

studied from the "consumer" point of view. We have "consumed" (or been consumed by) a great deal of administration since the early days of government in Canada. It is now time for us to take a closer look at the product and stop taking the label for granted.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY - AN HISTORIAN'S OPPORTUNITY

By

V. Seymour Wilson, Carleton University

"The productions of historians may be thought of as a great file indispensable to all social science -- I believe this is a true and fruitful view. History as a discipline is also sometimes considered to contain all social science -- but only by a few misguided 'humanists'. More fundamental than either view is the idea that every social science -- or better, every well-considered social study -- requires an historical scope of conception and a full use of historical materials. This simple notion is the major idea for which I am arguing."

C. Wright Mills, The Sociological Imagination

The words of this brilliant American sociologist give ample testimony for the reason why I, an amateur historian at best, am here to address this august gathering today. The late C. Wright Mills was a persistent gadfly to us social scientists, and, more particularly, a trampelling bête noir within the intellectual cabbage patch known as sociology, for, it was one of his passionate convictions that the contemporary work of much social science had lost its moorings by its serious disregard of historical studies. This line of thought he reiterated throughout most of his writings: history must be conceived as much more than past political events, for it was the life of yesterday in the present.<sup>1</sup>

It was Alfred North Whitehead who, many years ago, reminded us of a phenomenon called "historical foresight", not in the sense of scientific prediction, for man's behaviour is much too complex to be classified in the straight jacket of most universal physical laws, but a connotation much more germane to the human experience. Whitehead argues that even though the facts of history are complex and at times seemingly unintelligible, yet there is precious knowledge in the fact that we are informed as to how individual men behaved in the past, and consequently how they might behave in roughly similar situations in the future.<sup>2</sup> At the risk of oversimplifying the arguments of Mills and Whitehead, I believe that a good synopsis of both scholars' arguments is that historical knowledge encourages a widening of one's perspective in assessing events of critical importance in the development of social structures. It is my main thesis that in the study of administration the work of Canadian scholars is seriously hampered by the dearth of historical studies within this area of intellectual endeavour.

Perhaps a few caveats are in order concerning the manner in which I have interpreted my assignment. Firstly, my orientation is totally

federal, not because time precludes looking at the provincial services, but simply due to the fact that we know virtually nothing about the historical development of our provincial governments. A random check of the Canadian Historical Review for the past thirty years reveals, at best, a couple of masters and doctoral theses which could be appropriately termed administrative history at the provincial level. One significant fact should be stated concerning the development of provincial bureaucracies: insofar as the evolution of civil service legislation is concerned, most provinces in Canada attempted to emulate reforms made by the federal government. Between 1908 and 1918, for example, when the federal government attempted civil service reforms along the lines of the Northcote-Trevelyan recommendations for Great Britain, at least three to four provincial services attempted to follow its example. Secondly, I assumed that the emphasis on "opportunity" allows me to adopt a panoramic perspective for this short address; what has been accomplished so far, and what opportunities are available, as I see it, for historians who are prepared to take up the cudgels.

Administrative history has a long and venerable tradition in the United Kingdom. Time and relevance precludes any discussion on this theme, but one work which will be singled out here for a brief comment is J. Donald Kingsley's influential historical analysis of the British civil service. In this study of the growth of the British civil service, Kingsley contended that the reforms implemented, beginning from the late 1850's, were basically oriented to accommodate the pressures applied to the bureaucracy by the British upper middle class.<sup>3</sup> Business groups, desiring an efficient political system that would facilitate and protect the development of commerce, clamoured for permanent non-political officials to ensure the continuity of government regulations and practices, thus making for stable relations within the political system regardless of shifts in party fortunes. Kingsley further contends that the British civil service had become a "captive" of this middle class -- the Oxbridge tradition of administrative generalist being all pervasive -- thus creating a lack of responsiveness on the part of the bureaucracy. He then argues for a representative bureaucracy: one which must contain a reasonable cross section of the population in terms of occupations and social class, so as to mirror the values and attitudes of the society which it serves and from which it derives its roots. Presumably when bureaucracies are representative of the various groups composing the society, they would have a "feel" for the social fabric of the land, thereby enabling them to give socially significant advice to their political overlords.

This concept of representative bureaucracy has had a profound effect on the writings on many scholars in the Western world.<sup>4</sup> Proponents of the concept argue that the greater the bureaucracy mirrors its containing society, the greater will be its responsiveness to the social problems and needs of that society. Professor Paul Van Riper, in his History of the United States Civil Service, puts it this way:

...to be representative a bureaucracy must (1) consist of a reasonable cross-section of the body politic in terms of occupation, class, geography, and the like, and (2) must be in general tune with the ethos and attitudes of the society of which it is a part...If we can maintain the ideal of representativeness in our civil service and maintain it consciously, we are more likely to control bureaucratic behavior at its source by a sort of internal thermostat... All this is meant to suggest that the concept of representative bureaucracy

offers one of the few positive approaches toward a new theory of administrative responsibility and perhaps even of public administration in general.<sup>5</sup>

Underlying this concept of representative bureaucracy are some basic assumptions. Implicit here is the thought that it is relevant to compare the composition of public bodies to the composition of the total population or labor force to determine the degree of "openness" and "responsiveness" of the bureaucracy. Secondly, the concept implies that high intelligence is not the monopoly of any particular group in a society; since able people come from all segments of the society they should all be able to gain access to the upper echelons of the bureaucracy in numbers that reflect their group's proportion of the total population.

But just how valid are these assumptions? What, in effect, constitutes representativeness? In Canada, significant criteria would be regional, ethnic, religious and class differences.<sup>6</sup> Can the concept be accommodated in Canadian society and really be meaningful?<sup>7</sup> Is it meaningful at all in any society? These are some of the questions now being asked by our Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Unlike the United States and Great Britain, the concept of bureaucratic representation here in Canada has not been a subject of discussion among intellectuals or the public at large. I suspect that after the forthcoming volume of the B and B, we will be hearing much more of the idea than heretofore.

Turning our attention rather briefly to the United States, it readily becomes apparent that American administrative historians have been left a rich legacy of studies on both the federal and state bureaucracies. I have already mentioned Van Riper's History of the United States Civil Service. Completed on the seventy-fifty anniversary of the famous Pendleton Act, this book traces the growth and demise of the "spoils system", in favor of the merit system of personnel recruitment. Van Riper pays considerable attention also to the rapid growth of the federal bureaucracy during the "New Deal" era and World War II. Professor Leonard D. White's studies have also been significant milestones in the study of American public administration. White's four volumes -- The Federalists (1948), The Jeffersonians (1951), The Jacksonians (1954) and The Republican Era (1958), cover essentially more than one hundred years of administrative history from 1789 to 1901. Through descriptions of the organization and operation of executive departments and extensive quotations from public reports and other official sources, White provides us with a rich, well-documented history of the evolution of the American federal bureaucracy. White's study has been an extremely valuable reference work for students of administrative history in the United States.

#### CANADA

There have been some Canadian efforts in writing administrative history, but these have been few and far between. J. H. Aitchison, for example, has already done some work on local government in Ontario. We have had W. Smith's, now somewhat dated, study of the development of postal services in British North America,<sup>8</sup> a biographical study of Sir Joseph Pope,<sup>9</sup> and various scattered articles of historical importance in Canadian Public Administration during our centennial year. The three most important historical studies on the Canadian federal bureaucracy have been done by political scientists: R. M. Dawson's The Civil Service of Canada,

written some forty years ago; Taylor Cole's, The Canadian Bureaucracy, a post World War II study continuing where Dawson had left off; and J. E. Hodgett's scholarly and influential analysis, Pioneer Public Service, which explored the prominent part that environmental factors played in affecting the pre-Confederation administrative structure in Canada.

What then remains to be done in Canada? My colleague on the panel, Mr. H. A. Taylor, has suggested what I think is a rather useful two-pronged approach to the subject: first, the influence which administration has had on the people at large, and second, the history of particular governmental departments or agencies. Let us look at this first aspect, the influence of administration on people at large.

The ceaseless expansion of government activities over the past forty years has created some concern among students of administration as to what methods could be devised to keep growing bureaucracies responsible and under democratic control. An influential study dealing with this problem has been Andrew Shonfield's able analysis of public and private power in the major countries of the occidental world.<sup>10</sup> In brief, the book deals with how capitalism in each of the democratic-capitalistic states of the West has met the weakness of a century's emphasis on laissez faire: each society having substantially expanded the area of public control over the economy. Shonfield makes the argument that in expanding this dimension of governmental activity -- this dimension of the public administrator's province -- each country has used different methods, in conformity with its traditions and institutional framework. There has, therefore, been an inexorable increase in the role and influence of public power. Canadian scholars have also expressed fears concerning this accretion of bureaucratic power and influence. W. L. Morton has voiced some concern about the growing influence of federal-provincial conferences.<sup>11</sup> J. E. Hodgetts has recently warned us that:

"In a system such as ours, where policy initiatives are either germinated by experts in the bureaucracy and ratified in the secrecy of cabinet enclaves or compromises worked out behind the closed doors of ad hoc dominion-provincial entities of all descriptions, there is a great danger that public apathy will be assumed to be a fact of life." <sup>12</sup>

While all these statements point to a concern about the accretion of bureaucratic power and its ramifications on a democracy such as ours, as yet no one has completed a Shonfield-like analysis of this purported accretion and the reasons, perhaps unique in some ways to the Canadian situation or otherwise, for this growth. This is an area, I believe, for Canadian administrative historians to demonstrate their scholarship.

In historical scenarios on Canadian national development, many historians have indicated that the Canadian experience has been rather strongly influenced by the models of Great Britain and the United States. This generalization has been amply verified, I believe, in many aspects of our national life -- politics and economic development for example -- and, as exploratory studies are now showing in our administrative development as well.

Between 1908 and 1917 there was a conscious attempt by the federal Civil Service Commission to develop the Canadian bureaucracy along the reform measures advocated by the famous Northcote-Trevelyan Report in the

United Kingdom. With the advent of the Union Government in 1917 Canada was to turn to the United States for the model of administrative reform which was subsequently adopted. Indeed even the reformers in the United States were impressed with the sweeping reform measures which cabinet government was able to achieve in Canada. One leading American civil service reformer indicated years later to one of our senior civil servants that by the introduction of the Civil Service Act of 1918, Canada had "proceeded to build up a modern civil service system, far in advance of that of the federal services of the United States, and in fact in advance of that in most provinces, states and cities."<sup>13</sup>

Historical studies on the Progressive movement in the United States have documented the extent to which this reforming crusade had influenced the implementation of reform measures in federal, state, and municipal government.<sup>14</sup> While there is no substantive documentation that the same holds true for the Canadian experience, initial probings indicate that the influence of Progressive reform philosophy in Canada was much more pronounced than scholars have heretofore recognized.

The unhappy experiences of Canadian political life during 1917, culminating in the creation of the Union Government, have caused the positing of two diametrically opposite views of historical reality by Canadian scholars. English Canadians usually subscribe to the view that Union Government was born of military necessity, for the survival of the Canadian nation made it imperative that the German juggernaut be stopped. Sir Robert Borden himself provided the rationale for this viewpoint when he pleaded in the House of Commons that "if this war should end in defeat, Canada, in all the years to come, would be under the shadow of German military domination. This is the very lowest at which we can put it."<sup>15</sup>

Most French Canadians, however, have argued that Canada, by actively committing herself to the European conflict, was joining with Great Britain in pursuing "imperialist ventures", the effects of which "may rend and tear this Canada of ours down to the very roots."<sup>16</sup> The tendency, therefore, has been to discuss Union Government either in terms of military necessity or crass political indifference, and in many ways this is understandable because of the direct effects the war had on Canadian life. There are good reasons to suggest that this historical dichotomy, has however, been too narrow an interpretation of past events, for in viewing Union Government in this limited perspective, students of Canadian history have failed to elaborate on the reform orientation of the motley collection of politicians who, holding such widely differing views on many political issues, came together to form the union. In his biographical record of the tumultuous events leading up to the formation of a Union cabinet, Prime Minister Borden admitted that, on more than one occasion, he had sought the counsel of Henry Wise Wood, the high priest of the Progressive movement in Western Canada.<sup>17</sup> There is a possibility that Wood could have been offered a Cabinet post in the Union Government, although there is no conclusive evidence to substantiate this assertion.

More germane to our discussion here, however, is the fact that the 1917 election was fought on two major issues: the need for the vigorous prosecution of the war effort and the necessity for civil service reform in Canada. To what extent Borden joined issue with Progressive reform philosophy to win an election victory in very difficult times is still a matter of conjecture. The point to be made here, however, is that these reforms, implemented in 1918, have made an indelible imprint on the

Canadian federal bureaucracy since that time. A study showing the inter-connection between progressive reform philosophy and the bureaucratic reform measures would fill a missing void in Canadian studies.

Another area of potential exploration for historians would be to indicate to what extent the Canadian administrative experience has been influenced by the practice of bureaucratic patronage. What is the connection between the practice of patronage, the party system and the bureaucracy? The superficial evidence we have so far points to an interesting relationship which needs further study and research.

Writing at the turn of the century, the French sociologist, André Siegfried had the following to say about Canadian political parties:

The lack of ideas, programmes, convictions, is only apparent. Let a question of race or religion be raised, and you will immediately see most of the sordid preoccupations of patronage or connection disappear below the surface. The elections will become struggles of political principle, sincere and passionate. Now this is exactly what is feared by the prudent and far-sighted men who have been given the responsibility of maintaining the national equilibrium. Aware of the sharpness of certain rivalries, they know that if these are let loose without any counterbalance, the unity of the Dominion may be endangered. That is why they persistently apply themselves to prevent the formation of homogeneous parties... The clarity of political life suffers from this, but perhaps the existence of the federation can be preserved only at this price.<sup>18</sup>

In a short paragraph "the de Tocqueville of Canada" captured a basic sociological truth about Canadian parties. When Canada began Confederation in 1867, there were no such extra-parliamentary organizations as parties. Present on the political scene was a motley collection of men in political life. In the coalition government of 1867 there was the almost unbelievable camaraderie of Ontario and Quebec Conservatives. As Frank Underhill puts it:

... Canadian statesmanship reached its highest pinnacle of achievement when in the same cabinet under one prime minister there sat side by side the head of the Orange Order and the spokesman of French Catholic Ultramontanism.<sup>19</sup>

The man who achieved this feat of distinction was of course no other than Sir John A. Macdonald. In order to forge a Parliamentary majority of the disparate group of politicians, Macdonald had to appeal to those "loose fish" or "waiters on Providence".<sup>20</sup> After Alexander MacKenzie achieved power in 1875, he too had to face the realities of Canadian political life as it existed at the time.<sup>21</sup> In a letter dated November 18, 1874 to his Nova Scotia lieutenant, A. G. Jones of Halifax, he exclaimed in exasperation:

I am in receipt of your extraordinary letter about railway and other appointments, and I confess nothing has been written to me for months that has astonished me more. It is really too bad. Half of my time is taken up with this question of patronage in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. My life has become a torment to me about it.<sup>22</sup>

One of the reasons for Conservative success in our early history is Sir John's conscious utilization of patronage, and the power of office, to construct a national party. On the other hand, the Liberal leadership refused to do so, and hence was faced with the consequences of maintaining a weak, unstructured party. As Sir John Willison later commented: "The fault of the Liberal party was voluble virtue".<sup>23</sup> Not until Sir Wilfrid Laurier's prime ministership did the Liberals begin to utilize the office of power to build a stronger political party.

There seems to be a connection between our party structures and the bureaucracy. What forms did patronage take in the federal administration? How pervasive was the practice? Was it comparable to the American spoils system or, where there significant differences? Is the connection of patronage with the party structures and the bureaucracy as simple as it appears or was it much more complex? A scholarly study on this subject would be invaluable to both students of political parties and the bureaucracy.

Turning our attention to institutional studies, there still remains much to be done on the historical studies of administrative departments and agencies. These structures, in turn, cannot really be understood if we neglect to take into consideration the kinds of individuals - the key decision-makers - who play such instrumental parts in shaping them. For this reason we need biographical studies of such men as Sir Joseph Pope, William Foran, the influential secretary of the Civil Service Commission for over thirty years, Adam Shortt, the first de facto Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and later Director of the Board of Historical Publications in the Public Archives of Canada, W. C. Clarke, Watson Sellar, A. W. Ronson and many others who have helped shape the destiny of this country.

These, then, are just a few of the random possibilities for historical research in Canada. Administrative history has not been a particularly favorable area of intellectual pursuit in Canada, for the very simple reason, I suspect, that most historians never have considered it important. Canadian historical writings have been greatly influenced by the romance of the individual - the Lauriers, the Macdonalds, the Borden and the MacKenzie Kings. Undoubtedly these men are of extreme importance to our historical record, but whatever else man may be, he is a social and historical actor who must be understood, if at all, in close and intricate interplay with the social and historical structures which comprise part of his environment. The study of administrative history, I believe, could help immeasurably in furthering this understanding.

#### Footnotes

1. C. Wright Mills, The Sociological Imagination, (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1959).
2. Alfred North Whitehead, Adventures of Ideas. (New York: MacMillan & Company, 1947).
3. J. Donald Kingsley, Representative Bureaucracy. (Yellow Springs: Antioch Press, 1944).

4. Norton Long, "Bureaucracy and Administration" American Political Science Review, 46 (September, 1952), p. 803; Paul Van Riper, History of the United States Civil Service, (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1958). V. Subramanian, "Representative Bureaucracy: A Reassessment" American Political Science Review, Vol. LXI (December, 1967), pp. 1010-1019.
5. Riper op.cit., pp. 552 - 553.
6. John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965). p. 449.
7. For an initial application of this concept to Canada, see S. M. Lipset, Agrarian Socialism: The CCF in Saskatchewan (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950).
8. W. Smith, The History of the Post Office in British North America, 1639 - 1870. (Cambridge: University Press, 1920).
9. Sir Joseph Pope, Public Servant: The Memoirs of Sir Joseph Pope (ed) by Maurice Pope (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1960).
10. Andrew Shonfield, Modern Capitalism: The Changing Balance of Public and Private Power (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1965).
11. W. L. Morton, "Needed Changes in the Canadian Constitution" in Gordon Hawkins (ed) Concepts of Federalism (Toronto: CIPA, 1965). pp. 82 - 92.
12. J. E. Hodgetts, "Public Power and Ivory Power", Agenda 1970: Proposals for a Creative Politics Lloyd and McLeod (eds) (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968).
13. Fred Telford, Director, Bureau of Public Personnel Administration to William Foran, Secretary Civil Service Commission of Canada. March 23, 1932.
14. Samuel Haber, Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era 1890 - 1920. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).
15. Henry Borden (ed) Robert Laird Borden: His Memoirs (London: MacMillan & Company Limited, 1938) p. 698.
16. Ibid., p. 704.
17. Ibid., pp. 728-756.
18. A. Siegfried, The Race Question in Canada Carleton Library, No. 29. (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1966). pp. 113 - 114.
19. Frank Underhill, In Search of Canadian Liberalism (Toronto: The MacMillan Co., 1960).
20. Macdonald's and Cartwright's terms for the ministerialists. See Escott M. Reid, "The Rise of National Parties in Canada" in H. Thorburn (ed) Party Politics in Canada (2nd edition) (Scarborough:



Prentice Hall of Canada, 1967) pp. 15 - 22.

21. For further documentation of this, see Frank Underhill op.cit., and Sir John Willison, Reminiscences Political and Personal, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1919).
22. Quoted by Underhill, op.cit., p. 38.
23. Willison op.cit., p. 36.

In the discussion which followed, PROFESSOR WILLIAM ORMSBY felt that the historians' opportunity coincided with the archivists' need only to a limited extent. Is the situation in which the archivist finds himself today really as gloomy as Mr. Taylor suggests? Is it true that the archivist cannot adequately service the records in his custody until historians and M.A. candidates have provided him with a whole series of studies in administrative history of the relevant governmental agencies? He agreed that such work would improve the archivists' understanding, and therefore enable him to give better service, but did not regard it as essential. He saw a tendency among archivists to become obsessed with the necessity to restore the original order to a series of records. Is there not a tendency to overestimate the volume of evidence to be obtained from understanding the interrelationship of series within a group? If an archivist does not find sufficient evidence of an original order, the assumption that valuable evidence is lost if the original order, whatever it may have been, is not restored may well be a delusion. Which is most important? Acquisition of knowledge of the subject matter of the series or knowledge of the organizational structure? That may be an academic question, for the archivists' greatest need is to have the historian use as extensively as possible the holdings which he has saved from destruction for the historians' use. If there are fifty series where the archivist knows in depth the administrative history of the agency, thoroughly understands the relationship between series, but has no means for the historian to go to specific subject matter in the series, then these records are not going to be used very much. Also, what kind of questions does the historian come with? He wants to know what records are available that would show him how Baillie operated in New Brunswick or what material there was on the general social and economic level of the Loyalists who came to settle in New Brunswick. Historians are not as concerned as archivists like to think with the relationship of one series to another.

The archivist has to show both the ability to think historically and display what may be called historical imagination. Should not the archivist be his own historian? If he waits for the historian and the graduate student to provide him with information required to understand his records thoroughly, he is very likely going to wait forever. The archivist might do well to hang up on his wall the adage that "The Lord helps those who help themselves". If the archivist produces a number of interesting articles on the administrative history of agencies whose records he holds, he will have at least made a beginning and will greatly enhance the chances of attracting historians and social scientists to the field; the archivist wants more than anyone else to know precisely how an agency was organized.

The examples of "opportunity" that Mr. Wilson gave support this view, for most of his examples show a need for information on something wider than just organization.

Given the present state of historiography in Canada, perhaps one could even say in North America, are historians or social scientists likely to become interested in detailed analysis of administrative structure - the kind that is required to provide the archivist with a better understanding of the interrelationship of series within record groups? They will more likely continue to be interested in the kind of problems which attracted Professor Leonard B. White and Professor Hodgetts, and they will turn to detailed analysis of administrative structure only when they find it relative to social, political or economic problems. If the archivist can show them that it is relevant by his own need, then they are likely to turn to him, but it is not automatically relevant. When Professor Hodgetts was doing the research for Pioneer Public Service, he had people working for him, and he himself worked, much below the departmental report level, although the kind of question he was asking was more often than not answered by the departmental reports.

For the archivist, minute details of organization and performance of function are invariably of some value. Perhaps this is also true for the archivist and the social scientist, but if it is, the archivist will likely have to prove it by his own example, by demonstrating the social, economic or political significance of this type of work.

HUGH TAYLOR replied by saying that he would be the first to admit that it is the obligation of the archivist to understand and work out for himself the basic history of the groups he is concerned with. But the archivist can only go so far with this, especially when he is working in an "instant archives" where he is almost submerged in records, and is then expected to offer viable service within a year of opening. He naturally recruits all kinds of help to illumine what he can, and there is an opportunity here for graduate research in this field. On the matter of the internal structure of a series of documents, the archivist's job is one of reconstruction. He is probably the nearest in time to the original order, and the longer he leaves it, the dimmer the pattern of the structure becomes. **He must try and set it up right, and if the job is well done,** it will stand the test of time. He will not get it all right, but there is quite a high priority to do this because in the subject field - and historians are of course interested in subjects and not frameworks - the subject index will be all the better for having the documents properly structured. Themes can then be traced more logically and rapidly to their conclusion.

DR. KAYE LAMB was sure that Mr. Taylor and everybody else wishes that records were as tidily arranged or at least came into existence as tidily as we would like them to do, but that was not always the case. He remembered two large and rather conglomerate departments in Ottawa which were, for the first time in their lives, safely established in a brand new building, and were settling down very happily until Mr. Pearson came into office and decided to change the whole structure, resulting in an administrative upheaval that has very little relation to function. **And all** sorts of extraneous things can happen to records that only an index will bring out. Dr. Lamb recalled being in the Public Record Office in London once and purely fortuitously noticing a name, which resulted in the discovery of the personal papers of a Governor of Newfoundland amongst the

records of a Naval Hospital in England in which he happened to have become governor because his papers stayed there at the time of his death.

The movement of records is in a constant state of flux which does not necessarily have anything to do with function. The copyright office has been to three different departments, but, from the point of view of function, that does not make any difference to the person interested in copyright. It is just a matter of keeping track, and there is a great deal of administrative transfer that is caused just by whim. There have been instances in the Federal Cabinet, for instance, where a new minister had obtained permission from the Prime Minister for certain responsibilities to be moved to his portfolio, and the pattern would be changed again. In the history of departments, it is this kind of administrative arrangement that causes much confusion and papers, like people, can become "orphans" when their antecedents are lost.

HUGH TAYLOR agreed with Dr. Lamb, that this is absolutely so and the doctrine of inheritance of records as they move from one group to another only requires a line written in an inventory to keep the picture straight. Sometimes a record series changes in significance over the years. The verbiage still goes on but the heart and authority has gone out of it as the power passes from that department or branch.

DR. WILFRED SMITH (Chairman) saw a danger in interpreting administrative history too narrowly. Surely, with the increasing significance of government in all our lives and our interest in social, economic, and every other type of history that is a part of human experience, there should be a broader concept of administrative history which should include what departments and agencies are doing. For example, Professor Turner has been working on immigration, agents and national representation abroad. This is a very significant field of research, and it is probable that Professor Turner, in his use of departmental records, has probably handled hundreds of boxes which he was literally the first person to use. Here is significant material, not limited in value to administrative history, which is not being used. Now, perhaps this is the fault of the Public Archives for not making the contents of its holdings widely enough known. But should it be necessary to inform historians that there is more in departmental papers than administrative history?

SEYMOUR WILSON asked what happened if the archivist is not conversant with these wider social and economic questions. How does he determine which documents are relevant; that is, which ones should be left in the possession of the archives and which are to be destroyed? For example, in looking at the Civil Service Commission, he notices that certain documents were available and was seriously hampered by the fact that these documents had been destroyed.

The criteria used by archivists in documentary appraisal was then explained and discussed. DR. LAMB said it must not be assumed that the records of a department always reach the archives in a complete state. The archivist is not always to blame for the gaps in the files. They may be caused by departmental decisions or neglect in the past. DR. SMITH remarked that archivists have sometimes been criticized for not keeping up with current trends in historical research. But if the archivist waited for historians to indicate where they were going to place their emphases, then there would be no source material left. The archivist must learn to anticipate the future needs of the historian, and, through selection

criteria, decide what records are significant. The material will then have been saved, not because of any particular historical subject interest on the part of the archivist, but because he has devised criteria which enabled him to select significant material, regardless of subject matter. There is nothing haphazard about appraisal. The Public Archives has to appraise on a massive scale, and is always striving to remove the guesswork. It is a normal part of a professional archivist's job to look at hundreds or thousands of cubic feet of records and to decide which of these should be kept and which can safely be destroyed. Now, this has to be done; the decision has to be made; the problem cannot be solved by keeping everything, by building more archives or by microfilm or minitization alone. The basic solution is selection, and there is the challenge to make the proper selection. It is a professional job that must be mastered.

PROFESSOR MURRAY YOUNG said that, for him, one of the most fascinating aspects of administrative history is the tracing of power structures and the very subtle shift of emphasis that take place in government to which Mr. Wilson paid a great deal of attention in his very able paper. The initiative coming from within the bureaucracy is a very important aspect of administrative history which cannot be approached except through the study of departmental records or the reports of civil servants. Another aspect is the way provincial civil services have followed the federal plan, and in the past, colonial civil services have followed the British pattern. For example, there is no very clear picture of how the power of the Treasury emerged in British government, in Canadian government or in the government of New Brunswick. It is quite clear that, in New Brunswick, the power of the Treasury increased enormously in the late 1950's, and was perhaps not effectively established until that time, whereas the power of the British Treasury probably became effectively established in the modern sense sometime in the 1820's and 1830's.

MR. WILSON suggested that a useful study could be made of the Canadian bureaucracy and its build-up during the war. To what extent have these men influenced public administration in Canada? Initial probes seem to indicate that the answer would be that they were very influential. Mr. Wilson added that he had just completed a study on the growth of the Treasury and its importance in Canada. The Treasury Board seems to have been brought in by John A. Macdonald because (and this has happened in Canadian bureaucracy over the years) he saw a nice thing in England and instituted it in Canada. But the Treasury Board was of little importance until the administration of R. B. Bennett and the fact that Mr. Bennett himself was directly concerned with fiscal and monetary control during the Depression. The accession of power within the Treasury Board probably dates from that period.