

have not been widely adopted, although it is often suggested that their effect on provincial legislation may have been greater than at first sight appears. At the present moment the Conference has run out of the wholly non-controversial material in which it has met with its greatest success and has before it a few measures of mild law reform viz. evidence, interpretation, central registration of liens on motor vehicles, the rights of the owner of a chattel after it has been affixed to land.

Conclusion

Of the two pre-requisites for the attainment of uniformity of legislation among the common law provinces of Canada, centralization in the making of law and centralization in the interpretation of the law so made, we already have one, a centralized court system. If we cannot somehow achieve the other, the flood of provincial taxing laws, regulatory laws and laws amending the common law by which our Society is trying to adjust itself to the conditions of to-day is going to turn our comparatively uniform laws into ever increasing diversity.

How then are we going to achieve it? The technically easy way is to attack the problem head on and widen the list of subjects on which the Dominion has the exclusive power to make laws, but the technically easy is, as so often, the politically difficult. Short of changing the constitution the only other method is to attack the problem sideways by the method of agreement—to have the eight provinces, retaining formally unimpaired their power to legislate on a topic, agree to adopt legislation from some central source and enact it into law as it stands. Unfortunately we have the experience of the Uniformity Commissioners to shew us what an unsatisfactory method this is. They have found that even in their chosen and non-controversial field of private law—they have never touched tax law or regulatory law—they have been unable to secure any real agreement for the adoption of their Acts to eliminate verbal or trivial diversities, far less for the adoption of their mild Acts of reform. Somebody, someday, somehow is going to have to attempt the politically difficult.

Public Administration To-Day

By LLOYD M. SHORT

THE rapid expansion of governmental activities, the increased proportion of national incomes required to finance such activities, and the rapidly growing number of persons necessary to administer them, all attest to the truth of such observations as "administration has become the heart of the modern problem of government," made by Leonard White and "government today is largely a matter of expert administration," contributed by Pendleton Herring.¹

A detailed analysis of the process of public administration in a democracy will reveal an almost unlimited number of specific problems that deserve and command attention, but for purposes of summary treatment we may group them under two main headings, namely, the conduct of the several activities with the greatest amount of satisfaction to the citizenry and with the least expenditure of human and material resources, and secondly, the achievement of efficiency and economy of operation without sacrificing the principle of responsibility. A concerted attack upon both of these problems is imperative and calls for the combined efforts of practicing administrators and students of public adminis-

EDITOR'S NOTE: Lloyd M. Short is Professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

1. White, L.D., *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, (1st. ed.), p. 6; Herring, E.P., *Public Administration and the Public Interest*, p. 23.

tration. They may be modified by the exigencies of war and national defense, but they cannot be ignored.

EFFICIENCY

Marshall Dimock has stated aptly that "the competence of administration sets the limits of popular rule and democratic effectiveness."² The trend, observable in all democratic countries, toward collective action through the instrumentality of government in meeting the problems resulting from the combined factors of technology, industrialization, and urbanization imposes a tremendous responsibility upon public administrators. As President Roosevelt's Committee on Administrative Management put it, "without results we know that democracy means nothing and ceases to be alive in the minds and hearts of men."³ In an earlier day the citizens of a democracy, concerned primarily with keeping government under control, looked to the ballot, the legislature, and the courts for protection. Today, while still concerned lest government become irresponsible and arbitrary, those citizens are equally concerned with administrative performance, with getting the job done expeditiously and effectively.

What evidence do we have that public administrators and students of public administration have recognized this responsibility and that they are taking steps to meet it? Space permits brief mention of only a portion of that evidence.

In a number of countries, professional associations devoted to the advancement of the art and science of public administration have been organized. Beginning with the British Institute of Public Administration, established in 1922 "for the development of the Civil Service as a recognized profession and for the promotion of the study of Public Administration," such organizations have been formed in the United States, Australia, and New Zealand with the avowed purpose of bringing together

practicing administrators and students of public administration interested in the discovery of principles of public management. Committees appointed by these associations are endeavoring to stimulate and encourage research in the field of administration. Contributions to knowledge are circulated through the media of journals, special reports, and annual conferences.

Associations of public officials serving particular areas of government, or engaged in the administration of particular functions of government, also have increased in number and effectiveness. They provide a medium for the exchange of information and practice, and frequently undertake research projects. Particularly significant in this direction are the several organizations whose secretariats are housed in the attractive and spacious building given to the University of Chicago by the Spelman Fund for the purpose, and which are affiliated with the Public Administration Clearing House. The utilization of the results of research and accumulated experience is facilitated through the Public Administration Service which undertakes surveys and installations in administrative organization and procedure.

Universities are developing programs of training for present and prospective public administrators and are cooperating with associations of public officials in the prosecution of research projects. The Committee on Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council in the United States, with financial assistance from The Rockefeller Foundation, not only has sponsored some significant researches in public management through its own staff, but it is continuously engaged in the encouragement of research both within the universities and in government agencies. The series of case reports published by this Committee and contributed by practicing administrators is a significant contribution.

Writers in specific fields of governmental activity are devoting increasing attention to problems of administration. Recent additions to the literature of this type include studies in public health

2. Dimock, M.E., *The Study of Administration*, A., Pol. Sci. Rev. 31:30 (Feb. 1937).

3. Report of *President's Committee on Administrative Management*, with Special Studies, (1937), p. 1.

administration, public welfare administration, the administration of labor legislation, agricultural administration, the administration of public recreation, and public works administration.

Finally mention may be made of the establishment within government departments and agencies of management research divisions which are charged with making continuous studies of administrative organization and procedure in order to secure greater efficiency and economy.

RESPONSIBILITY

Thoughtful administrators and citizens in democratic countries are concerned about how we may utilize expert knowledge with reference to administration and the technical tasks of government without sacrificing the principle of popular control. As the Report of the Machinery of Government Committee in Great Britain submitted in 1918 was followed by the Report of the Committee on Ministers' Powers in 1932, so the Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management in the United States submitted in 1937 has been supplemented by the Report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure in 1941. Bar associations, organizations of public officials, and students of public administration and administrative law are devoting ever increasing attention to the problem of keeping bureaucracies responsible.

Three rather well-defined approaches to this problem of administrative responsibility are discernible in the current literature on this subject. One effort is in the direction of maintaining and strengthening the controls, especially legislative and judicial, which are more or less traditional to democracy. As Herman Finer states them, "the devices for securing the continuing responsiveness of the official are, of course, the law courts, the procedure of criticism, question, debate, and fact finding, and parliamentary control of the purse within the assembly, and, in the U.S.A., the election of executive or administrative

officials and their recall."⁴ This approach does not overlook the necessity of adjusting the relationships between legislative assemblies and administrative agencies in the light of the increasing need for administrative initiative and advice in the formation of public policies, nor between the administration and the judiciary in view of the rather obvious advantages of administrative adjudication in certain types of cases. Rather, it seeks to utilize administrative competence to the best possible advantage while preserving the essential principle of responsibility to agencies external to administration.

Related to this approach are the recommendations of the U.S. Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure which call for more precise separation of the prosecuting and judicial functions of administrative agencies, and more definite legislative determination of standards of fair procedure and the availability and scope of judicial review.⁵

A second approach, cognizant of the limitations involved in the attempt to make effective legislative and judicial control over professional and expert administrators and technicians, seeks a solution in another direction, namely, in the development of internal controls and the growth of a sense of professional responsibility among public administrators in a democracy. John Gaus envisions a "rich future in which the public servant will be responsible to American society in part through his responsibility to the ideals and achievements of his own profession."⁶ Carl Friedrich observes that "throughout the length and breadth of our technical civilization there is arising a type of responsibility on the part of the permanent administrator, the man who is called upon to seek and find the creative solutions for our crying technical needs, which cannot be effectively en-

4. Finer, H., *Administrative Responsibility in Democratic Government*, Public Administration Review (U.S.), 1:339 (Summer, 1941).

5. *Administrative Procedure in Government Agencies*, S. Doc. 8, 77 Cong., 1st Sess. (1941)

6. Gaus, J.M., *The Responsibility of Public Administration*, in Gaus, White, and Dimock, *Frontiers of Public Administration*, Ch. III, p. 44.

forced except by fellow-technicians who are capable of judging his policy in terms of the scientific knowledge bearing upon it."⁷

Still a third approach is the effort to stimulate and institutionalize citizen and group participation in administration. Informal conferences between administrators and interested persons or organizations, group representation at hearings called to consider proposed administrative policies and regulations, popular referenda, and advisory councils reporting public reaction to administrative performance and conferring relative to new activities and measures, are some of the specific methods suggested for furthering this method of making administration responsible. Pendleton Herring sees the problem as a twofold one, namely, "to keep the bureaucrat responsive and uncorrupted, and to join the citizen with the administrative process in order to utilize

his particular expertness or to gain the sanction of his consent." He goes on to point out that "even though the public service is directed by honest men endowed with *esprit de corps*, inflexibility and unimaginative routinism threaten when contacts with the public outside cease to be close and sympathetic."⁸

These several attempts to solve the modern problem of administrative responsibility in a democracy are not mutually exclusive. They can and should be prosecuted simultaneously. Public administrators who are committed to the democratic ideal will find numerous ways by which these several types of control may be extended and implemented. They will agree with Finer that "administrative responsibility is not less important to democratic government than administrative efficiency," and that "it is even a contribution to efficiency in the long run."⁹

7. Friedrich, C. J., *Public Policy and the Nature of Administrative Responsibility*, in *Public Policy*, Yearbook of the Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard University, (1940), Ch. 1 p. 14.

8. Herring, E. P., *Public Administration and the Public Interest*, pp. 20, 21.

9. *Op. cit.*, p. 335.

Progress of the Youth Hostel Movement

By WALTER HARDING

YOUTH hosteling, once an exclusive treasure of the youth of Europe, has now definitely opened its opportunities to the youth of the Americas. For years educational leaders on this side of the Atlantic admired and envied the progress made by the hosteling movement in Europe in developing in its young people those essential qualities of leadership, self-initiative and dependability. Then in 1933 two New England school teachers, Munroe and Isabel Smith, spent some months abroad studying and there, becoming intimately acquainted with hosteling and its leaders, determined to bring it to America.

Searching carefully over the United States for the best location for their first hostel, they finally settled on central New England where within a short radius were large populations, numerous colleges and many places of scenic beauty. The first American hostel was opened in 1934 in Northfield, Mass., in the Connecticut River valley, just a few miles from the junction of the states of Massachusetts, Vermont and New Hampshire. That first hostel was only a few rooms in the basement of Schell Chateau, the picturesque annex of a fashionable summer hotel. But the movement spread rapidly. Within a few months, a second hostel was opened thirty miles down the river at Mount Holyoke College, the oldest and one of the most outstanding woman's colleges in the country. By 1935, there

EDITOR'S NOTE: Mr. Harding is connected with the American Youth Hostel Headquarters at Northfield, Mass. Information on the Canadian Youth Hostel Association which is contained in the article has been furnished by Mr. P. E. Tyas, the National Secretary of the Canadian Association in Toronto.