

supervisor of the candidate for promotion. The appraisal is kept under lock in the office of the Deputy Administrator.

3. We do not test on a mass-production basis. Of 263 positions filled since we started this particular program, we have tested for only 29 positions. Of 125 categories of positions in our entire organization, we have tested in only 9 categories that we regard as critical to the successful operation of BPA. The consultant "tailor makes" the tests for each position, and interviews the applicants both before and after the examination. This costs more money, but it assures that each of our employees is treated as an individual and that, whether or not he is selected for the job he is competing for, he gets the benefit of friendly and helpful advice from the consultant as to areas in which he can improve himself.

4. We have advised our selecting officers that the appraisal should be considered along with all other pertinent information. It is not to be used as the sole selection factor.

With these safeguards, we believe it cannot fairly be said that our testing program infringes upon our employees' right of privacy in an unjustified way.

No one has a vested right to Federal employment, nor for that matter, to employment with a private firm. When a man or woman seeks new employment (or, as in our testing program, a promotion), he necessarily consents to divulging certain information which the employer otherwise would have no right to ask.

For example, an applicant for Federal employment must take a physical examination. For some individuals, this can be very embarrassing. Such an applicant, further, must consent to be fingerprinted; he must reveal whether he has received treatment for a mental disorder; he must divulge past arrests and convictions; he must tell whether he ever belonged to a subversive organization. He will be investigated by the FBI or Civil Service Commission. If he is the head of an agency, he may be required to disclose his property holdings and debts, as well as his wife's; and he may be required to dispose of certain properties involving a possible conflict of interest.

The Government, as a government, could not thus invade an ordinary citizen's privacy and individual liberty. To do so would be the grossest violation of constitutional rights. But the Government, as an employer, has not only the right but the duty to obtain this information, and thereby assure that Federal employees will be competent and trustworthy, as well as mentally and physically qualified to perform on the job.

The real question, then, is not whether our testing invades privacy. Any test, even a physical examination, does that. The question is whether the tests, as we administer them, produce relevant information that enables us to make more intelligent decisions in filling certain key jobs. We sincerely believe that they do enable us to make fairer and wiser decisions.

We believe, too, that Bonneville employees also benefit from psychological testing. We reduce the chance of putting a man or woman in a position where he or she would be unqualified and unhappy. We point out possible areas of strength and weakness so that the employees can better improve their skills and obtain advancement.

In essence, the objectives of our psychological testing program are to assist in identifying talents of employees, to place them in jobs where their best talents will be utilized, and to avoid placing them in jobs which require talents they do not possess. Psychological testing thus helps to minimize the "square peg in round hole" situations that probably exist in every large organization. A brilliant engineer is not necessarily a good executive. An expert accountant may not be able to fill a job that requires dealings with the public. An outstanding electrician may not have the temperament to be supervisor. A man or woman in the wrong job is neither happy nor efficient. He may develop anxieties and tensions that adversely affect his health, even shorten his life. Employees who work under his direction may also feel frustrated.

The relevancy of a test cannot, we believe, be determined by selecting individual questions from the test and considering them separate and apart from the rest of the test. We have chosen competent and reputable consultants to do the testing. We have sought, and received, assurances from them that they ask only questions which in their professional opinion are relevant to their making an intelligent appraisal of the applicant's qualifications for the position involved. We have not attempted to overrule their judgment, any more than a patient who has selected a good doctor, or a client who has retained a competent lawyer, attempts to interfere with their professional judgment.

We have considered, also, whether, despite the prerogative of an employer to obtain confidential information from his employees, there is something morally