



League of Women Voters of Minnesota Records

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.

CIVIL SERVICE

We do not often picture our State in the role of employer, yet our taxes provide the money for the state payroll, which includes about 20,000 persons. The duties of an employer we delegate to our legislators. These duties include setting rates of pay, and directing policy on recruitment, retirement, and dismissal. The situation is pretty much the same as an industrial employer faces.

At this session many more bills than usual dealing with phases of the Civil Service Program were introduced. of the recommendations of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program were adopted. List follows:

The League of Women Voters took legislative action on three bills affecting Civil Service.

1. S.F. 32 - Authors: Vukelich, Rogers, E. Peterson.
H.F. 158 - Authors: Rutter, Dunn, Cina, Fugina, Dirlam

A bill vacating the office of director of civil service and providing for his appointment by the governor with the consent of the senate.

The League opposed this bill. because it did not provide for selection through competitive examinations and the director was not given tenure. The bill passed out of the House Civil Administration Committee by a 10 to 6 vote on February 23. When it came up on the floor of the House, Harold Anderson of Minneapolis and Clifton Parks of St. Paul, members of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program, moved to amend the bill so it would conform with the bill based on the Interim Committee's recommendations (S.F. 951 and H.F. 1097). This bill provided for selection of the examining committee by the Civil Service Board and appointment of the director by the governor from a list of not less than three nor more than five names certified by the examining committee, the director to have tenure and be removable by the Board for cause. The amendment was approved by the House but the bill as passed on March 10 by a vote of 97 to 15 retained the "consent of the senate for the appointment", a feature which did not meet with our approval. It is apparent that if the Senate turned down appointments made from competitive civil service examinations they would in a sense be playing politics with civil service.

H.F. 32 and H.F. 158 and S.F. 951 and H.F. 1097 were sent to a sub-committee of the Senate Civil Administration Committee on March 16. The full committee adopted the report of the sub-committee on March 31. The sub-committee recommended the following amendments to the House bill: change from appointment by the Governor back to appointment by the Board (as at present); director to be appointed for a six year term with consent of Senate; if re-appointed at end of the term, he would not have to take another examination.

Attached is the testimony given by the League's Acting Civil Service Chairman, Mrs. Everson, in support of S.F. 951 and H.F. 1097.

2. S.F. 950 - Authors: Wefald, Root
H.F. 1120 - Authors: Parks, H.J. Anderson.

A bill based on the recommendations of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program, regarding Veterans Preference, introduced March 1 in the Senate, March 3 in the House.

The League supported this bill. It provided for: 5 and 10 point preference upon receipt of a passing grade in examination; part or all of the 5 points allowed non-disabled veterans and the 10 points granted disabled veterans could be used on either entrance or promotional examinations, but once the total number of points had been used there would be no more preference; in order to qualify as disabled veterans must have a 10% or more disability rating by the Veterans Administration; widows would receive preference if they did not remarry; wives of disabled veterans would receive preference if their husband had a disability rating of 50% or more.

In the Senate the bill was sent to the Civil Administration Committee. Amendments to the bill were suggested and approved which stripped the bill of the following: requirement of a passing grade before the preference points could be used; requirement of a 10% disability rating before a veteran qualifies as disabled; giving equal eligibility to veterans and non-veterans with equal examination scores. The bill was then sent to a sub-committee for redrafting.

In the House, the companion bill, H.F. 1120, was sent to the House Veterans and Military Affairs Committee. Proponents were heard on March 18. Mrs. T. O. Everson, representing the League of Women Voters, Mr. Charles Silverson, President of the Citizens League of Minneapolis and Hennepin County, and Mr. George Humphrey of the North Star Post 530 of the American Legion spoke for the bill. Mrs. Everson and Mr. Silverson asked that the bill be amended to include the political sub-divisions (counties and municipalities). Mrs. Everson's testimony is attached.

In the House Veterans and Military Affairs Committee the bill was explained by Clifton Parks of St. Paul, an author but not a member of the ~~Veterans~~ committee. It is impossible to describe the treatment accorded Rep. Parks by some members of the committee. There just aren't words in the English language which could picture the scene for you. Mr. Parks should be commended for the calm manner in which he answered questions shrieked at him in an insulting tone of voice. Had constituents of Rep. LeBrosse of Duluth and Volstad of Minneapolis been present, they would have hung their heads in shame for these two were perfect examples of what a statesman is not. Rep. Parks luckily was a veteran with 14 months overseas service, also a past Commander of an American Legion Post. Some members of both House and Senate committees by their statements and questions showed that they knew little or nothing of the manner in which preference is frequently granted. The prize remark was made by a member of the Senate Committee which had been studying the four civil service bills for three meetings, and was about to vote on one of them, ^{he} said, "I know that Wefald and Root were members of the Interim Committee; I'd like to know who the other members were, it might make a difference in my vote." (Members were listed on page 10) About that time Senator Root said, "I don't think more than three members of this committee have read the Interim Report." Those of us who attended the hearings would probably agree that was about the situation in both committees, though they knew bills based on the report would come before them and though the committee report was placed on their desks the middle of January.

Representatives of the Veterans Organizations were heard in the Senate on the 18th and 23rd of March, and in the House Veterans and Military Affairs Committee on March 25. Rep. Tieman, chairman of the House Committee, opened the meeting by asking the speakers to refrain from bringing personalities into the discussion. We heard after the meeting was over that apologies had been made to Rep. Parks and Sen. Wefald for the treatment they had received when proponents were being heard. Mrs. Everson asked to make a clarifying statement in reply to the many references about the League made by the Veterans. (see attached testimony)

Inconsistencies of veterans were very pronounced. It is evident they do not want equal treatment for veterans working for the state and the political sub-divisions since they wanted no change in either the law which grants preference to veterans in the classified service of the state or in the General Preference law which provides for veterans preference in the political sub-divisions. They said these were good laws, yet the provisions are such that if one is fair the other is not. Veterans in the classified service of the state do not have to pass examinations in order to get preference while those working in the sub-divisions must first pass examinations to get preference. The disabled veterans working for the state classified service get absolute preference, the non-disabled do not, yet in the political sub-divisions all veterans go to the top of the list when they pass. Testimony of the representatives of the veterans organizations indicated interest only in retaining the status quo. One moment they insisted that we did not have absolute preference in the state because of the rule of three; the next moment they pleaded not to abolish the same absolute preference.

They kept yelling (literally true) to be given the name of just one inefficient veteran, knowing full well the difficulties of proving such a charge under the present system. Yet no mention was made of the number of capable veterans who had left the state service or who did not want to enter state service because there was little or no chance of promotion if disabled veterans (with zero disability) were competing for a job - for they go to the top of the list if they get 60 in the examination.

It was apparent from the start that H.F. 1120 would not have a chance of being passed by the Veterans and Military Affairs Committee. Rep. Parks pleaded to have the bill sent to a sub-committee so it could be discussed thoroughly. He offered to sit down with the veterans and try to work something out. Rep. A. O. Sundet, Faribault, made such a motion with a second by Rep. Christie of Minneapolis. No one voted with them. Rep. Otto Clark, Osakis, then made a motion to indefinitely postpone (same as killing), a voice vote was taken, the motion carried. So once more the League attended the last rites for a bill modifying veterans preference.

3. S.F. 1172 - Authors: Wefald, Root
H.F. 1300 - Author: Parks

A bill to modify veterans preference in the political subdivisions of the state.

The League supported this bill. This bill modified preference in the political subdivisions of the state. It was killed in the Senate Civil Administration Committee by Senator Donald Wright of Minneapolis, when he moved to indefinitely postpone. When this happened the League of Minnesota Municipalities, sponsors of the bill, speaking through their representative, Orville Peterson, told Rep. Parks there was no need to present the bill in the House Committee. Some one commented on Senator Wright's inconsistent action in proclaiming devotion to the merit system and inviting to abolish veterans preference on promotional examinations in the state service, yet moving to kill a bill modifying preference in the political sub-divisions, where all veterans get absolute preference on promotional as well as entrance examinations. Another wryly answered that the Senator doesn't have to worry about the veterans outside of his district which is in a political sub-division.

League members who represented you at the hearings on these bills feel strongly that if we are ever going to get modification of veterans preference (and though we failed this time, we got farther than we ever did before) a tremendous effort in community education must be made. Maybe then our legislators will know that post office jobs come under Federal Civil Service, not State; that the purpose of legislative authorization of four commissions to study this subject was to provide a logical, consistent basis for action on this one of the remaining abuses of the merit principle. The men and women who represent us might stiffen their backbones and have the necessary courage if they thought someone besides veterans was interested in this issue. We sometimes wonder how many of the 400,000 veterans in the state know what a monopoly 520 disabled veterans (not necessarily rated as such by the Veterans Administration, since they only need zero disability to qualify) have on promotions in the state classified service.

It is indeed frustrating to know that the valuable time of legislators and other highly respected citizens and some of our very precious and much needed tax money have gone into the four reports published since 1948. Each one has pointed out the need for modification of veterans preference, yet nothing has been done about it. A Minneapolis Star editorial of March 28 said, "Privately many legislators say they oppose this sort of favoritism but the veteran organization lobbies are so powerful a prudent lawmaker dare not oppose them. That seems a sad admission in a legislature which, in view of the states many other pressing problems, needs to show courage as well as wisdom."

This brings up a question many of us have been asking, "What constitutes proper lobbying?" Is it when done by special interests which hold the threat of non-support in the next election over the heads of the lawmakers or by those whose lobby technique is to wine and dine the legislators? Or is the proper method, the one we would like to have our League carry out - an information program to the community between and during sessions in the public interest? Can it be that we have been resented because some know that we know more than they do about some issues, and that perhaps we have made the mistake of being too obvious when doing our lobbying - talking and writing with and to them? If this is so, then the remedy lies in educating the community along with ourselves so that when next we write or meet, we will all have equal knowledge of our subject matter and the support of the community to back us up.

Y
d
O
C

1885 - Tatum St., St. Paul 13

March 1, 1955

To: State Board - L.W.V.

From: Falcon Heights L.W.V.

Re: Civil Service

Three of us in the Falcon Heights League have studied the legislative commission's report on civil service and were much impressed.

We concur with the recommendations regarding the selection of a director, and in view of S.F. 32 and H.F. 158 feel the League should support the commission recommendation.

A survey by an outside agency seems an excellent idea.

We also concur with the commission's recommendation regarding grievance procedures and employment security, but do not feel qualified to recommend League support at the present time because of the possibility of finding out more about the problems. We also feel this may be increasing the state program load too much. We question whether we could get information to our members in time to ask them to support so many bills on civil service.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Curtis Larson
Legislative Chairman of
L.W.V. of Falcon Heights

March 1955

TESTIMONY REGARDING S.F.951 and H.F.1097

I am Mrs. T.O.Everson, Acting Civil Service Chairman of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota.

The League supports this bill, as introduced and without amendment, in the first instance because it provides safeguards through open competitive examination and tenure for the director, both necessary to insure a real merit system.

In the second place, appointment by the governor rather than by the civil service board is a procedure recommended by both the Little Hoover Commission and the Interim Committee on Civil Service. It is a practice adopted by other states where there has been recent civil service reform. It is a recommendation incorporated in the writings of many authorities in the field of public personnel administration. We recognize that change can be beneficial where it is in keeping with efficient, economical, and responsible government. No major change has been made in the civil service law since its adoption in 1939. We believe that appointment of the Civil Service Director by the governor is a desirable change at this time.

It is desirable because:

1. It clarifies the responsibility of the chief executive for personnel management in the state government.
2. It makes the single state personnel administrator responsible to the chief executive for successful administration of the state merit system.
3. It puts personnel administration where it belongs as an important tool of executive management.

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota urges this committee to pass favorably on S.F.951 because, to quote the Little Hoover Commission: "...the Director of Civil Service should be appointed by the Governor, but only with safeguards against abuse of the appointing power."

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
84 South Tenth St., Room 406
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota

March 1955

TESTIMONY REGARDING S.F.950 and H.F.1120

I am Mrs. T. O. Everson, Acting Civil Service Chairman of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota.

At several legislative sessions representatives of the League of Women Voters have testified in favor of modification of veterans preference in the interest of efficient and economical government. We have not been alone in our thinking on this subject. Since 1948 four commissions authorized by the Legislature have pointed out the need for modification of our veterans preference laws: The Legislative Research Committee reported in 1948 on Veterans Preference in Minnesota; the Little Hoover Commission in 1950; the Veterans Preference in Public Employment Commission in 1951; and the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program in 1955.

The Veterans Preference section of the Interim Committee's report is so well documented that there is no need for us to elaborate on it. We can simply say we endorse the bill based on the recommendations contained in this section.

We would be even more enthusiastic about the bill if it were amended to include another recommendation of the Interim Committee, which states: "It is recommended that veterans' preference laws, when applicable, shall be uniform for the state and its political subdivisions."

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota urges this committee to consider seriously the suggested amendment and to recommend H.F.1120 (S.F.950) for passage.

Present Preference;

5 & 10 points, and they may be used to get a passing grade, and may be used every time an examination is taken. Disabled veteran goes to top of list. Widow and spouse are granted same preference as the veteran. Even 0% disability qualifies a veteran as "disabled."

Preference under H.F. 1120 (S.F. 950)

Total of 5 & 10 points, but after getting a passing grade on exam.
Placed on eligible list according to grade earned on exam., plus points.
Veteran may use all his points on one exam. or store some for future exams, but cannot use total points for every exam.
Widow if not remarried gets same pref.
Spouse of 50% disabled " " "
10% or more disability necessary to qualify for 10 points.

League of Women Voters of St. Paul

123 W. Fifth Street
Saint Paul 2, Minnesota

CEdar 3178

March 2, 1955

Miss Barbara Stuhler
League of Women Voters of Minnesota
84 S. Tenth Street
Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Miss Stuhler:

Re: S. F. 32 H. F. 158 - Civil Service

Our Board of Directors thoroughly considered your communication of February 25, 1955, regarding action of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota on the above bills.

The Board felt that we cannot make an evaluation of any of the proposals because we are not well enough informed.

Sincerely,

Mari Donohue
Mrs. John K. Donohue,
President

March 2nd 1955

Miss Barbara Stuhler, Vice Pres.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota

Room 706, 84 South 10th Street

Minneapolis 3, Minnesota

Dear Miss Stuhler,

As legislative chairman of the board of Roseville League of Women Voters, I would like to report the board's feeling on the civil service issue. We are a comparatively new league and the board feels that as a group we have not studied Civil Service in general, enough to be able to give unqualified support of the Interior Committee's recommendation.

We agree that H. 7158 and S. 752 should be opposed by the league because of the lack of safeguards in the appointment of a civil service director but because of lack of study we have no background for positive action.

Cordially yours,

(Mrs J.N.) Lucile N. Spaeth

Roseville League of Women Voters

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNEAPOLIS

84 South Tenth Street, Room 407, Minneapolis 2, Minnesota

Telephone: Atlantic 6319

March 4, 1955

MEMORANDUM

To: Barbara Stuhler, First Vice President, LWV of Minnesota

From: Mrs. Samuel C. Gale, President, LWV of Minneapolis

Re: Civil service legislation

The Board of Directors of the LWV of Minneapolis heard the report of the Vukelich bill and other bills being introduced, from Miss Burton at our Board meeting Wednesday.

There was a great deal of discussion and, I might say, confusion, but I shall try to give you the feeling of the Board as far as I can remember it.

No one was in favor of eliminating competitive examinations or tenure for the director.

Putting the director under the Department of Administration was approved by a majority, but some of the Board members strongly objected, both because they were opposed to the change and because they felt we were not well enough informed before we voted. (The latter would certainly apply to the majority of our members.)

March 7, 1955

The Honorable Leonard Lindquist
House Of Representatives
State Capitol
St. Paul, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Lindquist:

We understand that H.F. 158 (authors: Rutter, Fugina, Cina, Dirlam; Dunn; a bill to vacate the office of the Civil Service Director and to place future appointments under the governor) will be discussed in the House Tuesday. The League of Women Voters of Minnesota hopes this bill will not pass since it has no provision for selection through competitive examination and it does not place the director under the classified service, two essentials in maintaining the whole principle of civil service.

I promised to get some information to you in case the bill would be amended on the floor. This had to wait until the state Board of Directors knew the League's position on H.F. 1097/S.F. 951, the bill which recommends appointment of the director in accordance with the Interim Committee's Report.* The state League Board voted Friday, March 4th, to support H.F. 1097/S.F. 951, introduced in the Senate, March 1, and House, March 2. We support this bill because:

- 1) authorities in the field of public personnel management agree that the trend is toward getting away from the concept of a civil service commission as a policing agency and more into the idea of the civil service system as being a part of the total staff function. Appointments of the director by the governor would be in line with this objective.
- 2) Making personnel a direct management responsibility of the chief executive was a recommendation of the Little Hoover Commission: "Because personnel administration is an important tool of executive management, the Director of Civil Service should be appointed by the governor but only with safeguards against abuse of the appointing power."
- 3) Giving the appointing power to the governor gives a) unified administrative direction to the department of civil service, b) clarifies the responsibility of the chief executive for personnel management in the state government, c) gives the chief executive a more effective and direct instrumentality with which to discharge his personnel management duties.

*Except that H.F. 1097/S.F. 951 eliminates the Interim Committee's recommendation that the governor concur in the appointment of the examining committee.

Mr. Leonard Lindquist

2

March 7, 1955

If our information is correct, Representatives Anderson and Parks, members of the Interim Committee, will propose an amendment to H.F. 158 incorporating the safeguards of competitive examination and tenure as set forth in H.F. 1097. Such an amendment would bring this bill into line with the League's position. However, if an effort to retain the provision of H.F. 158 which requires consent of the Senate is retained, we could not support the bill. You will find that the Little Hoover Commission did not recommend consent of the Senate.

C The League of Women Voters of Minnesota has taken no position on the bill which would make civil service a division of the Department of Administration, as this is a new proposal which League members are studying and on which consensus has not been reached.

O If you wish to talk with one of our local experts in the field of public personnel management on this subject of appointment by the governor, I suggest you get in touch with Clarence Ludwig of the Municipal Reference Bureau at the University. Mr. Ludwig was on the drafting committee of the present civil service act. I am sorry this information is so late in reaching you but hope it is still in time to be of help.

P
Y
Sincerely yours,

Mrs. T. O. Everson
Acting Civil Service Chairman

cc: Representative S. Luther

cc: Everson
Young
Down

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
84 South Tenth St., Room 406
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota

March 11, 1955
This is not going out on
Standing Order
Additional copies - 38

Memo to: Local League Presidents
From: Mrs. T. O. Everson, Acting Civil Service Chairman

Here is the League position on civil service. We shall oppose S.F.32 and H.F.158 (vacating the office of director of civil service and providing for his appointment by the governor without the safeguard of competitive examination and tenure). We shall support S.F.950 and H.F.1120 (modification of veterans preference) and S.F.951 and H.F.1097 (appointment of the civil service director by the governor from the top 3 to 5 names selected by competitive examination and placement of the director in the classified service - tenure under civil service). Incidentally, contrary to information carried in the Minneapolis papers, the bill does not provide for the governor to approve the examining committee. The League will not support or oppose any other civil service measure thus far introduced including the bill which places the civil service department as a division in the Department of Administration. This is new subject matter not acted on before and not in the report of the Little Hoover Commission.

These decisions were made at the state board meeting on Friday, March 4. There was no question as to the League's opposition to S.F.32 and H.F.158. We had opposed this bill in 1953 and, as a threat to the principle of the merit system, the League's continuing role as a watch-dog was clearly called for. We have long supported modification of veterans preference (S.F.950 and H.F.1120). Our decision to support S.F.951 and H.F.1097 was based on these reasons:

1. Both the Little Hoover Commission and the Interim Committee on Civil Service recommended appointment by the governor. This follows trends and recommendations in other states.
2. League materials issued in 1952 referring to the Little Hoover Commission proposals, stated: "The difference proposed here is that the director be appointed by the Governor rather than by the Civil Service Board. With the safeguard of having three names resulting from examination, from which to appoint, it does not make much difference whether the Board or the Governor makes the appointment. From the standpoint of establishing a good relationship between the Governor and the department heads, appointment by him is desirable." Mrs. Arthur Down testifying for the League in 1953 in opposition to the bill now labeled S.F.32 and H.F.158 pointed out that the Little Hoover Commission had recommended that the Director be appointed by the governor but with the retention of the examination procedure for selection of three top candidates.
3. Replies from the local Leagues to civil service memos of January 24 and February 25 indicated no opposition to appointment by governor through competitive examination and with tenure. Some Leagues supported the proposal. No Leagues mentioned preference for the status-quo. Several Leagues, however, felt they were not sufficiently informed to pass judgment. The state board following an hour's discussion, decided to support S.F.951 and H.F.1097. It was agreed that where a measure was not of great importance and did not violate a principle of League support and where support would be helpful to protect the merit system from such things as appointment by the governor without safeguards, the board, exercising its duty of leadership, could make such a decision.

League testimony is attached.

March 1955

TESTIMONY REGARDING S.F.950 and H.F.1120

I am Mrs. T. O. Everson, Acting Civil Service Chairman of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota.

At several legislative sessions representatives of the League of Women Voters have testified in favor of modification of veterans preference in the interest of efficient and economical government. We have not been alone in our thinking on this subject. Since 1948 four commissions authorized by the Legislature have pointed out the need for modification of our veterans preference laws: The Legislative Research Committee reported in 1948 on Veterans Preference in Minnesota; the Little Hoover Commission in 1950; the Veterans Preference in Public Employment Commission in 1951; and the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program in 1955.

The Veterans Preference section of the Interim Committee's report is so well documented that there is no need for us to elaborate on it. We can simply say we endorse the bill based on the recommendations contained in this section.

We would be even more enthusiastic about the bill if it were amended to include another recommendation of the Interim Committee, which states: "It is recommended that veterans' preference laws, when applicable, shall be uniform for the state and its political subdivisions."

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota urges this committee to consider seriously the suggested amendment and to recommend H.F.1120 (S.F.950) for passage.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
84 South Tenth Street, Room 406
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota

March 1955

TESTIMONY REGARDING S.F.951 and H.F.1097

I am Mrs. T.O.Everson, Acting Civil Service Chairman of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota.

The League supports this bill, as introduced and without amendment, in the first instance because it provides safeguards through open competitive examination and tenure for the director, both necessary to insure a real merit system.

In the second place, appointment by the governor rather than by the civil service board is a procedure recommended by both the Little Hoover Commission and the Interim Committee on Civil Service. It is a practice adopted by other states where there has been recent civil service reform. It is a recommendation incorporated in the writings of many authorities in the field of public personnel administration. We recognize that change can be beneficial where it is in keeping with efficient, economical, and responsible government. No major change has been made in the civil service law since its adoption in 1939. We believe that appointment of the Civil Service Director by the governor is a desirable change at this time.

It is desirable because:

1. It clarifies the responsibility of the chief executive for personnel management in the state government.
2. It makes the single state personnel administrator responsible to the chief executive for successful administration of the state merit system.
3. It puts personnel administration where it belongs as an important tool of executive management.

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota urges this committee to pass favorably on S.F.951 because, to quote the Little Hoover Commission: "...the Director of Civil Service should be appointed by the Governor, but only with safeguards against abuse of the appointing power."

March 28, 1955

Mr. Edmund Tiemann, Chairman
Veterans & Military Affairs Committee
Minnesota House of Representatives
State Capitol
St. Paul, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Tiemann:

As requested by the secretary of your committee, I am enclosing a copy of my March 25th statement for the records.

Sincerely,

Mrs. T. O. Everson
Acting Civil Service Chairman

C
O
P
Y

STATEMENT OF
MRS. T. O. EVERTSON, ACTING CIVIL SERVICE CHAIRMAN, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA
before the
HOUSE VETERANS & MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
MARCH 25, 1955

I would like to read the following from History and Development of League Support of Civil Service (January, 1950) because I feel Mr. Lieb, a Minneapolis city employee has misinterpreted the League's stand. I believe this will clarify the past and present position of the League on modification of Veterans Preference.

"The first civil service bill supported by the League of Women Voters of Minnesota was introduced in a special session in 1935.

"Before the 1937 session the League asked state-wide organizations endorsing the merit system for state employees to send representatives to the Civil Service Council.

"A bill drafted by a committee appointed by the Council was introduced in the House in the 1937 session. This bill failed to pass. Educational work throughout the state was undertaken by the League. Meetings were sponsored all over the state. One thousand people attended such a meeting in Minneapolis. The League's usual questionnaire for candidates for the Legislature was confined to one subject only, civil service.

"The council began regular meetings again in the spring of 1938. The text of the proposed bill was given wide distribution throughout the state by member organizations of the Council. The bill recommended by the Civil Service Council was taken to each member organization for its official endorsement. Although the bill as drafted was accepted by the State Employees Union and although the state Federation of Labor had agreed that the action of the union would be acceptable to the Federation, in September, 1938, the state Federation refused to endorse the bill requesting that it contain a "blanketing in" provision for all employees and absolute veterans preference.

"So, another bill was introduced with Federation sponsorship, identical to the Council bill in most particulars but including these two provisions and other minor ones believed to be more acceptable to state employees.

"The Council bill was introduced into the House and Senate on the first day of the session. Five hearings were held before the House Civil Administration Committee and a sub-committee was then appointed with the result that a bill was reported to the House as a "committee" bill. The three chief points of controversy centered around the status of present employees, exemptions from the civil service system and veterans preference. With these exceptions, the committee bill which was enacted in 1939 was practically the bill recommended by the Council."

So, Gentlemen, this bill was, as is most legislation, a result of a compromise. The League did not support this bill wholeheartedly. We compromised because we felt it was imperative that a merit system be established. We believed that when it got on its feet, we could work for modification of veterans preference. That is why we have supported bills modifying veterans preference based on the findings and recommendations of the four commissions authorized by the Legislature which I mentioned at your last meeting.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
84 South Tenth St., Room 406
Minneapolis 33, Minnesota

May 6, 1955

Memo: to Local League Presidents and Legislative Chairmen
From: State Civil Service Acting Chairman, Mrs. Everson
Re: Legislative Report on Civil Service Item, May 1, 1955

Will you please attach this latest bit of information to the Report on Civil Service:

"At this session many more bills than usual dealing with phases of the Civil Service Program were introduced. Several of the recommendations of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program were adopted. These provided that:

- 1) a record be kept of all oral examinations,
- 2) the board have the power to initiate rules and regulations,
- 3) all rules be referred to the legislative session after their adoption.

Other provisions modified the dismissal procedure and broadened the base for selection of employees so that department heads have more leeway than formerly in choosing employees; in the case of sick leave, immediate family is defined as spouse or minor children living in the household of the employee."

CIVIL SERVICE ITEM
1955 REPORT

CONTINUING
RESPONSIBILITY

At the Council meeting in the spring of 1953 the League voted to continue to work for An Efficient Civil Service System as one of its Continuing Responsibilities. This support was to be two-fold: 1) to work to preserve the good features of the system when under legislative attack; and 2) to continue to work for its improvement, especially in the field of modification of Veterans' Preference.

We do not often picture our state in the role of employer, yet our taxes provide the money for the state payroll, which numbers about 20,000 persons. Many of the duties of an employer we delegate to our legislators. These include setting rates of pay and directing policy on recruitment, retirement, and dismissal. The tasks are pretty much the same as those of an industrial employer.

BILLS
INTRODUCED

At this session many more bills than usual dealing with phases of the Civil Service Program were introduced.

S.F. 32
H.F. 158
OFFICE OF
DIRECTOR

The League of Women Voters took legislative action on two bills affecting Civil Service. The first of these was:

S.F. 32 - Authors: Vukelich, Rogers, E. Peterson.
H.F. 158 - Rutter, Dunn, Cina, Fugina, Dirlam.

A bill vacating the office of director of civil service and providing for his appointment by the governor with the consent of the Senate.

HOUSE
ACTION

The League opposed this bill because it did not provide for selection through competitive examination and the director was not given tenure. The bill passed out of the House Civil Administration Committee by a 10 to 6 vote on February 23. When it came up on the floor of the House, Harold Anderson of Minneapolis and Clifton Parks of St. Paul, members of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program, moved to amend the bill so it would conform with the bill based on the Interim Committee's recommendations (S.F. 951 and H.F. 1097). Acting Civil Service Chairman, Mrs. T. O. Everson, prepared testimony in support of S.F. 951 and H.F. 1097, but there was not opportunity to give it. This bill provided for selection of the examining committee by the Civil Service Board and appointment of the director by the governor from a list of not less than three or more than five names certified by the examining committee, the director to have tenure and be removable by the Board for cause. The Anderson-Parks amendment was approved by the House but the bill, as passed on March 1 by a vote of 97 to 15, retained the "consent of the Senate for appointment," a feature which did not meet with our approval. We felt that if the Senate turned down appointments made from competitive civil service examinations it would in a sense be playing politics with civil service.

SENATE
ACTION

The Senate Civil Administration Committee acted on these bills on March 31, amending the House-passed bill (H.F. 158) to: change from appointment by the Governor back to appointment by the Board (as at present); director to be appointed for a six-year term with consent of the Senate; if re-appointed at end of the term, he would not have to take another examination. H.F. 158 as amended by the Senate was adopted in the last week of the session.

S.F. 950
H.F. 1120
VETERANS
PREFERENCE

This bill, based on the recommendations of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program regarding Veterans Preference, was introduced March 1 in the Senate, March 3 in the House.

S.F. 950 - Authors: Wefald, Root
H.F. 1120 - Authors: Parks, H. J. Anderson

LEAGUE
SUPPORTED

The League supported this bill which provided for: 5 and 10 point preference upon receipt of a passing grade in examination; part or all of the 5 points allowed non-disabled veterans and the 10 points granted disabled veterans could be used on either entrance or promotional examinations, but once the total number of points had been used there would be no more preference; in order to qualify as disabled, veterans must have a 10% or more disability rating by the Veterans Administration; widows would receive preference if they did not remarry; wives of disabled veterans would receive preference if their husbands had a disability rating of 50% or more.

TESTIMONY

The Senate bill was sent to the Civil Administration Committee. The House bill was sent to the Veterans and Military Affairs Committee. Proponents were heard on March 18 in both the House and Senate Committees. Mrs. Everson, representing the League of Women Voters, Mr. Charles Silverson, President of the Citizens League of Minneapolis and Hennepin County, and Mr. George Humphrey of the North Star Post 530 of the American Legion spoke for the bill. Mrs. Everson and Mr. Silverson asked that the bill be amended to include the political sub-divisions (counties and municipalities).

SENATE

Senator Wefald spelled out the provisions of the bill in the Senate committee and did an excellent job. Amendments to the bill were suggested and approved which stripped the bill of the following: requirement of a passing grade before the preference points could be used; requirement of a 10% disability rating before a veteran qualifies as disabled; giving equal eligibility to veterans and non-veterans with equal examination scores. The bill was then sent to a sub-committee for redrafting.

HOUSE

In the House Veterans and Military Affairs Committee the bill was explained by Clifton Parks of St. Paul, an author but not a member of the committee. Although Committee Chairman Tieman, opened the meeting by asking that personalities not be brought into the discussion, the treatment accorded Rep. Parks by some members of the committee who were violently opposed to any limitation of Veterans Preference was anything but statesmanlike. Mr. Parks should be commended for the calm manner in which he answered irrelevant questions concerning his own service record. Reps. LaBrosse of Duluth and Volstad of Minneapolis were particularly virulent in their questioning of Rep. Parks. Fortunately, Mr. Parks is a veteran with 14 months overseas service and a past Commander of an American Legion Post.

HEARINGS

IN BOTH HOUSES

As discussions proceeded in both House and Senate committees, it seemed clear that there was little knowledge either of the manner in which preference is presently granted or of the contents of the Interim Committee's report. A member of the Senate Committee which had been studying civil service bills for three meetings, and was about to vote on one of them, remarked "I know that Wefald and Root were members of the Interim Committee; I'd like to know who the other members were, it might make a difference in my vote." (Members were listed on page 1) Senator Root replied, "I don't think more than three members of this committee have read the Interim Report." The committee report was placed on each legislative desk the middle of January.

INCONSISTENCIES
OF VETERANS
ORGANIZATIONS

Representatives of the Veterans Organizations were heard in the Senate Committee on the 18th and 23rd of March, and in the House Committee on March 25. Inconsistencies of the veterans organizations were very pronounced. Apparently they do not want equal treatment for veterans working for the state and the political sub-divisions since they argued against changes in laws which grant preference to veterans in civil service systems at either level. The laws are now different. They said these were good laws, yet the provisions are such that if one is fair, the other is not. Veterans in the state service do not have to pass examinations in order to get preference while those in the sub-divisions must first pass examinations. The disabled veterans working for the state service get absolute preference, the non-disabled do

not; yet in the political sub-divisions all veterans go to the top of the list when they pass. Testimony of the representatives of the veterans organizations indicated interest only in retaining the status quo. They insisted that we did not have absolute preference in the state because of the rule of three; yet they pleaded not to abolish the same absolute preference.

Spokesmen for the veterans organizations and some of the committee members demanded to be given the name of "just one inefficient veteran," knowing full well the difficulties of proving such a charge under the present system. No mention was made of the number of capable veterans who had left the state service or who did not want to enter state service because there was little or no chance of promotion where disabled veterans (with zero disability ratings) were competing for jobs. The disabled veteran automatically goes to the top of the list if he gets 60 in the examination.

HOUSE
BILL
KILLED

It was apparent from the start that H.F. 1120 would not have a chance of being passed by the Veterans and Military Affairs Committee. Rep. Parks pleaded to have the bill sent to a sub-committee so it could be discussed thoroughly. He offered to sit down with the veterans organizations and try to work something out. Rep. A. O. Sundet, Faribault, made such a motion with a second by Rep. Christie of Minneapolis. No one voted with them. Rep. Otto Clark, Osakis, then moved to indefinitely postpone (same as killing); Rep. Harry Basford of Wolf Lake seconded the motion, a voice vote was taken, the motion carried. Once more the League attended last rites for this bill.

S.F. 1172
H.F. 1300
PREFERENCE IN
POLITICAL
SUB-DIVISIONS

This was a bill to modify veterans preference in the political sub-divisions of the state. The League took no action on this bill.

S.F. 1172 - Authors: Jelfald, Root

H.F. 1130 - Author: Parks

This bill modified preference in the political sub-divisions of the state. It was killed in the Senate Civil Administration Committee when it was indefinitely postponed on a motion by Senator Donald Wright of Minneapolis, although Senator Wright voted to abolish veterans preference on promotional examinations in the state service. This inconsistency did not pass unnoticed.

WHAT OF
THE FUTURE?

League members who represented you at the hearings on these bills feel strongly that if we are ever going to get modification of veterans preference, a tremendous effort in community education must be made, and though we failed this time, we got farther than we ever did before. The men and women who represent us might find the necessary courage if they thought other besides veterans organizations' lobbyists were interested in this issue. We wonder how many of the 400,000 veterans in the state know what a monopoly 520 disabled veterans (some of whom have only zero disability) have on promotions in the state classified service.

The valuable time of legislators and other highly respected citizens and some of our very precious and much needed tax money have gone into the four reports published since 1948. Each one has pointed out the need for modification of veterans preference, yet nothing has been done about it. A Minneapolis Star editorial of March 28 said, "Privately many legislators say they oppose this sort of favoritism but the veterans organization lobbies are so powerful a prudent lawmaker dare not oppose them. That seems a sad admission in a legislature which, in view of the state's other pressing problems, needs to show courage as well as wisdom."

[May, 1955]

State of Minnesota
DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE

Saint Paul, Minnesota

An Open Competitive Examination for the Position of

DIRECTOR OF THE STATE CIVIL SERVICE

ANNOUNCEMENT; APPLICATIONS:

The position of director of the state civil service in Minnesota is vacant. In accordance with the provisions of state law the Civil Service Board has appointed a committee of three members to receive applications and conduct an examination of candidates for the position. The examination will be open to qualified persons, nationwide. Individuals who believe they are qualified and are interested are invited to write for an application form to the Chairman, Examining Committee, Civil Service Department, 122 State Office Building, St. Paul 1, Minnesota. With the application form there will be mailed a copy of certain sections of the statutes pertaining to the duties and powers of the director. Applications and all material including a photograph at least two by four inches taken within the previous year will be retained in the files of the state civil service board. Only special or unusual material will, upon request, be returned to the applicant.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS:

In addition to completing carefully the application form, applicants will be expected to submit thoughtfully worded supplementary statements, which should be typewritten and numbered consecutively, signed, and enclosed with the completed application. It is expected that the applicant will supply in these statements information which in his or her judgment will help the committee to judge whether or not the applicant possesses the qualifications required for the position of director. Applicants are urged to make their statements brief. They may contain reference to special work accomplishments, but it will be inadvisable to mail copies of such material with applications. If the committee wishes to study any work of an applicant, it will make request for it.

DESIRABLE QUALIFICATIONS:

There will be no minimum qualifications for admission to this examination. However, the committee regards the following as desirable qualifications for this position:

Education equivalent to that which is represented by a bachelor's degree
Graduate or professional training with specialization in public or
business administration or industrial management
Experience as an administrator or technician in public or industrial
personnel work
Familiarity with administrative practices and procedures in government
Special competence in the fields of public relations, supervision, and
general administration

(over)

SALARY:

This position carries a current salary rate of \$11,600 per year, which is subject to cost-of-living adjustment.

FILING TIME:

Applications which show a postmark prior to or as of June 13, 1955, will be accepted; applications which show a postmark after that date cannot be considered.

EXAMINATION; CERTIFICATION; APPOINTMENT:

The committee will review the applications and will invite a limited number of the candidates whom it feels are the best qualified to report for further examination. Expenses of candidates so invited are reimbursable at the discretion of the Civil Service Board. The candidates so examined will be rated according to rank only. Veterans' preference is not applicable, according to law. The names of not less than three nor more than five persons rated highest by the committee will be certified to the Civil Service Board. The board will appoint one of the persons so certified to the position of director of the state civil service for a six year term, subject to confirmation of the Senate. Upon the expiration of his six year term, the director may be reappointed by the board, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The director is in the classified service, and may be removed by the board only in accordance with the provisions of law governing the dismissal of permanent state employees.

May, 1955

CIVIL SERVICE ITEM
1955 REPORT

CONTINUING
RESPONSIBILITY

At the Council meeting in the spring of 1953 the League voted to continue to work for An Efficient Civil Service System as one of its Continuing Responsibilities. This support was to be two-fold: 1) to work to preserve the good features of the system when under legislative attack; and 2) to continue to work for its improvement, especially in the field of modification of Veterans' Preference.

We do not often picture our state in the role of employer, yet our taxes provide the money for the state payroll, which numbers about 20,000 persons. Many of the duties of an employer we delegate to our legislators. These include setting rates of pay and directing policy on recruitment, retirement, and dismissal. The tasks are pretty much the same as those of an industrial employer.

BILLS
INTRODUCED

At this session many more bills than usual dealing with phases of the Civil Service Program were introduced.

S.F. 32
H.F. 158
OFFICE OF
DIRECTOR

The League of Women Voters took legislative action on two bills affecting Civil Service. The first of these was:
S.F. 32 - Authors: Vukelich, Rogers, E. Peterson.
H.F. 158 - Rutter, Dunn, Cina, Fugina, Dirlam.

A bill vacating the office of director of civil service and providing for his appointment by the governor with the consent of the Senate.

HOUSE
ACTION

The League opposed this bill because it did not provide for selection through competitive examination and the director was not given tenure. The bill passed out of the House Civil Administration Committee by a 10 to 6 vote on February 23. When it came up on the floor of the House, Harold Anderson of Minneapolis and Clifton Parks of St. Paul, members of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program, moved to amend the bill so it would conform with the bill based on the Interim Committee's recommendations (S.F. 951 and H.F. 1097). Acting Civil Service Chairman, Mrs. T. O. Everson, prepared testimony in support of S.F. 951 and H.F. 1097, but there was not opportunity to give it. This bill provided for selection of the examining committee by the Civil Service Board and appointment of the director by the governor from a list of not less than three or more than five names certified by the examining committee, the director to have tenure and be removable by the Board for cause. The Anderson-Parks amendment was approved by the House but the bill, as passed on March 1 by a vote of 97 to 15, retained the "consent of the Senate for appointment," a feature which did not meet with our approval. We felt that if the Senate turned down appointments made from competitive civil service examinations it would in a sense be playing politics with civil service.

SENATE
ACTION

The Senate Civil Administration Committee acted on these bills on March 31, amending the House-passed bill (H.F. 158) to: change from appointment by the Governor back to appointment by the Board (as at present); director to be appointed for a six-year term with consent of the Senate; if re-appointed at end of the term, he would not have to take another examination. H.F. 158 as amended by the Senate was adopted in the last week of the session.

S.F. 950
H.F. 1120
VETERANS
PREFERENCE

This bill, based on the recommendations of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program regarding Veterans Preference, was introduced March 1 in the Senate, March 3 in the House.
S.F. 950 - Authors: Wefald, Root
H.F. 1120 - Authors: Parks, H. J. Anderson

LEAGUE
SUPPORTED

The League supported this bill which provided for: 5 and 10 point preference upon receipt of a passing grade in examination; part or all of the 5 points allowed non-disabled veterans and the 10 points granted disabled veterans could be used on either entrance or promotional examinations, but once the total number of points had been used there would be no more preference; in order to qualify as disabled, veterans must have a 10% or more disability rating by the Veterans Administration; widows would receive preference if they did not remarry; wives of disabled veterans would receive preference if their husbands had a disability rating of 50% or more.

TESTIMONY

The Senate bill was sent to the Civil Administration Committee. The House bill was sent to the Veterans and Military Affairs Committee. Proponents were heard on March 18 in both the House and Senate Committees. Mrs. Everson, representing the League of Women Voters, Mr. Charles Silverson, President of the Citizens League of Minneapolis and Hennepin County, and Mr. George Humphrey of the North Star Post 530 of the American Legion spoke for the bill. Mrs. Everson and Mr. Silverson asked that the bill be amended to include the political sub-divisions (counties and municipalities).

SENATE

Senator Wefald spelled out the provisions of the bill in the Senate committee and did an excellent job. Amendments to the bill were suggested and approved which stripped the bill of the following: requirement of a passing grade before the preference points could be used; requirement of a 10% disability rating before a veteran qualifies as disabled; giving equal eligibility to veterans and non-veterans with equal examination scores. The bill was then sent to a sub-committee for redrafting.

HOUSE

In the House Veterans and Military Affairs Committee the bill was explained by Clifton Parks of St. Paul, an author but not a member of the committee. Although Committee Chairman Tieman, opened the meeting by asking that personalities not be brought into the discussion, the treatment accorded Rep. Parks by some members of the committee who were violently opposed to any limitation of Veterans Preference was anything but statesmanlike. Mr. Parks should be commended for the calm manner in which he answered irrelevant questions concerning his own service record. Reps. LaBrosse of Duluth and Volstad of Minneapolis were particularly virulent in their questioning of Rep. Parks. Fortunately, Mr. Parks is a veteran with 14 months overseas service and a past Commander of an American Legion Post.

HEARINGS
IN BOTH HOUSES

As discussions proceeded in both House and Senate committees, it seemed clear that there was little knowledge either of the manner in which preference is presently granted or of the contents of the Interim Committee's report. A member of the Senate Committee which had been studying civil service bills for three meetings, and was about to vote on one of them, remarked "I know that Wefald and Root were members of the Interim Committee; I'd like to know who the other members were, it might make a difference in my vote." (Members were listed on page 1) Senator Root replied, "I don't think more than three members of this committee have read the Interim Report." The committee report was placed on each legislative desk the middle of January.

INCONSISTENCIES
OF VETERANS
ORGANIZATIONS

Representatives of the Veterans Organizations were heard in the Senate Committee on the 18th and 23rd of March, and in the House Committee on March 25. Inconsistencies of the veterans organizations were very pronounced. Apparently they do not want equal treatment for veterans working for the state and the political sub-divisions since they argued against changes in laws which grant preference to veterans in civil service systems at either level. The laws are now different. They said these were good laws, yet the provisions are such that if one is fair, the other is not. Veterans in the state service do not have to pass examinations in order to get preference while those in the sub-divisions must first pass examinations. The disabled veterans working for the state service get absolute preference, the non-disabled do

not; yet in the political sub-divisions all veterans go to the top of the list when they pass. Testimony of the representatives of the veterans organizations indicated interest only in retaining the status quo. They insisted that we did not have absolute preference in the state because of the rule of three; yet they pleaded not to abolish the same absolute preference.

Spokesmen for the veterans organizations and some of the committee members demanded to be given the name of "just one inefficient veteran," knowing full well the difficulties of proving such a charge under the present system. No mention was made of the number of capable veterans who had left the state service or who did not want to enter state service because there was little or no chance of promotion where disabled veterans (with zero disability ratings) were competing for jobs. The disabled veteran automatically goes to the top of the list if he gets 60 in the examination.

HOUSE
BILL
KILLED

It was apparent from the start that H.F. 1120 would not have a chance of being passed by the Veterans and Military Affairs Committee. Rep. Parks pleaded to have the bill sent to a sub-committee so it could be discussed thoroughly. He offered to sit down with the veterans organizations and try to work something out. Rep. A. O. Sundet, Faribault, made such a motion with a second by Rep. Christie of Minneapolis. No one voted with them. Rep. Otto Clark, Osakis, then moved to indefinitely postpone (same as killing); Rep. Harry Basford of Wolf Lake seconded the motion, a voice vote was taken, the motion carried. Once more the League attended last rites for this bill.

S.F. 1172
H.F. 1300
PREFERENCE IN
POLITICAL
SUB-DIVISIONS

This was a bill to modify veterans preference in the political sub-divisions of the state. The League took no action on this bill.

S.F. 1172 - Authors: Wefald, Root
H.F. 1130 - Author: Parks

This bill modified preference in the political sub-divisions of the state. It was killed in the Senate Civil Administration Committee when it was indefinitely postponed on a motion by Senator Donald Wright of Minneapolis, although Senator Wright voted to abolish veterans preference on promotional examinations in the state service. This inconsistency did not pass unnoticed.

WHAT OF
THE FUTURE?

League members who represented you at the hearings on these bills feel strongly that if we are ever going to get modification of veterans preference, a tremendous effort in community education must be made, and though we failed this time, we got farther than we ever did before. The men and women who represent us might find the necessary courage if they thought other besides veterans organizations' lobbyists were interested in this issue. We wonder how many of the 400,000 veterans in the state know what a monopoly 520 disabled veterans (some of whom have only zero disability) have on promotions in the state classified service.

The valuable time of legislators and other highly respected citizens and some of our very precious and much needed tax money have gone into the four reports published since 1948. Each one has pointed out the need for modification of veterans preference, yet nothing has been done about it. A Minneapolis Star editorial of March 28 said, "Privately many legislators say they oppose this sort of favoritism but the veterans organization lobbies are so powerful a prudent lawmaker dare not oppose them. That seems a sad admission in a legislature which, in view of the state's other pressing problems, needs to show courage as well as wisdom."

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
84 South Tenth St., Room 406
Minneapolis 33, Minnesota

May 6, 1955

Memo: to Local League Presidents and Legislative Chairmen
From: State Civil Service Acting Chairman, Mrs. Everson
Re: Legislative Report on Civil Service Item, May 1, 1955

Will you please attach this latest bit of information to the Report on Civil Service:

"At this session many more bills than usual dealing with phases of the Civil Service Program were introduced. Several of the recommendations of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program were adopted. These provided that:

- 1) a record be kept of all oral examinations,
- 2) the board have the power to initiate rules and regulations,
- 3) all rules be referred to the legislative session after their adoption.

Other provisions modified the dismissal procedure and broadened the base for selection of employees so that department heads have more leeway than formerly in choosing employees; in the case of sick leave, immediate family is defined as spouse or minor children living in the household of the employee."

P.S. Sorry, but because of the pressure of time just before State Convention, the FEP Report won't be out until after the Convention.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
84 South Tenth St., Room 406
Minneapolis 3, Minn.

all Board
May 6, 1955

Memo: to Local League Presidents and Legislative Chairmen
From: State Civil Service Acting Chairman, Mrs. Everson
Re: Legislative Report on Civil Service Item, May 1, 1955

Will you please attach this latest bit of information to the Report on Civil Service:

"At this session many more bills than usual dealing with phases of the Civil Service Program were introduced. Several of the recommendations of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program were adopted. These provided that:

- 1) a record be kept of all oral examinations,
- 2) the board have the power to initiate rules and regulations,
- 3) all rules be referred to the legislative session after their adoption.

Other provisions modified the dismissal procedure and broadened the base for selection of employees so that department heads have more leeway than formerly in choosing employees; in the case of sick leave, immediate family is defined as spouse or minor children living in the household of the employee."

P.S. Sorry, but because of preparation for Convention, the FEP report won't be done until after the State Convention.

CIVIL SERVICE ITEM
1955 REPORT

CONTINUING
RESPONSIBILITY

At the Council meeting in the spring of 1953 the League voted to continue to work for An Efficient Civil Service System as one of its Continuing Responsibilities. This support was to be two-fold: 1) to work to preserve the good features of the system when under legislative attack; and 2) to continue to work for its improvement, especially in the field of modification of Veterans' Preference.

We do not often picture our state in the role of employer, yet our taxes provide the money for the state payroll, which numbers about 20,000 persons. Many of the duties of an employer we delegate to our legislators. These include setting rates of pay and directing policy on recruitment, retirement, and dismissal. The tasks are pretty much the same as those of an industrial employer.

BILLS
INTRODUCED

At this session many more bills than usual dealing with phases of the Civil Service Program were introduced.

S.F. 32
H.F. 158
OFFICE OF
DIRECTOR

The League of Women Voters took legislative action on two bills affecting Civil Service. The first of these was:

S.F. 32 - Authors: Vukelich, Rogers, E. Peterson.

H.F. 158 - Rutter, Dunn, Cina, Fugina, Dirlam.

A bill vacating the office of director of civil service and providing for his appointment by the governor with the consent of the Senate.

HOUSE
ACTION

The League opposed this bill because it did not provide for selection through competitive examination and the director was not given tenure. The bill passed out of the House Civil Administration Committee by a 10 to 6 vote on February 23. When it came up on the floor of the House, Harold Anderson of Minneapolis and Clifton Parks of St. Paul, members of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program, moved to amend the bill so it would conform with the bill based on the Interim Committee's recommendations (S.F. 951 and H.F. 1097). Acting Civil Service Chairman, Mrs. T. O. Everson, prepared testimony in support of S.F. 951 and H.F. 1097, but there was not opportunity to give it. This bill provided for selection of the examining committee by the Civil Service Board and appointment of the director by the governor from a list of not less than three or more than five names certified by the examining committee, the director to have tenure and be removable by the Board for cause. The Anderson-Parks amendment was approved by the House but the bill, as passed on March 1 by a vote of 97 to 15, retained the "consent of the Senate for appointment," a feature which did not meet with our approval. We felt that if the Senate turned down appointments made from competitive civil service examinations it would in a sense be playing politics with civil service.

SENATE
ACTION

The Senate Civil Administration Committee acted on these bills on March 31, amending the House-passed bill (H.F. 158) to: change from appointment by the Governor back to appointment by the Board (as at present); director to be appointed for a six-year term with consent of the Senate; if re-appointed at end of the term, he would not have to take another examination. H.F. 158 as amended by the Senate was adopted in the last week of the session.

S.F. 950
H.F. 1120
VETERANS
PREFERENCE

This bill, based on the recommendations of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program regarding Veterans Preference, was introduced March 1 in the Senate, March 3 in the House.

S.F. 950 - Authors: Wefald, Root

H.F. 1120 - Authors: Parks, H. J. Anderson

LEAGUE
SUPPORTED

The League supported this bill which provided for: 5 and 10 point preference upon receipt of a passing grade in examination; part or all of the 5 points allowed non-disabled veterans and the 10 points granted disabled veterans could be used on either entrance or promotional examinations, but once the total number of points had been used there would be no more preference; in order to qualify as disabled, veterans must have a 10% or more disability rating by the Veterans Administration; widows would receive preference if they did not remarry; wives of disabled veterans would receive preference if their husbands had a disability rating of 50% or more.

TESTIMONY

The Senate bill was sent to the Civil Administration Committee. The House bill was sent to the Veterans and Military Affairs Committee. Proponents were heard on March 18 in both the House and Senate Committees. Mrs. Everson, representing the League of Women Voters, Mr. Charles Silverson, President of the Citizens League of Minneapolis and Hennepin County, and Mr. George Humphrey of the North Star Post 530 of the American Legion spoke for the bill. Mrs. Everson and Mr. Silverson asked that the bill be amended to include the political sub-divisions (counties and municipalities).

SENATE

Senator Wefald spelled out the provisions of the bill in the Senate committee and did an excellent job. Amendments to the bill were suggested and approved which stripped the bill of the following: requirement of a passing grade before the preference points could be used; requirement of a 10% disability rating before a veteran qualifies as disabled; giving equal eligibility to veterans and non-veterans with equal examination scores. The bill was then sent to a sub-committee for redrafting.

HOUSE

In the House Veterans and Military Affairs Committee the bill was explained by Clifton Parks of St. Paul, an author but not a member of the committee. Although Committee Chairman Tieman, opened the meeting by asking that personalities not be brought into the discussion, the treatment accorded Rep. Parks by some members of the committee who were violently opposed to any limitation of Veterans Preference was anything but statesmanlike. Mr. Parks should be commended for the calm manner in which he answered irrelevant questions concerning his own service record. Reps. LaBrosse of Duluth and Volstad of Minneapolis were particularly virulent in their questioning of Rep. Parks. Fortunately, Mr. Parks is a veteran with 14 months overseas service and a past Commander of an American Legion Post.

HEARINGS
IN BOTH HOUSES

As discussions proceeded in both House and Senate committees, it seemed clear that there was little knowledge either of the manner in which preference is presently granted or of the contents of the Interim Committee's report. A member of the Senate Committee which had been studying civil service bills for three meetings, and was about to vote on one of them, remarked "I know that Wefald and Root were members of the Interim Committee; I'd like to know who the other members were, it might make a difference in my vote." (Members were listed on page 1) Senator Root replied, "I don't think more than three members of this committee have read the Interim Report." The committee report was placed on each legislative desk the middle of January.

INCONSISTENCIES
OF VETERANS
ORGANIZATIONS

Representatives of the Veterans Organizations were heard in the Senate Committee on the 18th and 23rd of March, and in the House Committee on March 25. Inconsistencies of the veterans organizations were very pronounced. Apparently they do not want equal treatment for veterans working for the state and the political sub-divisions since they argued against changes in laws which grant preference to veterans in civil service systems at either level. The laws are now different. They said these were good laws, yet the provisions are such that if one is fair, the other is not. Veterans in the state service do not have to pass examinations in order to get preference while those in the sub-divisions must first pass examinations. The disabled veterans working for the state service get absolute preference, the non-disabled do

not; yet in the political sub-divisions all veterans go to the top of the list when they pass. Testimony of the representatives of the veterans organizations indicated interest only in retaining the status quo. They insisted that we did not have absolute preference in the state because of the rule of three; yet they pleaded not to abolish the same absolute preference.

Spokesmen for the veterans organizations and some of the committee members demanded to be given the name of "just one inefficient veteran," knowing full well the difficulties of proving such a charge under the present system. No mention was made of the number of capable veterans who had left the state service or who did not want to enter state service because there was little or no chance of promotion where disabled veterans (with zero disability ratings) were competing for jobs. The disabled veteran automatically goes to the top of the list if he gets 60 in the examination.

HOUSE
BILL
KILLED

It was apparent from the start that H.F. 1120 would not have a chance of being passed by the Veterans and Military Affairs Committee. Rep. Parks pleaded to have the bill sent to a sub-committee so it could be discussed thoroughly. He offered to sit down with the veterans organizations and try to work something out. Rep. A. O. Sundet, Faribault, made such a motion with a second by Rep. Christie of Minneapolis. No one voted with them. Rep. Otto Clark, Osakis, then moved to indefinitely postpone (same as killing); Rep. Harry Basford of Wolf Lake seconded the motion, a voice vote was taken, the motion carried. Once more the League attended last rites for this bill.

S.F. 1172
H.F. 1300
PREFERENCE IN
POLITICAL
SUB-DIVISIONS

This was a bill to modify veterans preference in the political sub-divisions of the state. The League took no action on this bill.

S.F. 1172 - Authors: Mefald, Root
H.F. 1130 - Author: Parks

This bill modified preference in the political sub-divisions of the state. It was killed in the Senate Civil Administration Committee when it was indefinitely postponed on a motion by Senator Donald Wright of Minneapolis, although Senator Wright voted to abolish veterans preference on promotional examinations in the state service. This inconsistency did not pass unnoticed.

WHAT OF
THE FUTURE?

League members who represented you at the hearings on these bills feel strongly that if we are ever going to get modification of veterans preference, a tremendous effort in community education must be made, and though we failed this time, we got farther than we ever did before. The men and women who represent us might find the necessary courage if they thought other besides veterans organizations' lobbyists were interested in this issue. We wonder how many of the 400,000 veterans in the state know what a monopoly 520 disabled veterans (some of whom have only zero disability) have on promotions in the state classified service.

The valuable time of legislators and other highly respected citizens and some of our very precious and much needed tax money have gone into the four reports published since 1948. Each one has pointed out the need for modification of veterans preference, yet nothing has been done about it. A Minneapolis Star editorial of March 28 said, "Privately many legislators say they oppose this sort of favoritism but the veterans organization lobbies are so powerful a prudent lawmaker dare not oppose them. That seems a sad admission in a legislature which, in view of the state's other pressing problems, needs to show courage as well as wisdom."

STATE EMPLOYMENT

Highlights From The 16th Annual Report Of The Civil Service Department For The Year July 1, 1954; June 30, 1955

In November the Civil Service Board submits to the Governor a report of the department's activities for the preceding year. Although the report is prepared primarily for administrative purposes it contains much information of general interest to employees and to the public. The following brief summaries illustrate some of the activities and problems of the State Civil Service Department during the year 1954-1955.

The Civil Service Board is composed of three members, Mr. Francis W. Russell, Chairman and Mr. Raymond Black and Mr. Charles Bannister, the latter two having been appointed on March 9, 1955.

The Civil Service Department provided central personnel services to state departments for 12,861 classified positions at a departmental cost of \$218,613.71 for the fiscal year 1954-55.

Have you ever wondered what the average state employee is like, how old he is, how much he earns and how long he has been employed in the state service? The following tables taken from the annual report of the State Civil Service Department indicate that on the average he is 45 years of age, earns a salary of \$287 per month, receives an annual salary increase of \$7.30 per month and has worked for the state for seven years. More than 99% of all full time classified employees have permanent or probationary status in their jobs after qualifying under provisions of the Civil Service Law.

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

June 30, 1955

| Age | Men | Women | Total |
|------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| 20 and under | 60 | 342 | 402 |
| 21 to 30 | 1124 | 836 | 1906 |
| 31 to 40 | 1694 | 693 | 2387 |
| 41 to 50 | 1730 | 1116 | 2846 |
| 51 to 60 | 2055 | 1170 | 3225 |
| 61 to 69 | 1238 | 469 | 1707 |
| 70 and over | 122 | 28 | 150 |
| | <hr/> 8023 | <hr/> 4654 | <hr/> 12677 |
| No record of birthdate | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| | <hr/> 8026 | <hr/> 4655 | <hr/> 12681 |

SALARIES OF FULL-TIME CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

June 30, 1955

| Monthly Salaries | Number of Employees |
|------------------|---------------------|
| \$175 thru \$199 | 994 |
| \$200 thru \$249 | 4,768 |
| \$250 thru \$299 | 1,889 |
| \$300 thru \$349 | 3,013 |
| \$350 thru \$399 | 587 |
| \$400 thru \$449 | 750 |
| \$450 thru \$499 | 212 |
| \$500 thru \$549 | 161 |
| \$550 thru \$599 | 113 |
| \$600 thru \$649 | 77 |
| \$650 and over | 117 |
| | <u>12,681</u> |

Average State salary-\$287.00 per month

MERIT INCREASES GRANTED DURING THE YEAR 1954-1955 TO FULL-TIME CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

| Amount of Merit Increases Per Month | Number of Merit Increases |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| \$ 5 | 514 |
| \$ 6 | 1904 |
| \$ 8 | 1348 |
| \$10 | 370 |
| \$12 | 225 |
| \$14 | 77 |
| \$16 | 17 |

Total Number of Merit Increases

4455

Average Merit Increase-\$7.30

LENGTH OF SERVICE OF FULL-TIME CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

June 30, 1955

| Years Worked | Men | Women | Total |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Less than 5 years | 2,575 | 2,173 | 4,748 |
| 5 - 9 | 2,094 | 1,216 | 3,310 |
| 10 - 14 | 874 | 629 | 1,503 |
| 15 - 19 | 714 | 240 | 954 |
| 20 - 24 | 745 | 140 | 885 |
| 25 - 29 | 414 | 114 | 528 |
| 30 - 34 | 452 | 88 | 540 |
| 35 and over | 158 | 55 | 213 |
| | <u>8,026</u> | <u>4,655</u> | <u>12,681</u> |

STATUS OF FULL-TIME CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

June 30, 1955

| | |
|----------------------|---------------|
| Permanent | 11,445 |
| Probationary | 1,139 |
| Provisional Promoted | 27 |
| Provisional | 70 |
| | <u>12,681</u> |

The Civil Service Rules permit the establishment of training programs to prepare qualified individuals for careers in the state service. During the year, one thousand sixty-six trainees were appointed. The training programs cover a number of different fields of activity. Listed below are the number of individuals who participated in the fifteen different programs in use during the reporting period.

| Training Program | Number of Trainees |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Administrative Trainees | 1 |
| Civil Engineers | 22 |
| Engineering Aides | 85 |
| Child Welfare Workers | 7 |
| Affiliate Nurses | 897 |
| Occupational Therapists | 10 |
| Patient Activities Interns | 10 |
| Surgical Resident Trainees | 3 |
| Orthopedics Trainees | 7 |
| Bank Examiner Trainees | 6 |
| Anesthesiology Trainees | 4 |
| Research Trainee | 5 |
| Psychiatric Social Workers | 6 |
| Brace-maker Trainees | 1 |
| Secondary Teacher Trainees | 2 |
| | <u>1066</u> |

Although there were 18,000 applications processed for State employment last year and more than 14,000 persons were given examinations, one should not assume that the state service was adequately supplied with qualified persons in all fields of employment. Over 59% of all applications, or 11,147, were received for 15 classes. In the specialized professional and technical classes the number of applications was extremely low. The following tables show the work load and summarize the activities of the Examining Division.

Examination Summary

| Examinations | Open Competitive | Promotional | Total |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------|-------|
| Announced | 111 | 70 | 181 |
| Open Continuously | 150 | 4 | 154 |
| Classes Examined For | 246 | 74 | 320 |
| Times Administered | 808 | 111 | 919 |

Recruiting and Examining Results

| Candidates | Open Competitive | Promotional | Total | Percent |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------|--------|---------|
| Applying | 18,821 | 3,382 | 22,203 | 100% |
| Accepted | 18,008 | 3,262 | 21,270 | 95.8% |
| Examined | 14,584 | 3,129 | 17,713 | 79.8% |
| Placed on Lists | 7,930 | 2,188 | 10,118 | 45.57% |
| Appointed | 1,717 | 446 | 2,163 | 9.74% |

Names Placed on All Eligible Lists

| Applicants | Open Competitive | Promotional | Total | Percent |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------|--------|---------|
| Disabled Veterans | 363 | 296 | 659 | 6.51% |
| Non-disabled Veterans | 1,514 | 766 | 2,280 | 22.54% |
| Non-Veterans | 6,053 | 1,126 | 7,179 | 70.95% |
| Total on Lists | 7,930 | 2,188 | 10,118 | 100% |

State employees used an average of 5.37 days of sick leave during the last fiscal year. The Civil Service Department in cooperation with personnel administrators of the major state departments is in the process of developing a state-wide sick leave policy to promote uniform application of sick leave in the state service.

Although there are approximately 800 classes of positions in the state classified service, more than half of all positions are included in only 20 classes which are listed below.

TWENTY LARGEST CLASSES OF FULL-TIME POSITIONS

June 30, 1955

| Class | Men | Women | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Account Clerk | 57 | 83 | 139 |
| Accountant I | 127 | 14 | 141 |
| Civil Engineer I | 258 | 1 | 259 |
| Civil Engineer II | 172 | - | 172 |
| Clerk I | 36 | 249 | 285 |
| Clerk II | 83 | 215 | 298 |
| Clerk Stenographer I | 3 | 145 | 148 |
| Clerk Stenographer II | 4 | 389 | 393 |
| Clerk Stenographer III | 2 | 142 | 144 |
| Clerk Typist I | 16 | 316 | 332 |
| Clerk Typist II | 15 | 227 | 242 |
| Correctional Officer I | 246 | - | 246 |
| Custodial Worker I | 241 | 319 | 560 |
| Engineering Aide I | 235 | 11 | 246 |
| Engineering Aide II | 333 | 11 | 344 |
| Game Warden | 120 | - | 120 |
| Highway Maintenance Man I | 401 | - | 401 |
| Highway Maintenance Man II | 443 | - | 443 |
| Psychiatric Aide I | 596 | 760 | 1,356 |
| Psychiatric Aide II | 202 | 195 | 397 |
| All Others | 4,437 | 1,578 | 6,015 |
| | <u>8,026</u> | <u>4,655</u> | <u>12,681</u> |

The 1955 Legislature enacted a salary plan which eliminated serious defects in the previous plan and established for the first time longevity increases for longtime employees. This legislative action provided an improved salary structure to meet current employment conditions.

During the fiscal year the Civil Service classification staff began a general salary and classification survey of positions in the state service. To date surveys have been completed for the Conservation Department and the Central Office of the Welfare Department and a survey of Highway Department positions is in progress. Positions will be reviewed every four or five years.

JUL 25 1955 *File*

Statement by Mrs. T. O. Everson, former Civil Service Chairman, League of Women Voters of Minnesota, given to the Institute of Minnesota Government and Politics

Mr. Chairman, Panel and Institute Members:

C
The second Hoover Commission in reporting on Federal Personnel and Civil Service calls attention to the fact that: the preferences granted in employment are only part of a comprehensive program of special benefits to veterans provided by this nation.

O
The program includes Aid ⁱⁿ ~~to~~ Education, Housing Loan guarantees, Business and farm loans, Medical Aid and Pensions. The Commission said all these should be considered when weighing the need for preference in employment.

P
Of roughly 20 million veterans in the U.S. approximately 1 million or 1 out of 20 veterans are on the Federal payroll. 50% of the Federal employees and 60% of the male Federal employees receive veterans preference.

Y
On March 17, 1955, we had 12,508 full time State employees — 23.6% were accorded veterans preference. From May 1, 1947, to January 1, 1955, 911 veterans with failing scores were appointed to state positions (original 764, promotional 147). 440 of these were disabled veterans. Under the present law a zero disability is enough to get such a rating, and disabled veterans go to the top of the eligible list.

The principle of the merit system allows no exceptions from the rule that the best possible person, selected through competitive examination, shall be appointed to a given position. For this reason, veterans' preference or preference for any group, is inconsistent with the ^{theory} theory of the merit system.

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota, however, is aware of the service veterans have rendered to our country and we believe that this service and the time it consumed should be recognized through incorporation of some preference for veterans as an integral part of our civil service system.

C
O
P
Y
It is our belief, however, that too much reliance has been placed upon a rigid system that benefits neither the veteran nor our government. At several legislative sessions, representatives of the League of Women Voters have testified in favor of modification of veterans' preference in the interest of efficient and economical government. Here ⁱⁿ Minnesota we have not been alone in our thinking on this subject. Since 1948 four commissions authorized by the legislature have pointed out the need for modification of our veterans' preference laws: the Legislative Research Committee reported in 1948 on veterans preference in Minnesota; the Little Hoover Commission in 1950; the Veterans Preference in Public Employment Commission in 1951; and the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program in 1955. We have supported bills based on the findings of these groups.

We are in accord with what Colonel Garey, Civil Service Counsel for the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, International, said about veterans' preference, especially absolute preference, when commenting on the Report of the Interim Committee, "everything that the committee says in condemnation of and about improving the veterans' preference situation in Minnesota is endorsed by me heartily. As a veteran of two wars, and most of a life time service in the National Guard, I endorse heartily the courage of the committee. Veterans' preference should be limited to five points ~~to~~ be used only in entrance examinations and ten points only if there is shown compensable disability, meaning at least 10% disability.

"The absolute preference is unthinkable and will soon become unbearable and no one knows this better than veterans. Only the 'professional' veteran holds out for something that should have been written off our statutes shortly after World War I. The sons and daughters of veterans if they do not happen to be veterans themselves suffer just as much from unconsiderable veterans' preference as do the sons and daughters of non-veterans, if we have any non-veterans left in our land." Colonel Garey is considered an authority on civil service and was one of the men who aided in the first draft of the 1939 law.

C
O
P
Y

We are also in accord with the statement made by Senator Wefald, member of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program, in a letter to an American Legion Post. He said, "In your resolution you express 'unequivocal opposition to any change in the veterans' preference law of the state of Minnesota.' There is no law so perfect that it does not require change or amendment and the veterans' preference law is in need of some changes which will benefit veterans themselves as well as the public at large.

"Many of the veterans employed by the state of Minnesota are of the highest caliber and ability, but it would be rather far fetched to say that every veteran is of the highest caliber and ability. There is no group of people anywhere on earth where everyone in the group can be said to be of the highest caliber."

We have approved the recommendations of the commissions and committees which state, "That veterans' preference laws when applicable shall be uniform for the state and its political subdivisions." If improvement is desirable in the classified service of the state, it is much more so in the political subdivisions where all veterans have absolute preference. In Minneapolis about half of the city's 6,000 employees work in the fire, police and engineering departments. The heads of these departments have pointed out publicly the need for modification of our veterans' preference laws. In the cities we are constantly aware of the demand for more efficiency in government. Yet our hands are tied when our local department heads say that the one thing which would do more than anything else to increase efficiency in their departments is modification of our veterans' preference laws. The power to change rests with the legislature. During the past legislative session as discussion proceeded in both House and Senate committees it seemed clear that there was little knowledge either of the manner in which preference is presently granted or of the contents of the Interim Committee's report upon which bills under discussion were based, although copies of the report were given to the legislators two months before the bills were introduced and the members should have known that if bills on the Report were introduced, they would come before their committee.

We therefore believe that a tremendous effort must be made before the next session to bring information to the local communities on this subject.

C
O
P
Y
The valuable time of legislators and other highly respected citizens and some of our very precious and much needed tax money have gone into the four reports published since 1948. Each one has pointed out the need for modification of veterans' preference. Yet nothing has been done about it. A Minneapolis Star editorial of March 28, 1955 said, "Privately many legislators say they oppose this sort of favoritism but the veterans organization lobbies are so powerful a prudent lawmaker dare not oppose them. That seems a sad admission in a legislature which, in view of the state's other pressing problems, needs to show courage as well as wisdom."

Since there seems to be a feeling on the part of some legislators that no changes in our preference laws should be made until the veterans themselves recommend them, we were pleased to learn that a state wide committee of the American Legion has voted in favor of some modification. We hope the committee's recommendations are adopted at the State Convention next month.

In closing I want to go back to the second Hoover Report; the task force on Personnel and Civil Service states, "the special preference can be justified only where it meets a real need of the veteran without seriously damaging the civil service.... Assistance to veterans during the period of readjustment is reasonable but preferences for able bodied veterans cannot be continued permanently without doing violence to the effectiveness of the Government's Personnel. The argument that veterans have proved as capable as non veterans' civil servants is not in itself an argument for veterans' preference in public employment. After making their readjustment to civilian life, veterans can stand on their own feet as well as other citizens. The task force does not believe that the American people, including the great majority of veterans themselves, want veterans to be a permanent "privileged class." That runs counter to the democratic ideals of America - ideals which veterans were called into service to defend."

State employees as of March 17, 1955 —

12,508

Non-veterans

9,552

Disabled

520

Non-disabled

2,436

C Total Veterans

2,956 or 23.6%

O
P
Y
Figures above came from Mr. Frank Moulton, who got them during the session from
the Civil Service Department.

TRIB - 7/15/55

Legion Group Backs Curb on Vets' Privilege

By JOHN C. McDONALD

Minneapolis Tribune Staff Writer

A statewide American Legion committee has voted in favor of modifying three veterans preference provisions for public employees, it was learned Thursday.

Legion chairman of



Partially Scanned Material

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/library/.

Aug 6-55

Defeated by
committee of
convention.

never considered
by entire body

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

OF THE UNITED STATES

1026 17TH STREET, N. W.



WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

MRS. JOHN G. LEE
President

December 6, 1955

File

AIR MAIL

Mrs. Basil Young, President
League of Women Voters of Minnesota
University of Minnesota
15th & Washington Ave., S.E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Dear Mrs. Young:

I am trying to gather material on state merit systems and civil service laws for Mrs. Killen of the national Board. Mrs. Killen has recently been appointed to the Florida State Merit Council. I believe your state had a publication called, An Efficient Civil Service System. We do not seem to have a copy here, and I am writing to ask that you send a copy, together with any other civil service material that you have, directly to Mrs. Henry L. Killen, 1227 Golden Lane, Orlando, Florida.

long

Thank you very much for any help you can give Mrs. Killen.

Sincerely yours,

Christine Urban

Christine Urban
Program Secretary

Interim Study also

CU/blc

CC: Mrs. Killen



FLORIDA MERIT SYSTEM

307 W. V. KNOTT BUILDING

TELEPHONE 2-3680

TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

GEORGE T. SHANNON, CHAIRMAN
TAMPA

ALBERT H. EDWARDS
JACKSONVILLE

J. SHIRLEY GRACY
ST. PETERSBURG

MRS. HENRY KILLEN
ORLANDO

E. B. MCKINNEY
JACKSONVILLE

ANGUS LAIRD
MERIT SYSTEM DIRECTOR

Orlando, Florida
January 2, 1956

Mrs. Harold Wilson,
Executive Secretary
LWV of Minnesota
University of Minnesota
15 & Washington Avenue S. E.
Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Mrs. Wilson:

Thank you very much for the interesting and helpful material which reached me so promptly. I was sorry to note that you wanted the Interim Committee Report returned--because it is just wonderful, so well organized, and so full of excellent information, I surely would love to keep it, but I will return it very soon. I am sure you can appreciate that I have found little time for such study in recent days, however, I will return it to you before I leave for the National Board meeting on January 7th. Meanwhile, my thanks to you and very best wishes for a Happy New Year!

Sincerely,

Louise Killen

Mrs. Henry Killen

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

University of Minnesota, TSMc, 15th & Washington Ave. S.E., Minneapolis 14, Minnesota
Price 8¢ Federal 8-8791 February, 1956

CIVIL SERVICE IN MINNESOTA

There are a number of different merit systems in Minnesota. Each is a distinct unit with its own law, organizational structure and jurisdiction. Basically the principles are very much the same. They give examinations for selection of employees; some classify jobs; they provide a structure for the assignment of salaries; they allow paid vacations and sick leave; they provide a system for making promotions. But within these areas, the methods differ widely. Any individual employee case which may come up for inspection must be examined only within the framework of the particular merit system in which it falls.

The State Civil Service system, which the League was so influential in creating, is the most modern, having an administrator responsible for all of the operations of the department, with a part-time board acting in a policy-making, quasi-judicial capacity, as recommended in the Model Civil Service Law prepared by the National Civil Service League. Many of the other public personnel systems in the state are administered by full-time boards or commissions with a secretary or chief examiner who is responsible to the board or commission for all administrative actions.

The jurisdictions of the various merit systems operating in Minnesota are described briefly below.

1. Federal Civil Service. This personnel system in Minnesota is administered by the United States Civil Service Commission from the branch office in St. Paul and the regional office in St. Louis, Mo. Under Federal Civil Service are offices such as the U.S. Post Office, the U.S. Forest Service, Customs, Veterans Administration, Social Security and Internal Revenue. These departments have offices scattered throughout the state, in addition to larger district or regional offices located in the Twin Cities.

2. County Welfare Merit System. This is a subdivision of the State Department of Public Welfare, established by the federal Social Security law to provide a merit system for county welfare employees. In Minnesota this personnel system has jurisdiction only over the employees of the County Welfare Boards. The federal Social Security law provides that all employees partially paid by Social Security funds shall be selected on a merit basis. All states, therefore, have a personnel system which has jurisdiction over all health, welfare, and employment and security employees. In Minnesota the state employees in these departments enjoy the benefits of the statewide civil service system.

3. Municipal civil service systems and City Police and Fire Civil Service Commissions. For many years, Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth (cities of the first class) have had civil service systems for the employees of the city governments. Civil service for police and fire departments has been authorized for cities smaller than first class since 1929.

The 1951 Legislature passed an act enabling cities of the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th class, and villages or boroughs to establish civil service systems. Under this statute, establishment of a local merit system is provided by an ordinance approved by a majority of the voters voting on its approval at a general or special election.

4. County civil service systems. St. Louis County and Ramsey County have merit systems covering county employees. The St. Louis County Civil Service Board has jurisdiction over the St. Louis County Welfare Board employees. In Ramsey County,

those employees are under the jurisdiction of the County Welfare Merit System. (See 2 above).

5. State of Minnesota Civil Service Department. This is the public personnel agency which has jurisdiction over employees working for state government. It is the Civil Service which the League was instrumental in effecting in this state in 1939, and the one in which it is particularly interested as a result.

STATE CIVIL SERVICE COVERAGE

In the extent of its coverage, Minnesota's state civil service system is one of the best in the country. In June, 1955, there was a total of 13,622 state employees. Of this total, 12,681 were in the classified service (positions under civil service) and 941 were in the unclassified service (positions not under civil service). The Civil Service Act specifically excludes some state employees from provisions of the law. Briefly, these unclassified positions include: Elective officials, department heads appointed by the Governor, one private secretary to each of the elective officers, deputy registrars of motor vehicles and their seasonal help, employees in the Governor's office, employees of the Legislature, the academic staffs of the state teachers' colleges, professional staff of the Attorney General's office, court employees, patient and inmate help in state institutions, and state highway patrolmen. (State Highway Patrolmen are selected and appointed according to civil service procedures, but none of the other provisions of the civil service law affect them.)

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERSONNEL AGENCY AND THE FINANCE AGENCY

Important to keep in mind when studying the functions of a personnel agency is its relationship to other agencies of the governmental unit, especially the department in control of funds. In Minnesota, for instance, the functions of the Budget Division of the Department of Administration and of the Civil Service Department are closely related.

In order to understand civil service in this state, it is necessary also to know some of the functions of the Budget Division and also of the state Legislature with respect to allocation of funds. Briefly, the Legislature appropriates the monies for the operation of each state department for each biennium. The Budget Division controls the expenditure of these monies within the amount appropriated by the Legislature. (The Budget Division maintains a much more rigid control over the expenditures of the General Revenue Fund than over those of dedicated funds.)

The Department of Administration, therefore, is the one which determines: whether or not a new position would be necessary to the department's operations; whether or not a proposed departmental reorganization of positions would be in accordance with the principles of sound management; and whether, therefore, such a reorganization could be allowed; and whether or not funds be available for the reallocation of a position to a higher job classification. Such problems involve personnel management. Their resolution, however, falls within the scope of the central finance agency rather than that of the personnel agency.

Governor Freeman, in his special reorganization message of February 25, 1955, spelled out a proposal to cement this relationship by placing the Civil Service Department as a division in the Department of Administration. The same suggestion was also recommended by the Interim Committee's Report on the Civil Service Program. It is generally agreed that this is a trend in administrative organization to unify all management functions (organization, finance, personnel, etc.) in a single staff agency - in Minnesota, the Department of Administration. A comparable recommendation was made by the second Hoover Commission in proposing that a presidential adviser on personnel management be appointed to the White House executive staff. Some states

have already adopted this organizational pattern. It should be noted that Minnesota's Little Hoover Commission, in 1950, recommended that the Civil Service Department be retained as a separate department.

Some fear has been expressed that this proposed arrangement would make civil service "political." However, most authorities endorse this recommendation without sharing apprehensions that it would weaken the civil service system.

On the other hand it should be pointed out that the present administrative arrangement in Minnesota does not really prevent close collaboration between the Department of Administration and the Civil Service Department. As in most organizational patterns, the human element plays a large part - cooperation depends largely on good relations among the administrators involved. At the present time, a harmonious working relationship seems to exist between the Commissioner of Administration and the Civil Service Director. The principle of unification of management functions in one department should not be overlooked, however, as a possible future development in the State government of Minnesota.

THE MINNESOTA STATE CIVIL SERVICE DEPARTMENT.

The Minnesota Civil Service Department has a single administrative head, with a three-member board which acts in a policy-making and a quasi-judicial capacity. This type of administrative organization is generally recognized by management experts as being one of the most efficient organizational forms, and is incorporated into the Model Civil Service Law.

Civil Service Board

Members of the Board are appointed by the Governor, with the consent of the Senate, for terms of six years. One member is ~~appointed~~ each biennium. The present members of the Civil Service Board are:

Charles Bannister, Duluth, Business Representative, Hotel and Restaurant Employees
Raymond D. Black, Minneapolis, Executive Director, Citizens League of Minneapolis and Hennepin County
Francis W. Russell, Cold Spring, Attorney

The principal powers and duties of the Civil Service Board are:

1. After public hearing, to approve, modify, reject, or approve as modified:
 - a. Rules and regulations prepared and recommended by the Director for carrying out the purposes of the Civil Service Act. 1955 law gave Board power to initiate rules.
 - b. Plans for the classification of positions.
 - c. Compensation schedules for positions in state civil service.
2. To make investigations concerning the enforcement and effect of the civil service act.
3. To conduct hearings and pass upon complaints, in accordance with the provisions of the act.

The Board is also responsible for appointing the Civil Service Director. It appoints an examining committee to conduct a merit examination for the purpose of establishing a list of eligible candidates. The Board then makes an appointment from the three to five highest names for a term of six years. The Board appoints subject to the consent

of the Senate, and the Director may be reappointed by the Board without further examination with Senate consent.

There were two proposals to change the method of appointment of the Civil Service Director in the 1955 legislative session:

1. To vacate the office of civil service director and provide for his appointment by the governor without the safeguard of competitive examination and tenure.
2. To provide for appointment of the civil service director by the governor from the top three to five names selected by competitive examination and placement of the director in the classified service (tenure under civil service).

In order to understand more fully the character of these proposals, it is necessary to point out that the former Director of Civil Service in Minnesota, who resigned in 1955, was a very controversial figure. The first proposal was clearly directed at getting rid of him. The second proposal incorporated a recommendation of the Little Hoover Commission and the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program and is generally supported by public personnel authorities. The Civil Service Director resigned under attack and his successor was chosen in accordance with existing law by the Civil Service Board by competitive examination. The second proposal changed nothing in this procedure except that the appointment would be by the Governor. It is very unlikely that the first proposal will be repeated now that the object of its intent has been removed. The League opposed the bill because it did not include selection of the Director on the basis of proved merit (competitive examination) and did not provide for tenure. The second and more serious recommendation, which received League support, might again be introduced in future legislative sessions.

The Director of Civil Service

The Director, John W. Jackson (his appointment in 1955 must be approved by the Senate in 1957) is responsible for administering the provisions of the Civil Service Act. He has a staff of some 55 persons engaged in the performance of these main functions of the department:

1. To administer the civil service law in accordance with its provisions and under the policies of the Civil Service Board.
2. To give open-competitive and promotional examinations in order to find the best qualified persons available to do state work; to test them; grade their papers; set up eligible lists; and make certain that appointments are made according to civil service law and rules.
3. To check the pay of each state employee to be sure he is getting paid within the proper pay range.
4. To determine whether proposed personnel actions are within the scope of the law and rules.
5. To maintain an official roster of state employees.
6. To make sure that all personnel transactions such as salary increases, promotions, transfers, and the like are proper and legal.
7. To classify jobs based on their duties and responsibilities in accordance with state classification plan.

8. To re-allocate jobs when duties and responsibilities have changed enough to make it necessary.
9. To recommend to the Civil Service Board the assignment of each class of work to a specific pay range and to recommend changes in these assignments when necessary.
10. In general, to be the state's central personnel agency.

The Department is divided into three main sections to administer the functions delegated to the Director under the act. These divisions of the Civil Service Department are:

1. The Recruiting and Examining Division. This division recruits state employees; prepares, gives and grades examinations; and sees to it that appointments are properly made from eligible lists.
2. The Classification and Compensation Division. This division classifies all the state jobs in accordance with the state classification plan and determines pay rates for state jobs in accordance with the state pay plan.
3. The Transaction and Office Management Division. This division is responsible for the accuracy and legality of all personnel transactions such as salary increases, resignations, layoffs, demotions, and so on; for making sure that all state payrolls are correct; for the proper explanations of the law and rules to the operating departments; and for doing "housekeeping" work for the Civil Service Department itself, such as budgeting, purchasing, filing, duplicating and typing.

VETERANS PREFERENCE

The League supported legislation in 1955, as it has in many legislative sessions, to modify veterans preference. It provided:

1. 5 and 10 point preference upon receipt of a passing grade in examination.
2. Part or all of the 5 points allowed non-disabled veterans and the 10 points granted disabled veterans could be used on either entrance or promotional examinations, but once the total number of points had been used, there would be no more preference.
3. In order to qualify as disabled, veterans must have a 10% or more disability rating by the Veterans Administration.
4. Widows would receive preference if they did not remarry; wives of disabled veterans would receive preference if their husbands had a disability rating of 50% or more.

The most recent information on veterans preference in public employment was presented in a statement (reprinted here in part) by Mrs. T. O. Everson, former Civil Service Chairman of the League of Women Voters, at the Institute on Minnesota Government and Politics, University of Minnesota, July 1955.

"On March 17, 1955, we had 12,508 full-time state employees - 23.6% were accorded veterans preference. From May 1, 1947 to January 1, 1955, 911 veterans with failing scores were appointed to state jobs (entrance 764, promotional 147); 440 of these

were disabled veterans. Under the present law, a zero disability is enough to get such a rating, and disabled veterans go to the top of the eligible list.

"The principle of the merit system allows no exceptions from the rule that the best possible person, selected through competitive examination, shall be appointed to a given position. For this reason, veterans preference or preference for any group is inconsistent with the theory of the merit system. The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is aware of the service veterans have rendered to our country, and we believe that this service and the time it consumed should be recognized through incorporation of some preference for veterans as an integral part of our civil service system.

"It is our belief, however, that too much reliance has been placed upon a rigid system that benefits neither the veteran nor our government. Since 1948, four commissions authorized by the legislature have pointed out the need for modification of our veterans preference laws: the Legislative Research Committee, in 1948; the Little Hoover Commission, in 1950; the Veterans Preference in Public Employment, in 1951; and the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program, in 1955. The League of Women Voters has supported bills based on the findings of these groups.

"Colonel Garey, Civil Service Counsel for the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, International, said in commenting on the Report of the Interim Committee:

'Everything that the committee says in condemnation of and about improving the veterans preference situation in Minnesota is endorsed by me heartily. As a veteran of two wars, and most of a life-time service in the National Guard, I endorse heartily the courage of the Committee. Veterans preference should be limited to five points to be used only in entrance examinations and 10 points only if there is shown compensable disability, meaning at least 10% disability. The absolute preference is unthinkable and will soon become unbearable and no one knows this better than veterans. Only the "professional" veteran holds out for something that should have been written off our statutes shortly after World War I. The sons and daughters of veterans, if they do not happen to be veterans themselves, suffer just as much from unconsiderable veterans preference as do the sons and daughters of non-veterans, if we have any non-veterans left in our land.'

"Senator Wefald, member of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program said in a letter to an American Legion Post:

'In your resolution, you express "unequivocal opposition to any change in the veterans preference law in the state of Minnesota." There is no law so perfect that it does not require change or amendment and the veterans preference law is in need of some changes which will benefit veterans themselves as well as the public at large. Many of the veterans employed by the state of Minnesota are of the highest calibre and ability, but it would be rather far-fetched to say that every veteran is of the highest calibre and ability. There is no group of people anywhere on earth where everyone in the group can be said to be of the highest calibre.'

"The League has approved the recommendations of the commissions and committees which state, 'That veterans preference laws when applicable shall be uniform for the state and its political subdivisions.' If improvement is desirable in the classified service of the state, it is much more so in the political subdivisions where all veterans have absolute preference. The power to change rests with the legislature.

"The valuable time of legislators and other highly respected citizens and some of our very precious and much needed tax money have gone into the four reports published since 1948. Each one has pointed out the need for modification of veterans preference. Yet nothing has been done about it. A Minneapolis Star editorial of March 28, 1955 said, 'Privately, many legislators say they oppose this sort of favoritism but the veterans organization lobbies are so powerful a prudent lawmaker dare not oppose them. That seems a sad admission in a legislature which, in view of the state's other pressing problems, needs to show courage as well as wisdom.' A state-wide committee of the American Legion recently voted in favor of some modification but its recommendations never reached the floor of the state convention in 1955.

"The task force on Personnel and Civil Service of the second Hoover Report (1955) said in part:

'...special preference can be justified only where it meets a real need of the veteran without seriously damaging the civil service.... Assistance to veterans during the period of readjustment is reasonable but preferences for able bodied veterans cannot be continued permanently without doing violence to the effectiveness of the Government's personnel. The argument that veterans have proved as capable as non veteran civil servants is not in itself an argument for veterans preference in public employment. After making their readjustment to civilian life, veterans can stand on their feet as well as other citizens. The task force does not believe that the American people, including the great majority of veterans themselves, want veterans to be a permanent "privileged class." That runs counter to the democratic ideals of America - ideals which veterans were called into service to defend.'"

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. What are the different civil service systems operating in Minnesota?
2. How complete is civil service coverage of state employees?

What is the difference between the "classified" and "unclassified" services? How many employees are presently in each category?

3. How is the Minnesota civil service system organized?

According to principles of public personnel administration, is Minnesota's civil service organized efficiently?

4. What are the principal functions of the Civil Service Board? Who is on the Board?
5. What are the major responsibilities of the Civil Service Director? Who is the Director?
6. What are the duties of the three main divisions in the Civil Service Department?
7. What is the relationship between the Department of Administration and the Civil Service Department?

What do you think of the suggestions for reorganization as they affect these two departments?

8. Do you think the Civil Service Director should be appointed by the Civil Service Board or the Governor? Why?

9. In what way does veterans preference hinder efficient and economical government?
10. What proposals do you suggest for modification of veterans preference?

REFERENCES

League Memos and Materials:

The Minnesota Voter, September-October 1955
Legislative Report, May 1 and 6, 1955
League Position on Civil Service, March 11, 1955
Interim Report Memo, January 21, 1955
The Articulate Voter, November-December, 1952
Civil Service in Minnesota, November 24, 1952
History and Development of League Support of Civil Service, January 13, 1950

Mosher, W. E., Kingsley, J. D. and Stahl, O. G., Public Personnel Administration, Harper and Bros., New York (3rd ed.) 1950.

"Report of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program," 1955.

Special Message by Governor Freeman before a Joint Session of the Minnesota Legislature, February 25, 1955.

Task Force Report on "Personnel and Civil Service," U. S. Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (second Hoover Commission). February 1955.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

University of Minnesota, TSMc, 15th and Washington Ave. S.E., Minneapolis 14, Minnesota
Federal 8-8791 February, 1956

Memo to: Local League Presidents
From: Mrs. T. O. Everson, former state Civil Service Chairman
Subject: Civil Service

Delegates to the May 1955 convention of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota voted to make the civil service system a continuing responsibility. Civil service has been a part of the League program ever since 1935 when we supported the civil service bill introduced in the special session of the Legislature. Civil service was enacted by the 1939 legislature, and the League was given major credit for the legislation!

Civil service was last on the League's current agenda in 1952. Then and since, we have worked especially hard for modification of veterans preference. At the 1955 state convention, the state board proposed that the item be limited as a continuing responsibility to modification of veterans preference in the state and its political subdivisions. But you wanted to continue the more comprehensive item. Your inheritance as daughters and granddaughters of the "founding mothers" of civil service probably prompted a desire to know the total picture.

In the 1955 legislative session, at your direction, we:

1. Supported modification of veterans preference.
2. Opposed vacating the office of civil service director and providing for his appointment by the governor without the safeguard of competitive examination and tenure.
3. Took no position of the proposal to place the civil service department as a division in the department of administration.

None of these measures passed.

4. Supported appointment of the civil service director by the governor from the top three to five names selected by competitive examination and placement of the director in the classified service (tenure under civil service).

#4 passed with an amendment that the civil service board rather than the governor appoint. Appointee now has to be confirmed by Senate.

The major source material on the current operations of civil service is the "Report of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program" which was sent to you in January 1955. Since the Report contains the most recent proposals for changes in the civil service system, dig it out of your files and use it in your discussions.

We shall anticipate civil service legislation in the 1957 legislature. What proposals would you have us support or oppose? The decision rests with YOU!

File

February 29, 1956

Mrs. T. O. Everson
1956 East River Terrace
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Dear Mrs. Everson,

Grace has told me that you question some of the content of the civil service material and are concerned because the covering memo is in your name. Perhaps I can explain why some of the things were done in the way they were.

First of all, I realize -- with the benefit of hindsight -- that, of course, you should have checked the material before it went out. I was careless on this point because of the pressure of time and because I have so frequently sent out League memos under other board members' names, with or without their knowledge, that this has become a nasty habit. The geographical dispersion of the State Board makes this necessary in many cases.

Secondly, let me say that I am responsible for the content of the material. The outline was approved by members of the State Board but the "filler" was prepared entirely by me. It was edited by Sis and checked by Mr. Jackson for accuracy. Incidentally, Mr. Jackson had only a few corrections of fact, thought the material was very good except that perhaps it emphasized veterans' preference too much.

Next, your material which was very good, and which is incorporated, for the most part, in my organization, dealt with two subjects: veterans' preference and the question of the administrative location of the civil service department. Yet the statement of the continuing responsibility is "the civil service system." I am convinced, and I think this opinion is shared by you and members of the State Board, that civil service is the least well-known of any of our program items. Hence, it was felt that some of the basic facts about the operation of civil service in Minnesota should be restated. The most recent comprehensive description was sent out in November, 1952, and I doubt if many Leagues -- most of which do not have offices or staffs -- could find it.

I could have reworded Audrey's material but I thought this unnecessary work, so I weaved in current events to a somewhat modified version of the first part of her 1952 material. Much of your work made this easy for me to do.

There were three specific parts of your material which I did not use in the precise form in which they were submitted:

1. 1955 changes in the laws affecting civil service,
2. Quotes from Freeman and the 2nd Hoover Commission, and
3. Questions based on the Interim Committee Report.

Some of the law's changes are mentioned. I did not include them all because I thought many of them technical and unnecessary for an understanding of civil service except for those who might be lobbying or preparing material.

I did not think it necessary to quote Freeman to state the arguments for placing the Civil Service Department as a division in the Department of Administration. Consideration of space largely determined my decision in this matter. Since the League has not taken a position on this issue and local Leagues have ^{not} asked specifically for information about it, I felt justified in reducing the discussion of this matter and stating all possible positions. As you know, I personally favor such a move.

The questions you submitted were not included because I believed the discussion questions should relate to the content of the mimeographed material, and not to the Interim Committee's Report which is probably not easily available to all our 275 units.

It is my impression that I used much of your material though perhaps not in its original form. It is my admission that I do not presume to know and understand the workings of civil service as you do -- maybe someday I will. Perhaps this fact puts me more on the side of the average Leaguer who does not know. What does she need to know about civil service before she can suggest improvements? This is a two-year program and it is perfectly possible that the State Board will want to send out additional material stating more fully some of the issues at stake. One reason people are devoted to and respectful of the League is because it knows the facts. Again, we thought a restatement of the facts to be a necessary first step.

I hope this will partially, at least, explain some of my mental processes involved in the arrangement of your material. You did the hard digging work, of course; it was my aim to put it together in a useful form for the purpose of serving as continuing education to Leaguers whose inheritance as "mothers" of Minnesota's civil service I emphasized in the covering memo.

I will be happy to discuss this with you at any time.

Sincerely,

Barbara Stahler

117 W. Howard St.
Hibbing, Minn.
April 23, 1956

Dear Mrs. Everson:

I hope you will forgive the long delay in answering your letter of February 25th with reference to your civil service material. Although I knew Barbara had written you, I still didn't intend to wait this long. I must plead the old, but nevertheless true, excuse of pressure of time.

I am sorry you were distressed, but am confident Barbara explained it to your satisfaction. It reminds me of a conversation I had with Mrs. Foreman of the National Board. I had complimented her on some material she had written and she laughed and said: "Don't say my material; I started it out, but it isn't mine anymore; every member of the Board took a crack at it, and then the staff; that's something you learn to expect in the League; any material written is usually a composite of everybody's ideas!"

Ever since, I think of that remark whenever I find my material has been edited, and I know you understand. As I have told you before, I have always considered the state very fortunate to have someone like you, with your knowledge of civil service, to call on, and deeply appreciate the work you have done.

Hope to see you at Council, May 17th and 18th, and that we can call on you to answer any of the "tough" questions that come up when we discuss continuing responsibilities Friday, the 18th.

Sincerely,

Ethel Young



Good Government

In This Issue . . .

**The Forgotten Anniversary
of a Martyred President**

**From Civil Service Protection
to Career Personnel System**

**Civil Service Facts and Figures
1789-1956**

MAY - JUNE, 1956

Vol. LXXIII—No. 3



Partially Scanned Material

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/library/.

LWV

Very good background
might put in files if
civil service should
ever become a current
agenda item.

RS

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNEAPOLIS

84 South Tenth Street, Room 407, Minneapolis 2, Minnesota

Telephone: Atlantic 6319

November 16, 1956

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
4000 E. County Line, Birchwood
White Bear Lake, Minn.

Dear Mrs. Guthrie:

Since talking with you I have had a couple of days of enforced inactivity in which to do some thinking. I am afraid that if you do not get a chairman for your Civil Service lobbying committee you will find that it is going to be up to you to do the lobbying yourself.

I suggest you get your group together and tell them to concentrate on the 1955 Report of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Programs, that part of the Governor's Special Message on Reorganization pertaining to personnel, and the section of the Self-Survey - which came out about a month ago and which was chaired by Dr. Short. Mr. Naftalin would know whether copies of the latter are available. My notes on legislation passed in 1955 also might be of use. I turned them over to the State League for inclusion in the study material put out last February, but they were never used and were not returned to me. Perhaps the State office or Miss Salisbury would have them.

Mr. Goodin was not at our last CLIC meeting, so I could not find out what changes in veterans preference might be proposed. I will try to contact him when he returns to the city and pass on to you any information I gain. I am afraid that is all the help you can plan on from me because of the heavy schedule of activity to which I am already committed.

Cordially,

Mary C. Everson

Mrs. T. O. Everson

MCE:j
cc: State office

205-0701

1956 E River Terrace

SUMMARY OF BILLS RELATING TO CIVIL SERVICE
INTRODUCED IN THE LEGISLATURE
AS OF APRIL 8 , 1957

| H.F. | S.F. | |
|------|------|--|
| 66. | 294. | Amends Minnesota Statutes 1953, Section 120.05 to permit the state board of education to set the salary of the Commissioner of Education House - Introduced: January 17, 1957 By: Reed Referred to: Education Senate - Introduced: January 29, 1957 By: Metcalf, Root Referred to: Education |
| 174. | 37. | Provides salary and per diem increases for Highway Patrol Senate - Introduced: January 16, 1957 By: Keller, Schultz, Murray Referred to: General Legislation Amended by Senate and placed on General Orders House - Introduced: January 25, 1957 By: Chilgren, Hartle, Prifrel, Beanblossom, Berglund Referred to: Civil Administration Recommended to pass and re-referred to Appropriations February 5. |
| 468. | 193. | Provides that the Industrial Commission will determine the prevailing rate of pay for Laborers and Mechanics employed on Minnesota public projects. House - Passed: March 26 Senate - Introduced: January 24, 1957 By: Anderson, E.L., Rolland, Vukelich Referred to: Labor S.F. 193. Indefinitely postponed H.F. 468. Placed on Senate General Orders in place of S.F. 193. |

| H.F. | S.F. | |
|------|------|--|
| 180. | 206. | Authorizes the Commissioner of Agriculture to hire temporary employees in the seed laboratory without going thru Civil Service procedures. H.F. 180. Signed by Governor February 19, 1957 |
| 216. | 477. | Places employees of Civil Defense in the classified service upon passing a qualifying examination. H.F. 216. Signed by the Governor March 28, 1957 |
| 359. | 602. | Amends Minnesota Labor Relations Act. Minnesota Statutes 1953, Section 179.57 and Section 170.01 Subdivision 3 so as to place state and local government employees under the act House - Introduced: January 28, 1957 By: Prifrel, LaBrosse, Goodin, Chilgren Referred to: Labor House general orders March 22, 1957. Senate - Introduced: February 8, 1957 By: Salmore, Anderson M.H., Schultz Referred to: Labor |
| 815. | 326. | Provides for time and a half for overtime over 8 hours per day or 40 hours per week for state employees and employees on state contract work Senate - Introduced: January 30, 1957 By: Kalina, Rogers, Schultz Referred to: Labor Re-referred to Civil Administration without recommendation on March 4, 1957 House - Introduced: February 14, 1957 By: Adams, Fudro, Skeate Referred to: Labor House general orders |
| 410. | 802. | Places certain teachers of the state and its political subdivisions under the provisions of the Old Age and Survivors Insurance program. House - Introduced: January 30, 1957 By: Shipka, McGill, Lindquist, Rutter, Reed Referred to: Education Passed as amended April 8, 1957 |

| H.F. | S.F. | |
|------|-------|--|
| 410. | 802. | (Cont.) Senate - Introduced: February 18, 1957 By: Peterson, Vukelich, Salmore Referred to: Education |
| 414. | 1247. | Provides life, health, accident, and hospitalization insurance for state employees to be paid out of money appropriated for salaries. House - Introduced: January 30, 1957 By: LaBrosse, Munger, Wanvick, Goodin, Karth Referred to: Insurance Amended, Recommended to pass, and re-referred to Appropriations on March 11, 1957 Senate - Introduced: March 11, 1957 By: Westin and Schultz Referred to: Committee on Insurance |
| 420. | 422. | Permits sick leave to be used for illness of brothers, sisters, parents, and grandparents residing in the household of the employee. Amends Laws 1955, Chapter 774, Section 1. House - Introduced: January 30, 1957 By: LaBrosse, Popovich, Munger, Wanvick, Goodin Referred to: Labor House General Orders Senate - Introduced: February 1, 1957 By: Fraser, Feidt, and Peterson Referred to: Civil Administration |
| 599. | 421. | Amends Minnesota Statutes 1953, Sections 179.56 and 179.57 and adds new provisions pertaining to the adjustment of grievances of public employees House - Introduced: February 6, 1957 By: Karth, Basford, Bergeson, Wichterman, Prifrel Referred to: Labor House General Orders Senate - Introduced: February 1, 1957 By: Novak, Rosemneier, Sinclair Referred to: Labor |

H.F. S.F.

703. 1526. Provides automatic salary increases of one step a
423. year unless removal proceedings under Section 43.24
against such employee are in progress

House - Introduced: February 11, 1957
By: Goodin, Prifrel, Tomezyk
Referred to: Civil Administration

Senate - Introduced: February 1, 1957
By: Salmore, Novak, Johnson, R.W.
Referred to: Civil Administration

Laid over indefinitely April 4, 1957

429. Places Highway Department skilled and unskilled non-
supervisory employees in the labor service and provides
prevailing union wage rates.

House - Introduced:
By:
Referred to:

Senate - Introduced: February 1, 1957
By: Novak, Root, Wright
Referred to: Labor

590. 432. Places State of Minnesota employees under unemployment
compensation provisions of Employment Security Act.
Also covers local government employees if the government
unit elects. Amends Minnesota Statutes 268.04 and
268.06.

House - Introduced: February 6, 1957
By: Goodin, French, Noreen, Prifrel
Referred to: Civil Administration

Re-referred to Employment Compensation and amended to
exclude elected public officials and unclassified em-
ployees appointed for a definite term.

~~House Consent Calendar April 9~~ *Passed by House April 9.*

Senate - Introduced: February 1, 1957
By: Fraser, Feidt, Peterson
Referred to: Workmens Compensation and
Unemployment Insurance

On Senate General Orders

| H.F. | S.F. | |
|--------------|------|---|
| 619 | 453. | <p>Provides ⁴ more salary ranges and specifies the method for moving classes to steps in the ranges assigned by the board.</p> <p>House - Introduced: February 7, 1957 By: Cina, Wozniak, Halsted, Prifrel, Johnson, A.I. Referred to: Civil Administration Passed: March 25, 1957</p> <p>Senate - Introduced: February 4, 1957 By: Wahlstrand, Sinclair, Schultz Referred to: Civil Administration</p> <p>H.F. 619. amended in Senate Civil Administration to strike ranges 43-45 and recommended to pass. On Senate General Orders April 5</p> |
| 911. 949. | 476. | <p>Amends Minnesota Statutes 1953, Section 43.32 as amended by eliminating the one year limit on training positions</p> <p>Senate - Introduced: February 5, 1957 By: Wahlstrand, Vukelich, Wefald Referred to: Civil Administration</p> <p>H.F. 911. Passed by House March 8, 1957. Sent to Senate. Amended by Senate Civil Administration and recommended to pass. Senate General Orders March 26</p> |
| 907. | 478. | <p>Raises pay of Civil Service Board members from \$15 a day to \$25 a day and eliminates the \$450 yearly maximum.</p> <p>S.F. 478. Signed by Governor on March 28, 1957</p> |
| 904. | 479. | <p>Permits Civil Service Department to maintain the salary above level of class for aged employees whose positions are reallocated to a lower class</p> <p>Senate - Introduced: February 5, 1957 By: Wahlstrand, Vukelich, Wefald Referred to: Civil Administration</p> <p>H.F. 904. On Senate General Orders April 8</p> |
| 911. 949. | | <p>House - Introduced: February 19, 1957 By: Wozniak, Popovich, Fitzgerald, Larson Referred to: Civil Administration</p> |

| H.F. | S.F. | |
|------|--------------|--|
| 904. | 479. (Cont.) | House - Introduced: February 19, 1957 By: Wozniak, Popovich, Grittner, Conn, Gerling Referred to: Civil Administration Passed March 8, 1957 |
| 906. | 480. | Repeals obsolete provisions of State Civil Service Act repealing Minnesota Statutes 1953, Section 43.10, Subdivision 7; 43.171; 43.22, Subdivisions 5 and 6; 43.225, 43.226, 43.33 and 43.36. S.F. Signed by Governor March 16, 1957 |
| | 541. | Permits only those persons who do not have three hours in which to vote in either the morning or afternoon to take time off for voting. Senate - Introduced: February 7, 1957 By: Andersen E.L., Schultz, Dunlap Referred to: Elections & Reapportionment. |
| 985. | 481. 899. | Permits a person to receive more than one temporary appointment in a year providing that no more than one is from the same department. Permits temporary appointment of one year to fill a vacancy created by a leave of absence. Gives board authority to extend an ordinary temporary appointment to one year. H.F. 985. Passed by Senate April 8, 1957 |
| 905. | 483. | Amends 43.16 to eliminate the oath on Civil Service applications H.F. 905. Passed by Senate April 8, 1957 |
| 532. | 841. | Repeals Minnesota Statutes 1953, Section 179.51 through 179.58 which prohibits public employees from striking House - Introduced: February 5, 1957 By: Fugina, Widstrand, Rutter, Cina, Karth Referred to: Labor Senate - Introduced: February 19, 1957 By: Schultz Referred to: Labor |

| H.F. | S.F. | |
|-------|-------|---|
| 585. | 824. | Amends Minnesota Statutes 1953, Section 43.12, Sub-division 2 by adding 12 ranges to the salary plan House - Introduced: February 5, 1957 By: Halsted, Parks, Prifrel Referred to: Civil Administration Senate - Introduced: February 18, 1957 By: Andersen, G.L., Butler, Wefald Referred to: Civil Administration Laid over indefinitely April 4, 1957 |
| 664. | 757. | Placed Chief Engineer of the Highway Department in the unclassified service and the Assistant Commissioner in the classified service. House - Introduced: February 7, 1957 By: Cina, Halsted, Wozniak, A.I. Johnson, Prifrel Referred to: Civil Administration Senate - Introduced: February 15, 1957 By: Schultz Referred to: Public Highways H.F. Passed as amended April 8, 1957 |
| 979. | 1184. | Provides for employment by commissioner at compensation rate set by commissioner, of any entomologists and other assistant needed to carry out inspection functions. House - Passed March 25, 1957 Senate - Introduced: March 7, 1957 By: George Referred to: Agriculture S.F. 1184. on Senate General orders. House amended to direct the Civil Service Department to fix compensation of persons hired and the Commissioner of Agriculture to hire deputies who shall assist him in his inspection. |
| 1012. | 581. | Amends 43.29 (political activity section of Civil Service Act) to permit classified employees to be delegates or alternates to political conventions. Senate - Introduced: February 8, 1957 By: Carr, Schultz, Johnson R. Referred to: Civil Administration |

| H.F. | S.F. | |
|-------|--------------|--|
| 1012. | 581. (Cont.) | House - Introduced: February 25, 1957 By: Munger, Shovell, Knudsen, Yetka, Peterson Referred to: Civil Administration |
| 1078. | 691. | Provides 40 hour week, 8 hour day, and time and a half and double time for Highway Department non-supervisory, skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled in the labor service Senate - Introduced: February 13, 1957 By: Carr Referred to: Public Highways House - Introduced: February 26, 1957 By: Munger, Shovell, Prifrel, Fugina, Lovik Referred to: Highways |
| 1405. | 761. | Provides that appointing authorities may with the approval of the Civil Service Department hire state employees from other departments for part time work as unclassified em- ployees Senate - Introduced: February 15, 1957 By: Schultz and Fraser Referred to: Civil Administration House - Introduced: March 12, 1957 By: Wozniak, Tomczyk, Warneke Referred to: Civil Administration |
| 910. | 762. | Gives the Commissioner of Administration the authority to fix the times for payment of state employees Senate - Introduced: February 15, 1957 By: Schultz Referred to: Civil Administration H.F. 910. Substituted for S.F. 762. House - Introduced: February 19, 1957 By: Wozniak, Popovich, et al Referred to: Civil Administration Passed - March 8, 1957. H.F. 910. sent to Senate on Senate General orders March 20. |

| H.F. | S.F. | |
|-------|-------|--|
| 844. | 900. | Limits the amount of vacation pay that accrues to employees on military leave without pay to four years House - Introduced: February 15, 1957 By: Tiemann, Newhouse, Angstmann Referred to: Civil Administration Passed: March 27, 1957 Senate - Introduced: February 21, 1957 By: Child Referred to: Civil Administration H.F. 844. sent to Senate and referred to Enrolling and Engraving |
| | 971. | Changes Department Head salary law by raising the basic rate of the Commissioner of Education from \$7,400 to \$9,800 Senate - Introduced: February 26, 1957 By: Metcalf Referred to: Education Laid over indefinitely. April 4, 1957 |
| 1047. | 1496. | Sets work week, work day, and provides overtime pay for law enforcement employees of state depts. and municipalities working longer than the established work days and work week. Provides for removal of authorities not complying House - Introduced: February 26, 1957 By: Yetka, Munger, Karth, Prifrel Referred to: Civil Administration Senate - Introduced: March 22, 1957 By: Hanson N.W. Referred to: Civil Administration |
| 1052. | 886. | Provides that Barber Board members' duties shall be limited to attending board meetings, holding hearings and giving examinations. Provides that inspection work be done only by inspectors and that all inspectors and other employees whether employed on a temporary or permanent basis be selected from the appropriate Civil Service list House - Introduced: February 26, 1957 By: Tomczyk, Munger, Wanvick, Shipka, Wright Referred to: Civil Administration |

| H.F. | S.F. | |
|-------|--------------|---|
| 1052. | 886. (Cont.) | Senate - Introduced: February 21, 1957 By: Murray Referred to: General Legislation |
| 1053. | 1498. | Establishes normal work days and work week for Highway Patrol and requires the Commissioner to grant 10% premium for night work, time and a half for Sunday and Holiday work, time and a half for ordinary overtime and double time for holiday and Sunday overtime work, plus bonuses for working on emergencies when called back on holidays, scheduled days off, and vacations. Provides insurance for suits for false arrest against patrolman, hospitalization and life insurance and sets up an arbitration board to hear employee grievances House - Introduced: February 26, 1957 By: Yetka, Munger, Karth, Prifrel Referred to: Civil Administration Senate - Introduced: March 22, 1957 By: N.W. Hanson Referred to: Civil Administration |
| | 991. | Provides for the appointment of a director and assistant director of mental health research in the unclassified service by the Commissioner of Public Welfare. Provides for salaries not to exceed \$18,000 House - Introduced: By: Referred to: Senate - Introduced: February 27, 1957 By: Wahlstrand, Root, Andersen E.L. Referred to: Civil Administration Amended and placed on General orders |
| 1056. | 1495. | Sets up a Minnesota Police Academy and provides that law enforcement officers who enter from departments, agencies, and government units be from a list prepared by the Civil Service Board. House - Introduced: February 26, 1957 By: Yetka, Munger, Karth, Prifrel Referred to: Civil Administration Senate - Introduced: March 22, 1957 By: N.W. Hanson Referred to: Civil Administration |

| H.F. | S.F. | |
|-------|-------|--|
| 1107. | 986. | Provides for coverage of Department of Employment and Security employees under Title II of the Federal Social Security Act, and provides for the financing of the employers contribution House - Introduced: February 27, 1957 By: Cina, Shipka, Popovich, Wozniak, Munger Referred to: Civil Administration Senate - Introduced: February 27, 1957 By: Andersen E.L., Schultz, Gillen Referred to: Civil Administration |
| 1183. | 1023. | Amends Civil Service salary law by adding "All skilled and semi-skilled employees in the classified service, shall be placed in the maximum bracket of the range, which is nearest to the prevailing wage which is being paid for the same or similar work by private industry." House - Introduced: March 1, 1957 By: Goodin, French, Reed, Ottinger Referred to: Civil Administration Senate - Introduced: February 28, 1957 By: Schultz Referred to: Civil Administration Recommended not to pass. |
| 1407. | 1406. | Permits permanent employees to go on leave to work for the Civil Defense Survival Plan project by amending Section 43.22 Subdivision 2. Adds new subdivision which requires permanent employees now on leave to Survival Plan project to return to their old job within one year after termination of their employment with the Survival Plan project S.F. 1406. Signed by Governor April 4, 1957 |
| 1553. | 1385. | Prescribes salaries of elected and appointed officers and employees in the unclassified service in the executive branch. House - Introduced: March 18, 1957 By: Cina, Wozniak, Prifrel, Hofstad Referred to: Civil Administration Senate - Introduced: March 15, 1957 By: Schultz, Peterson E., Anderson M.H. Referred to: Civil Administration On April 4, recommended to pass as amended. To take its place on General orders, and be re-referred to Finance. |

| H.F. | S.F. | |
|-------|-------|--|
| 1675. | 1357. | Provides that government agencies shall meet with representatives of employees to negotiate grievance and conditions of employment. Designates the labor conciliator to select the representative of the employees in cases of controversy. House - Introduced: March 22, 1957 By: Prifrel, Grittner, LaBrosse, Fugina Referred to: Civil Administration Senate - Introduced: March 14, 1957 By: Salmore, Anderson, M.H., Schultz Referred to: Labor |
| 1605. | 1493. | Provides that superintendents at Y.C.C. Camps and institutions shall receive residence and maintenance in addition to their salary. Passed by House April 8, 1957 Senate - Introduced: March 21, 1957 By: Harren, George, Johnson C.E. Referred to: Civil Administration |
| 1720. | | Provides that the director shall reclassify Weighers at the Duluth port to Cargo Weighers and assign a salary two ranges higher than other weighers. House - Introduced: March 25, 1957 By: Munger, LaBrosse, Wanvick, Peterson Referred to: Civil Administration |
| 1774. | 1638. | Amends Minnesota Statutes 350.08 to provide a \$14,000 yearly salary for each of the Railroad & Warehouse Commissioners House - Introduced: March 27, 1957 By: Karth, Cina, Yetka, Lindquist, Dirlam Referred to: Civil Administration Senate - Introduced: March 28, 1957 By: Johnson J.A., Schultz and Imm Referred to: Civil Administration |
| 1899. | 1656. | Provides annual salaries for elected officers of the state. House - Introduced: April 1, 1957 By: Noreen, Bergerud, Shovell and Cina Referred to: Civil Administration Senate - Introduced: March 29, 1957 By: Mullin, Imm, Vukelich Referred to: Civil Administration |

M
E
M
O

TO: John W. Jackson, Director of
Civil Service, State Capitol, St. Paul 1, Minn.

File
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

15th and WASHINGTON AVES. S.E.

FROM: Grace Wilson, Organization Secretary

MINNEAPOLIS 14, MINNESOTA

SUBJECT Aquestion on Civil Service from DATE Nov. 3, 1959
Mrs. R. Gale Noyes, LWV of Rhode Island, 68 Barney St., Rumford 16, R.I.

We received today the attached letter from a member of the League of Women Voters of R.I. concerning the "flexible rule of three" in Minnesota's Civil Service law. We do not presently have Civil Service on our state program, so we wonder if you would be so kind as to answer Mrs. Noyes question for us. Thank you very much.

Dear Mrs. Noyes, the LWV of Minnesota has not had Civil Service as a CR for several years, therefore have no one "expert" on the subject to answer your question. So I hope that the answer you get from our Civil Service Director, Mr. Jackson, will be helpful.

The Minneapolis League does have Civil Service as a CR on the local level. If you think there answer would help you in gathering your state material, you could write them at 84 South Sixth Street, Room 414, Minneapolis 2.

Grace Wilson, Organization Secretary

DEC 7 1959

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
15th and Washington Aves. S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Dear Mrs. Anderson and Mrs. Wilson:

We have received a very prompt letter from Mr. John W. Jackson, Director, Civil Service Department of Minnesota, describing how the "Flexible Rule of Three" works in your State. We appreciate all the help and information he has given us and thank you very much for your assistance too.

We have written to Mr. Jackson to thank him personally. If we can ever be of help to you please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

Barbara B. Hayes

League of Women Voters of R.I.