff or this staff to do your work for you? Where is your homework?

Mr. GELLER. Well, I believe that we have done our homework well.

Senator HARTKE. Well, where is it?

Mr. GELLER. I would gladly volunteer my services to classified—

Senator HARTKE. You don't have to volunteer anything to me. You have come here and testified as a representative of employees. I didn't ask you to come, as I understand it. You requested to appear.

Mr. GELLER. That is correct.

Senator HARTKE. All right. Now, what are you giving us which is significant? I am not going to take my staff and do your work for you and ask and find out from these people what they should be. I would like to know what type of work. I haven't found out yet.

The only thing I have is a rather indefinite statement from Mr. Macy about a 4. I asked General Hershey what classification he thought they were comparable to. What is an executive secretary of this type? Where would they be? How would you substantiate it? That type of testimony would be very convincing to me.

Quite honestly, I am going to tell you I looked through these statements and they are nice, glowing terms. I don't know whether you wrote them or who wrote them. I mean they are written well. It is good English and nice rhetoric, but rhetoric doesn't convince me of anything.

What I would like to know is what do these people do. This is what I am talking about. With all due respect to your letters, they will be self-serving letters. I don't blame any employee for complaining. As I stated a moment ago, don't overstate your case.

What I am telling you is as long as you continue in this line you are doing your case more harm than good. You understand what I am telling you?

Mr. GELLER. I read you well.

Senator HARTKE. I would like to see you come back and I think you would be well advised if you come back and do an in-depth study of what these people need. When the overseas teachers were here they gave us specifics: where they are and what they teach, what an elementary teacher was making in New York, what they were making in Washington and what they were making in every one of these places. They had the same problem, a very small group of Federal employees who were being mistreated.

In my opinion, you have the same situation today. It is obvious that you have some Federal employees here who are not being treated on a comparable basis, but you don't give us anything to go on.

Mr. GELLER. Mr. Chairman, in the attachment you will find a job description for a board clerk. Now, it does vary.

Senator HARTKE. Where is that?

Mr. GELLER. It is the second attachment.

Senator HARTKE. You tell me where it is.

Mr. GELLER. It is written by Rebecca T. Jenkins. It is the second attachment of the testimony.

Mr. PASCHAL. It wasn't on the statement you handed in.

Senator HARTKE. I don't mean to be harsh on you, but I am busy, too, and I don't want to come here and listen to you give me a lot of these fine words. When you started out, I tried to get you to shorten your testimony and you took it and you just went ahead with it.

I am telling you, as far as when you appear before me in the future, you come with the specifics and I will listen to you, but if I have to be bored by what I am listening to, I am frankly not going to pay much attention to you. That won't hurt. I want these clerks to know it won't make any difference. I just want you to know that I want you to do your homework and it is not done.

Mr. GELLER. May I read to you the statement of one of the employees?

Senator HARTKE. Whom is it by?

Mr. GELLER. Beg pardon?

Senator HARTKE. I would like to identify her. Go ahead.

Mr. GELLER. This is from Sparta, Tenn., a local board clerk member. These were submitted yesterday, Mr. Chairman:

As clerk of a Selective Service Board, I am responsible for all office work. Listed below are some of the duties of this office: Registration of the young men of our county as they reach their eighteenth birthday, making up and mailing Registration Certificates and Classification Questionnaires to each registrant, making up and mailing Classification Notices to all who have been classified by the local board. Our board is made up of three members. The board makes all classifications—

Do you want me to continue?

Senator HARTKE. Let me come on back. I finally got from Mr. Minton here comments on this thing and we have another member here that doesn't even have a copy of it. It is all very good.

What I am trying to tell you is I am going to ask you to submit it for the record. I don't want to know what one employee does. You are asking for a general classification and general regulation putting these people under the civil service system.

Basically, I am inclined to think that is right. All right.

Now, I have already told you that, so you are already 16 points ahead of the game and you are going into the final quarter and just don't throw the thing away. What I am trying to find out is do you have any basic information to be very helpful to us which would be very persuasive to these other people?

The first thing we will do when the rest of the members of this committee meet is they will say, "Well, what type of work do they do?" I will say, "I am sorry. We didn't develop that in the hearings."

Mr. GELLER. Mr. Chairman, we shall submit, within a period of 2 weeks' time, job classifications for as many areas of the country as we have available. This information is not readily available from the selective service offices.

However, we will furnish that to you with our estimate of the job classification for each of the critical jobs.

Senator HARTKE. All right. You may proceed with whatever you want to. I mean I will listen to you.

Mr. GELLER. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to burden the record any further. We will, immediately after this hearing concludes, proceed to work up job classifications for each of the jobs in the Selective Service System at the various boards and appeal boards in as many areas of the country as we can.

I appreciate your criticism. We will endeavor to comply with your request, and if this is what you need, this is what we will furnish.

Senator HARTKE. I am not wanting a lot of detailed information, but I mean in this one report here, in the study at least, they came in and they gave a comparison of certain areas and what the jobs were. Here on your statement let me show you this:

There is attached to this testimony several typical letters of Selective Service employees indicating their feeling regarding their pay and other significant aspects of their work.

Look, I understand this, but there are 7,000. I would imagine if you wanted to you would have 7,000 different letters. What I am asking you is not make Mr. Minton over here hunt as he did to find out where your testimony was and another member here of our staff doesn't even have a copy of the information.

You say it was submitted, but I don't know in point of fact whether it was submitted or not.

Mr. GELLER. There were 50 copies submitted of the testimony, Mr. Chairman.

Senator HARTKE. Let me state to you that the entire statement will appear in the record and so will the addendums to it. I don't want any of these people discouraged about what is going on, but I do feel that in a hearing of this kind you ought to present something more than self-serving declarations of individuals and I think you ought to say something which is factually helpful to us.

Mr. GELLER. Well, we endeavored to do that. However, we will accommodate your request. We find it useful and we will submit something.

Senator HARTKE. All right. Let me say to you I won't mean to direct my concern to you personally or to the rest of the testimony here.

Mr. GELLER. Thank you very much.

(The complete statement and the letters referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF NATHAN T. WOLKOMIR, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

My name is Nathan T. Wolkomir. I am President of the National Federation of Federal Employees. We have members in virtually all Departments and Agencies worldwide and, in particular, we enjoy a substantial membership of Selective Service Employees throughout the country. We have been granted both Exclusive and Formal Recognition in several States of the Union.

At the outset, I wish to express the appreciation of our organization to the Chairman and Members of this Subcommittee for their sympathetic and understanding concern for the vitally important subject of Classification and Compensation as it affects Selective Service Employees, the Federal service and, in a paramount sense, the public interest which is served by these employees and the Selective Service System. Mr. Chairman, the NFFE strongly urges the adoption of this bill and a similar bill which has been introduced in the House by Congressman Henderson.

All members of this Committee and, in fact, all knowledgeable people, are acquainted with the vital function performed by the Selective Service Employees. There are approximately 4,700 full-time compensated employees performing the supportive work for approximately 33,000 uncompensated employees of the Board, resulting in a ratio of one compensated employee for eight uncompensated employees. As you know, the uncompensated employees assume their responsibilities on a voluntary basis and frequently conduct their meetings in the evening. The day-to-day operation of the Selective Service Board and Appeal Boards are carried out by the compensated Selective Service Employees. They constitute the day-to-day contact with Selective Service registrants. It should be apparent that this is a substantial responsibility entailing the issuance of information or rules which are of a highly delicate nature and having significant effect on the recipient of such information.

There are other employees of the Federal Service who have frequent contact with the public, such as Contact Representatives of the Social Security Administration, Veterans Administration, and the Public Health Service. All such employees come under the Classification provisions of Title 5. Selective Service Employees do not. For reasons which are difficult to understand, the Selective Service Employees have been paid in a manner which is not easily ascertainable. The various State Directors determine the rates of pay for such employees and to our knowledge, there is no National or Coordinated Plan. Many of the Selective Service Employees are located in cities or counties having Federal employees of other agencies who uniformly come under the Classification Act. The argument has been raised that the rates of pay should conform with salary and wages for the community. Since Selective Service Employees are white-collar and administrative employees, it is in the public interest that their salaries be integrated with other white-collar and administrative employees of other Federal Agencies. This is important so as to permit promotional and transfer opportunities to Selective Service Employees, in order that they may be considered as a part of the Federal Personnel Administration System. To continue otherwise would result in their estrangement from good, sound public administration.

Currently the Civil Service Commission is busily engaged in issuing rules and regulations for a coordinated wage board program which is applicable to blue collar employees in the Federal Service. This activity was caused by the failure of agencies of the Government to pay wages at rates comparable to other agencies of the Government. It would, therefore, be logical and reasonable for agencies of the Government employing white collar employees to pay such employees salaries comparable to those employees of other agencies. The Classification Act states the policy that there should be substantially equal pay for equal work. Selective Service Employees are entitled to treatment under that concept.

Each time a pay increase is voted by the Congress, special legislation must be presented to grant increases to Selective Service Employees which further complicates the patch-quilt pay system (if there is one) for Selective Service Employees. The large proportion of Selective Service Employees are unconscionably underpaid. There is attached to this testimony several typical letters of Selective Service Employees indicating their feeling regarding their pay and other significant aspects of their work. They point out the fact that Selective Service Employees do not receive within grade increases automatically given to employees under the Classification Act.

The Selective Service System has become an important part of our way of life. Its personnel program and administration should be consistent with its importance.

We submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Selective Service Administration has not treated its employees fairly and that a continuation of the present system works a hardship on its employees and places them at a serious disadvantage in their pay, and promotional opportunities. The benefits of employment are substantially less than all other Federal Civil Service Employees.

This legislation is of great importance not only in justice to the employees concerned but very definitely to supply a long missing link in the whole chain of Federal personnel administration.

In the Selective Service System we see an accurate but distressing and deplorable reflection of what the Federal service generally was like decades ago, before the enactment of the Classification Act of 1923. Prior to 1923, every Federal department and agency largely went its own way in pay and other conditions of employment. Employees doing the same work, bearing the same responsibility, were paid differently in neighboring agencies and buildings, and even in the same office. It was to bring both order and equity out of this chaos that the Classification Act and much other legislation very properly was enacted by the Congress.

The evidence is that the Selective Service System today functions as though the Classification Act, and the vital basic principles upon which it is based, has never existed. Personnel administration is whimsical, inequitable, uneven, and seemingly without logical pattern, beyond a form of arbitrary and antiquated paternalism which permeates the System. The pay pattern reflects this unfortunate situation, as do other aspects of Selective Service's methods of dealing with its employees.

There perhaps was some excuse for such a ramshackle structure when the Selective Service System was brought into being hastily during the early days of World War II. But that excuse has long since worn thin beyond recognition. The time for remedial action is not only due . . . it is long and seriously overdue.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress now has an opportunity to require the Selective Service System to put its personnel house in order . . . as the Congress began requiring all other Federal departments and agencies to start doing with the passage of the Classification Act so long ago as 1923. It is unthinkable that the persistent failure of Selective Service to bring its personnel policies into the last quarter of the twentieth century should be further countenanced by the Congress. Every consideration of the highest public and national interest, as well as that of the employees directly concerned, urgently requires positive action at this time.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the National Federation of Federal Employees, I again express our thanks and appreciation for the interest shown by the members of this Subcommittee on this very important issue and for your action in scheduling these hearings early in the Session. It is the earnest hope that the Subcommittee will, as a result, be able to report a bill shortly placing Selective Service Employees under the Classification Act by amending Title 5 accordingly. We further hope that such bill will receive prompt and favorable action.

Typical letters from some of our members are as follows:

BUTTE, MONT.,
February 9, 1968.

MR. NATE WOLKOMIR,
President, National Federation of Federal Employees,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WOLKOMIR: For your information, I was appointed Assistant Clerk in Local Board No. 47, Butte, Montana, in August, 1950, at a starting salary of \$2423.04.

In June, 1954, I was appointed Chief Clerk, with one Assistant in the office. However, since September, 1967, we have two full-time assistant clerks. We have 10,000 registrants.

As of the present date, my salary is \$5937.00.

ALICE FLEMING,
Executive Secretary
(For Local Board No. 47, Silver Bow County).

FEBRUARY 8, 1968.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: When I first started working for Selective Service System on September 12, 1965, I was earning \$3750, I now make \$4596. However this was due to the fact that my responsibilities increased. I was made clerk of the Board.

I feel that when we are asked to come in early (for Induction and Physicals) and to return and stay late (for Board meetings) we should be paid over-time.

I also feel that we certainly should be graded just as all the other Government employees are graded.

Also I cannot see any reason why we have *not* received our 4½% increase retroactive since October 1, 1967. Every other Government Employer has received theirs by the end of 1967.

Thank you for presenting my problems to Congress.

Sincerely,

EVELYN L. FOLLY,
Yonkers, N.Y.

*Selective Service System, Local Board, Maryland, clerk's salary,
February 12, 1968*

1. Entrance salary-----	\$4,269.00
1 ingrade, now salary GS-3, step 2, 1 year service-----	4,644.00
2. Entrance salary-----	3,680.00
2 ingrades, June 1967, now GS-3, step 2, 3 years service-----	4,644.00
3. Entrance salary-----	3,255.00
At present supervisor, GS-3, step 6, 8½ years service-----	5,336.00
4. Entrance salary-----	2,300.00
At present salary (received raises when funds available), 17½ years service-----	5,861.00
5. Entrance salary-----	2,300.00
Present salary (received increases when funds available), 20 years service-----	5,861.00
6. Entrance salary-----	3,500.00
Present salary, GS-3, step 3, 8 years service-----	5,211.00

LOCAL BOARD No. 50,
CHOTEAU, MONT.

NATE WOLKOMIR, *President*,
National Federation of Federal Employees,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been a clerk for Selective Service for over 11 years and have just recently joined the NFFE to try and get the clerks classified. Since the president of our organization in Montana asked all clerks to try and write and tell of our pay scale I will try and picture what I have received over the years. I have an old pay scale form from 8-16-50 when I was receiving the salary of \$2423.04 or \$1.28 an hour. Now my new salary is \$4154 or \$2.00 an hour. So in 17 years that this board has been here the salary has only increased 72¢ an hour. Or I should say this is the salary paid me since I have been clerk off and on during this 17 year period. The board has been here longer and I can not say what the other clerks received since it isn't standard.

When I started as clerk in 1960 my salary was—

1960	\$3055.50		
1960—Aug —	3185.00		
1960—Oct —	3290.00	Adm	Inc
1962—Oct —	3455.00	"	"
1964—Jan —	3515.00	"	"
1964—Jul —	3615.00	"	"
1965—Oct —	3745.00	"	"
1966—Jan —	3864.00	"	"
1966—Jul —	3975.00	"	"
1967—Oct —	4154.00	"	"

I have had a Civil Service Rating since Jan. 1, 1961 but so far it hasn't done me any good. In a position such as clerks must serve—the public sometimes can be quite nasty and trying. For the most part I and the board members get along

real well with the young men in this community, although there have been many times when I have had to contain my temper and words with parents. Most classified Government employees don't come into contact with the public and are better paid for it. This job as clerk of Selective Service is by far the least desirable of Government jobs and as yet we aren't paid accordingly.

I hope this will help in some small way to get the clerks classified.

VIRGINIA NORDHAGEN, *Clerk.*

FEBRUARY 9, 1968.

To: Nate Wolkomir, President, National Federation on Federal Employees, 1737 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

From: Margaret Ward, Chief Clerk, Local Board No. 56, Billings, Montana.

Subject: Statistical Data on Selective Service System Employee.

DEAR PRESIDENT WOLKOMIR: It is my understanding that you will be meeting with the House of Representatives on February 15, 1968 to discuss and present evidence worthy enough to warrant hearings in behalf of we unclassified and ungraded Selective Service employees. This indeed is encouraging news.

You perhaps recall our conversation on this matter in 1967, however, to refresh your memory on a few facts I am submitting herewith statistics concerning my salary and pay increases for the past twenty (20) years.

Date of employment	Type of appointment	Title of position	Salary (annual)
Sept. 20, 1948	Temporary (indefinite)	Clerk-typist	\$2,152.00
Mar. 10, 1950	do	do	2,280.00
July 31, 1950	do	Assistant clerk	2,423.04
July 8, 1951	do	do	2,750.00

¹ Public Law Salary Increases.

I had no pay increases between 7-8-51 and 3-13-55—

3-13-55, Career Appointment, Asst. Clerk, 2960.00 P.L.

11-4-56, Career Appointment, Asst. Clerk, 3045.00 A.P. Incr.

12-16-56, Career Appointment, Chief Clerk, 4010.00 A.P. Incr.

12-12-58, Career Appointment, Chief, 4420.00 P.L.

7-10-60, Career Appointment, Chief Clerk, 4775.00 P.L.

10-14-62, Career Appointment, Chief Clerk, 4985.00 A.P. Incr.

1-5-64, Career Appointment, Chief Clerk, 5110.00 A.P. Incr.

7-5-64, Career Appointment, Chief Clerk, 5430.00 P.L.

11-16-65, Career Appointment, Chief Clerk, 5626.00 P.L.

5-22-66, Career Appointment, Chief Clerk, 6378.00 State Incr.

7-3-66, Career Appointment, Chief Clerk, 6563.00 P.L.

1-15-68, Career Appointment, Chief Clerk, 6867.00 P.L.

I was first employed under the Draft Act of 1940 starting employment on date of October 16, 1942, and was terminated by reduction in force December 31, 1946. As of December 16, 1956, I took over full responsibilities of the Local Board office and now supervise 2 full-time employees and 1 part-time trainee. I have also been responsible for training one man, namely C. J. Ricci, who is now on a classified and graded position as State Auditor for our System. I also wish to point out that when I received my salary increase as of May 22, 1966, I had almost 22 years of civil service with the Selective Service System, Mr. Ricci had been in my office for less than 3 years as an Asst. Clerk and when the salary increases came thru his increase in salary was only \$50.00 a year less than mine, while I realize that he is a Veteran with 20 years of active duty and receives his allotted pension for military service, I hardly felt in accordance with years of service and experience on my part was hardly equalized in pay and of course now that Mr. Ricci is on the State staff I feel sure his salary is well above what I am receiving as an ungraded and unclassified employee.

I have an assistant clerk in my office who was promised a \$500.00 a year raise last September and to this date she has not received such a raise, she did receive her allowed increase on January 15, 1968 under Public Law #90-206, which all federal employees received. This assistant clerk is an excellent dependable employee, however, if an adjustment is not made on her salary in the near future, she will upon an opportunity, transfer to a graded and classified position with another agency.

I had one part-time trainee, who in December 1967 was made an Asst. Clerk and transferred to the Local Board in Bozeman, Montana. I feel that if I am qualified to train a man to become an auditor and another to become an Asst. Clerk besides the training background I give to my own Asst. Clerk's, then I also feel that my salary should warrant the merits of my position. I am sure if a check has been made of other employees in our Federal Building the investigators would find out that there are employees with less responsibilities than I have receiving pay grades of 7's, 8's and 9's. I wish to present an example of this fact:

Mrs. Jacquelyn North, who is employed as a placement employment specialist with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Billings, Montana was hired on a grade 4 less than 6 years ago, having had no prior civil service positions before going to work for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In less than 2 years she was transferred to another department with the BIA and was granted a position on Grade 5, in less than 2 years she was advanced to Grade 7 and has been on a Grade 9 for about 1 year. While I grant that Mrs. North has a responsible position, she is not responsible for supervising and training other employees and has a Secretary who takes care of her correspondence. No man can truthfully say this is fair to we employees who have served in government service for 20-25 years with at least equal responsibilities. This Local Board office has a total of 13,922 men registered and a file completed and has been processed many times on each one—this is work and let no man say it isn't and the question is "Why aren't we paid for what we do? On a Graded and Classified rate."

I trust Mr. Wolkomir the facts that I am presenting may in some small way guide you in presenting the facts at the hearings. If I can be of any other assistance on this matter please feel free to contact me.

Fraternally,

Mrs. MARGARET WARD, *Chief Clerk.*

Explanation: P.L.—Public Law Salary Increases, A.P.—Administrative Increases and State Increases.

Personally, I so appreciate the great efforts you are so graciously extending to all we Selective Service Clerks.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, LOCAL 259,
Memphis, Tenn., February 8, 1968.

Dr. NATHAN T. WOLKOMIR,
President,
National Federation of Federal Employees,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. WOLKOMIR: Reference to your letter dated 5 February 1968,

Inclosed is information I was able to get from the employees in the Local Boards of Selective Service here in Memphis. They have six Boards and an information office in The Federal Bldg. with approximately 16 employees.

These employees are hard working and dedicated federal employees and deserve more consideration as a Federal employee than they are getting. Sure hope you can push the Bill through to put them under the Classification Act.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. BRYANT,
National Representative.

PAY-RATE REPORT ON SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM LOCAL BOARD CLERKS AND ASSISTANT CLERKS, SHELBY COUNTY, TENN.

	Salary rate as of—	Local board clerks	Local board assistant clerks
Public Law 88-631	April 1963	\$ 4,565	\$ 3,925
Administrative ²	July 1964	4,950	4,125
Public Law 89-301	October 1965		4,480
Public Law 89-504	November 1965	5,129	4,641
Public Law 90-206	July 1966	5,277	4,776
	October 1967	5,509	4,995

¹ Per annum.

² Administrative raise for assistant clerks only. Other increases are congressional pay raises—no within-grade increases, of course, as all clerks are unclassified.

Note.—Selective Service System does not participate in the medical aid program (services offered through Federal building dispensary).

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, LOCAL 1492,
February 7, 1968.

DEAR MR. WOLKOMIR: Herewith some information as requested by Mary Tillet regarding my pay as a Selective Service Clerk. I have worked in this office 4½ years. This is a full-time office serving a community of about 10,000. I have 25 years experience in office work.

8/63, \$3,455.
5/64, Adm. Inc., \$3,515, Performance rating Excellent 4/1/67 (satisfactory before).
10/64, Adm. Inc., \$3,615.
10/65, Adm. Inc., \$3,745, G.S. Rating 7/60 G.S. 3. numerical rating 88.
12/66, Adm. Inc., \$3,864.
7/66, Adm. Inc., \$3,975.
12/67, Adm. Inc., \$4,154.
10 other member clerks have been contacted about this I hope you hear from them.

Best wishes to you at the hearing.

We are working towards exclusive recognition. Our members have indicated they plan to attend (at their own expense) our May convention in Helena—being isolated its slow work but we will make it.

Fraternally,

PAM BAIN.

FEBRUARY 12, 1968.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
1737 H Street NW.,
Washington, D.C.:

This is a listing of my increases since my employment with Selective Service on June 25, 1962.

Started	6-25-62,	Salary	\$3,500
	9-16-62,	\$3,760,	Adm. Pay Increase
	10-27-62,	\$3,925,	Adm. Pay Increase
	9-28-63,	\$4,030,	Adm. Pay Increase
	9-26-64,	\$4,195,	Adm. Pay Increase
	10-24-64,	\$4,365,	PL 88-631
	11-20-65,	\$4,523,	PL 89-301
	8-13-66,	\$4,655,	PL 89-504
	9-24-66,	\$4,798,	Adm. Pay Increase
	1-13-68,	\$5,014,	PL 90-216

I am an Assistant Chief Clerk of a very large Board. My duties and job description would warrant the Salary of at least a GS-5. At this point I barely make the salary of a GS-3. The Administrative Increases fall just short of a GS-3 salary. I understand that we in New York City Headquarters are considered one of the lucky ones. That salaries throughout the U.S. hardly compare with ours. This seems inconceivable to me in reading my job description.

JOSEPHINE TULUMELLO,
Franklin Square, N.Y.

SUSSEX, VA., February 13, 1968.

MR. NATHAN T. WOLKOMIR,
President, National Federation of Federal Employees,
Washington, D.C.

Reference: W—Selective Service

DEAR SIR: I have been employed as clerk of Local Board No. 119 Sussex, Virginia for 18 years.

My present salary is \$4784 annually.

The following is a record of my salary during the last five years and what it was raised to on the different dates:

Feb. 1963,	\$3665
Apr. 1963,	\$3980
Jan. 1964,	\$4040
Oct. 1964,	\$4190
Oct. 1965,	\$4340
May 1966,	\$4459
July 1966,	\$4585
Oct. 1967,	\$4784

I have the full responsibility of running the local board office but I only work part time so I only receive part of the above. They are the figures my salary is based on. During 1967 I worked 32 hours per week and my wages were \$3691.60.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs.) MARY JANE SIMMONS.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a Chief Clerk, Ass't Coordinator of a board of 24,488 registrants.

According to job description for Chief Clerks of a board 12,000 to 20,000 require 2 or 3 clerks, as per our own headquarters.

Since 1964 this same board has been operating with 3 clerks and at that time reached 20,000—so for this amount of time we have been under-staffed.

Further there are not sufficient clerks to assist a board when a clerk is either ill or on vacation. The same work load must be handled regardless.

The local boards have lost girls quite repeatedly to seek new jobs in other agencies and they have not been replaced.

We work under constant deadlines, which is quite a strain on our nerves, with irate parents and registrants who are seeking all sorts of ways to elude us. We are abused by the public and are worked quite strenuously by our bosses.

We have not received our retroactive pay and have been told that we are not to call payroll because we tend to hold up the wheels of progress.

Work loads are not evenly distributed, there are boards with 15,000 and 19,000 registrants who have a Chief Clerk and 2 clerks, (3) in all. Another board is so jammed with work they must keep going all day and will even have her third clerk taken from her because she was the last one in and therefore is assigned to registration.

We have been told by some that we have a lot of registrants in 5-A, 4-A, 4-F, 2-S etc. These registrants must be processed in order to obtain a classification, they just don't arrive there.

We had a report on delinquents, we had 5 pages, another board, same amount of clerks had 2 pages. Who processed the difference between the 2 and 5 pages. No even distribution.

This processing entailed making registrant delinquent, processing Paka and employer letters, making up SSS Form 304's, entering on SSS 302, putting them up for a meeting, classification card, pre induction notice, pre induction list, induction notice, induction list, entering on SS115, on out cards, entering on SSS 301 reporting to U.S. Attorney. Then after all this they may report to the board and now you work to remove all this work, make up a 127, call U.S.A. call board members, bring them in for an interview, write the U.S.A. . . . and I could go on. This could be very easily the working of just 1 delinquent. Who processed the rest of the 3 pages—all these men were reported to the U.S.A. This you will realize is but one phase of our work.

We of the Local Board are in hopes that this hardship can be alleviated and let us all have a sensible day at work.

Sincerely,

M. K. MURPHY.

FEBRUARY 8, 1968.

To Whom It May Concern:

In the early part of 1965 I passed my Federal Civil Service Examination and in April 1965 was employed as a Clerk-Typist with Selective Service, Long Island City Group, New York. At the time of my employment, I was informed that Selective Service was an ungraded and unclassified agency. However, being a novice to government work I did not realize exactly what that meant and was not made aware at the time of the fact that only those in the so called field (local board level) were ungraded, but that those employed at New York City Headquarters were graded. After almost three years of employment, I cannot understand how this was achieved as grading half an agency is somewhat like dressing half a body and leaving the lower half nude. At the time of my employment I was not advised as to the intricate type of work involved in this type of job nor the many tasks I would be called on to perform. I did not realize the word load involved or the lack of help and the conditions one would be asked to work under. As we are constantly meeting deadlines and fighting time the pressures of local board work are extreme. It will never cease to mystify me how a system supposedly guided by the Federal Civil Service Commission and supposedly one of merit promotion planning can be so riddled with politics and unfairness.

Those of us who work at local board level for Selective Service are always fighting time and working against dead lines regardless of the work loads we have to meet. Local Boards have been growing rapidly by virtue of the huge influx of South American immigrants. When help is lost it takes months to replace with a new clerk and the work load is, of course, an ever increasing one due to the present world situations. When as a clerk a complaint is made about working conditions and the lack of help, one is told that the door is open and those that walk in can walk out. I, as a woman, resent being told that I must report to work in any kind of weather at the unearthly hour of 7:00 A.M. in order to see the boys on the bus for either a physical examination or induction. Long Island City is not the most desirable of neighborhoods and with the present rate of crime a woman does not belong out on the streets at this hour without police protection especially for straight compensatory time. A local board clerk is called upon to attend board meetings sometimes and can work from 8:30 A.M. to 12:00 P.M. which is a long day for anyone. She is then rewarded, provided she can take the time, with straight compensatory time.

They tell me Selective Service employees cannot be graded because it is a temporary agency, however, anything in existence for 25 years seems as permanent to me as it can get. The injustices are too many to enumerate, and I think it is time that we be given the protection afforded by the Civil Service Commission through grading in order that Selective Service Clerks are treated with the same respect as government clerks in any other agency.

M. BRESSLER,
*Selective Service System,
L.I.C. Group, Third Clerk.*

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
TENNESSEE LOCAL BOARD NO. 100,
White County, Sparta, Tenn., February 13, 1968.

To Whom It May Concern:

The following shows my salary as Clerk of Selective Service Board (Tennessee Local Board No. 100, Sparta, Tennessee) from April 1963 to the present time:

	<i>Per year</i>
April 1963.....	\$3, 350
April 1964.....	\$3, 410
October 1964.....	\$3, 500
November 1965.....	\$3, 626
July 1966.....	\$3, 731
November 1966.....	\$3, 853
October 1967.....	\$4, 028

As clerk of a Selective Service Board, I am responsible for all office work. Listed below are some of the duties of this office:

Registration of the young men of our county as they reach their eighteenth birthday, making up and mailing Registration Certificates and Classification Questionnaires to each registrant, making up and mailing Classification Notices to all who have been classified by the local board. Our board is made up of three members. The board makes all classifications. I also mail all other forms and notices required to be mailed, including Current Information Questionnaires, Armed Forces Physical Examination and Induction Notices. Not only do I mail the AFPE and Ind. Notices but I escort the registrants to the bus station and secure their tickets on the day of their departure. I take care of all correspondence to registrants, employers of registrants, parents of registrants, correspondence to other local boards, Selective Service State Headquarters, etc. My duties include making up minutes on each meeting of the local board, making all monthly and quarterly reports required, keeping a record book which contains the name of every registrant, each classification and date of such, date of AFPE, date of Ind. of registrant, date of enlistments and branch of service, entry of all transfers for AFPE and Ind., recording all cancellations, show if a registrant is deceased, also enter dates and types of separation on those registrants who have completed a tour of duty in the armed forces. The work includes filing, maintaining files. In addition to other things, I do the janitor work of the office.

The work of the clerk not only includes the things mentioned above, in addition it includes our every day dealings with the youth of our community in their problems that arise in connection with Selective Service. Really the duties are too

numerous to try to list all. I feel that the greatest duty and responsibility we have is in dealing with the very lives of the youth of our community.

Yours truly,

Mrs. REBECCA T. JENKINS, *Clerk.*

Mr. NATHAN T. WOLKOMIR,
President, NFFE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WOLKOMIR: Enclosed for your information is General Hershey's annual report to the U.S. Congress. I would like you to read pages 8, 38, 39, 40 and 42 of this report. In his report, as always, he gives the impression that the majority of work is done by the uncompensated board members. On page 8 he gives the staff total of the local boards. What he does not state is that a board member works on the average of 4 hours per month, or 48 hours per year, while the compensated employee works an average of 40 hours per week plus non-compensated time. The compensated employee thus works an average of 2,080 or more hours per year. To give you an even clearer picture, there are 16,372 uncompensated board members in all, working an average of 48 hours per year, per person, for a total of 785,856 hours. On the other hand there are 4,657 full time compensated employees averaging 2,080 hours per year, per person, for a total of 9,686,560 hours. There are 1,796 part time employees, many of whom are WAE employees who are only allowed to work 900 hours per year, per person. General Hershey's statement that over 85% of the 48,300 members are uncompensated tends to give Congress the impression that these people work side by side with the compensated employee 40 hours a week. This is simply not true and if a proper investigation were made the facts would bear out my statement.

To illustrate further, there are approximately 118 appeal boards with 4,170 appeal agents handling 9,741 appeal cases for the year 1965. This amounts to approximately 3½ appeal agents per appeal board handling approximately 83 appeal cases per year. Any one with common sense would realize that the appeal agents would not have to work a full 40 hours per week to handle this meager number of appeals.

I am not a statistician but I do have enough sense to figure that General Hershey's report does not bear him out when he states, as does the Civil Service Commission (see enclosed letter) that this work is a community effort by the majority of uncompensated personnel.

Fraternally yours,

DEAR NFFE: I am so happy to know that you are interested in the welfare of local board clerks.

Of all federal employees, we are the only ones that go to work before daylight for the purpose of forwarding young men for induction into the armed forces. I usually leave the bus station in tears after witnessing the farewells to loved ones. There is ALWAYS the possibility that some crank will take a shot at you.

I have been a local board clerk for over thirteen years and my take home pay at this time is more than it has ever been—\$126.56 every two weeks. I am paying on my home and my car is over nine years old.

Sure hope you can help us and if it could be made retroactive it would be wonderful. (Even if it meant dipping into the *anti-poverty* funds!).

P.S.—2-18, finally squeezed out the \$14.

Mr. NATHAN T. WOLKOMIR,
President, National Federation of Federal Employees,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter "1966, The Selective Service Year," and its enclosed information.

I am enclosing a half year's dues (\$7.00) and application for membership. I am glad that finally some one is interested in helping Local Board Clerks. I have been with Selective Service for five and one-half years (5½), having moved to this town because of my husband's health and work. I was a classified, Career employee, GS 4, Step 5 (Clerk-Steno). I started here at a salary lower than the beginning salary of a GS-1. After 5½ years I have had only *one* raise (because of an increase in registrants that was not by an act of Congress. My salary now

is the same as the *third* step of a *GS-1*. And this is the most responsible job I have ever had, because it involves the lives of young men. I am the one and only compensated member in this board. Thus I am delegated with the authority of managing the local board office and *all* the work.

The thing that makes us feel more discriminated against is the fact that clerical employees in all State Headquarters *are* classified. The work loads imposed upon us now are terrific.

Please let me know if there is anything I can do to help in this drive to get us classified.

Mr. NATHAN T. WOLKOMIR,
President, National Federation of Federal Employees,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WOLKOMIR: Thank you for your recent letter, and the interesting information enclosed.

Obviously, I couldn't agree more emphatically with the aims of NFFE, its opinions as expressed in your third paragraph, nor support more heartedly, the goals anent SSS, as you have outlined them.

Consequently, I would indeed be most happy to join. However, the moot question . . . being . . . on what? Money? In your letter you indicated the attitude of the officials toward the Clerical personnel and their wages . . . which leaves no allocation of funds for extra-curricula investments.

Even though we are required to pass a pedestrian GS test, we remain ungraded, and regardless of excellent ratings . . . or any individual efforts to do the best possible job, over and beyond the requirements in the Clerk's Manual, we continue ungraded. Unfortunately the excellent rating is non-edible.

It is my opinion that to efficiently fulfill the duties of a Local Board Clerk, it is helpful to be part lawyer . . . diplomat . . . guidance counselor . . . substitute parent, recruiter, and some public relations ability is also useful. These qualities in addition to "the paper work" are essential.

My plans, since last May, have been to leave the Service, as soon as a few personal problems have been resolved. As an SSS Clerk, I have no alternative, despite my efforts to supplement my income by selling Real Estate on Saturday, Sundays and using my Annual Leave when I have a prospective buyer.

One of my three children has just received his degree in Veterinary Medicine from U of Penn . . . my daughter is a senior at the College of William and Mary, and is now applying to Medical Schools . . . my young son is a sophomore at William and Mary, majoring in physics. It is my intention that their education be completed.

No doubt I shall continue in Government Service, having passed the "five year" mark this month. My final decision as to Agency and location may rest upon Cathy's acceptance into Medical School. When everything is settled, I shall, if I may, complete my application and return it, as I believe membership in the NFFE would be beneficial in any Agency of the Government in which I may finally be accepted. . . . my preferences are rather simple . . . a position offering a challenge . . . and a full schedule of work.

I apologize for consuming so much of your time, and offering so little in support, and I offer my best wishes for a total success for the personnel who elect to remain with SSS.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please send an application for Membership for your Union.

Until Jan. 1965 my annual salary barely exceeded \$2,000.00 as a Local Board Clerk with the Selective Service System.

Who can I write to or what can I do concerning S-705 by Sen. Daniel Brewster (Md.); H.R.-2195 by Congressman O. C. Fisher (Tex.); & H.R.-6997 by Congressman Clarence Long (Mo.)?

DEAR SIR: I *know* how wonderful N.F.F.E. is, but, sir, *some* Selective Service personnel are *so poorly paid*, that they can't afford the \$14.00 fee. Yet we must get all work out *exact* and on schedule. I belonged to N.F.F.E. 20 years ago, when I was in Civil Service before marriage. After being left a widow I went back,

was assigned to S.S.S. and regret it fully. Have years of experience, passed recent current examination for G.S.-3—but get the salary for a beginner G.S.-1. Have been with S.S.S. 3½ years, no raises, within grade, or otherwise. Why does Hershey *permit this? It is a cheap skate agency.*

I had my Civil Service rating before I went to work for Selective Service. I have never had an in-grade raise the full 6 yrs. I've been here nor a raise in rating. If possible, I would like a wallet-size card of S.S. ratings and wages.

Senator HARTKE. Thank you. We have one more witness, John A. McCart, Operations Director of the Government Employees' Council, AFL-CIO. Good morning, sir.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN A. McCART, OPERATIONS DIRECTOR,
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' COUNCIL, AFL-CIO**

Mr. McCART. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. We supplied the subcommittee with a copy of our prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, and if it meets with your approval I would like to just briefly summarize our position.

Senator HARTKE. All right. The entire statement will appear in the record and you may summarize such portions as you deem appropriate.

Mr. McCART. We want to express our appreciation to you and Senator Brewster and other members of the subcommittee for their interest in this problem which has been ongoing for a good number of years now. The unions associated with the Government Employees Council strongly support the enactment of S. 555.

We do it on three counts. At the present time the salaries of these some 8,000 employees are fixed, in effect, by the Director of the Service, the State officials, and the local board officials.

In other words, there isn't any salary system at the present time, and we find that there are individual employees who are denied the general salary increases Congress enacts for all other employees under the Classification Act.

You will recall that the classification system provides a series of step increases based on length of service and longevity increases.

In addition to that the employees covered by the Classification Act are entitled to appeal rights if they believe that their positions are not properly allocated gradewise. None of these rights is available to the employees of the Selective Service System.

Again, there is no system in fixing their pay.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, we believe that it is highly desirable that they be placed under the Classification Act for purposes of fixing their pay. With that, Mr. Chairman, I conclude my presentation.

(The prepared statement of the Government Employees' Council follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' COUNCIL, AFL-CIO

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, the Council and its 34 AFL-CIO unions join in expressing support for the pending bill to extend coverage of the Classification Act to employes of the Selective Service System.

To you, Mr. Chairman, and your colleagues on the Subcommittee, the Council extends appreciation for arranging this hearing on the current bill.

We are deeply grateful also to Senator Brewster's desire to correct the salary inequity experienced by clerical employes of local Selective Service Boards through introduction of S. 555.

Salaries of these workers are determined administratively by the Director of the Selective Service System. In practice, this means that the various State directors are empowered to establish rates of pay for the approximately 8,000 individual employes of the numerous boards. This situation has existed since the inception of the present universal military training program.

In effect, then, there is no salary system, as such, for the employes in question. There can be little doubt about the facts in the matter. Testimony presented to a House Civil Service Subcommittee in November, 1967, by officials of the Selective Service System and the Civil Service Commission reveals that salary rates available to board employes depend upon the decisions of the Director, state officials and local boards. This means that individual workers can be and are denied general salary adjustments given to other Selective Service employes and to all individuals within the purview of the Classification Act.

In addition, it causes substantial salary variations among employes performing the same work in various areas, and even within the same geographic locality.

One effect of this practice is that the average salary level for Selective Service employes is generally significantly less than that paid Classification Act workers with similar responsibility.

The most obvious deficiency, however, is the lack of any system at all. Since enactment of the original classification statute in 1923, Federal employes have participated in a system establishing salary grades based upon skills and responsibilities required in their jobs. If they believe their positions are improperly graded by their agencies, the law provides rights of appeal to their agencies and/or the Civil Service Commission.

In addition, the classification system provides a series of periodic salary advancements based upon completion of a term of satisfactory service in a lower step. The plan is climaxed by a series of longevity rate increases. In this way, employees have an incentive to remain in Federal Service and to anticipate small monetary increases as their work becomes more valuable to their agencies.

None of these rights is available to employes of the Selective Service boards.

It must be emphasized at this point that the Classification Act was not approved and amended from time to time simply for the convenience of the employes it covers. Many years ago, Congress and the Executive Branch recognized that a systematic approach to determining salaries of the Federal Government's "white collar" employes is essential to attain effective personnel management.

Officials of the Selective Service System maintain it is necessary to provide local boards with latitude in salary matters in keeping with the economic conditions in areas where boards are located. Implicit in this position is the belief that some board clerks would be paid more than the rates prevailing for similar work in the community, if the Classification Act were applicable.

Under the Classification Act, itself, there are undoubtedly isolated instances of individuals receiving higher rates of pay than those in effect generally in the surrounding locality. But the advantages of a national system of fixing rates necessitate maintenance of one salary scale which is applicable to all employes in all parts of the country performing work requiring the same level of skills and responsibility.

In many urban localities, Selective Service boards are housed in the same buildings as other Federal agencies. Board clerks cannot help knowing about the salary system in effect for their counterparts paid under the Classification Act for work of similar difficulty. The demoralizing effect of this situation on Selective Service employes is obvious.

The present Selective Service System has been in effect for more than a quarter-century. In view of our present international commitments, there is every likelihood that some form of universal military training will remain in the foreseeable future. It is our firm belief that a systematic method of determining the salaries of all Selective Service employes is overdue.

From the standpoint of good personnel administration and justice to the employes in question, the Federal Government cannot afford to continue the present salary situation for Selective Service employes.

The Council strongly recommends prompt, favorable action on the pending bill.

Senator HARTKE. All right. Thank you. I want to thank you for your statement. That concludes the list of witnesses this morning, and I hope you people are not too upset with what I said.

These hearings are adjourned. The record will be kept open for 2 weeks for additional statements or comments.

(Whereupon, at 11 :15 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.)





