

ANNUAL BANQUET

Monday, October 3, 7.00 p.m.

DR. CHESTER S. WALTERS presiding.

DR. CHESTER S. WALTERS: Ladies and Gentlemen. In bringing this meeting to order, I have to hold myself back and tell myself that I am past the three score and ten or else I become enthusiastic about the beautiful women that we have here this evening. (Applause). I am sure you're all with me.

Now, Canada is a beautiful country and the finger of the Great Architect of the Universe has been painting beautiful sentiments, our beautiful sentiments, upon the mountainside. However, not to make a speech, except to say that I am happy to have you here and I welcome you, I want to say that I believe I am correct in making this statement, that in Canada, 75% of the people of Canada, live within 75 miles of the land that is peopled by our great kindred people, the Americans, which means that whereas they can within the centre, they can draw, they can turn and reach millions here and there, we have to reach out as we have and as we do reach out. So, just to give you an idea I am going to try something here tonight. I am going to ask first if there is anyone here from the great, old Dominion and now the great young Province of Newfoundland, to stand. Newfoundland. (Applause).

My brother Canadian, you are most welcome. It is a great pleasure to welcome you. I recently visited your capital city and I met you and I met your Prime Minister and I met your Lieutenant-Governor, and I may say that the gentleman who was then the Governor and has since been promoted to be Chief Justice of Newfoundland, will visit Toronto and be my guest on the 28th of October. Thank you.

Now then, I am sure that I—I think I am on the beam. I am going to call next, if there is anybody here from Prince Edward Island. If there are any here, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like you to stand. The garden island of the gulf! (Applause).

Now, the old Province of Nova Scotia. Is there anyone here from Nova Scotia? If there are, please stand (Applause). I'll say

that for Nova Scotia, I always had the idea that the people of Nova Scotia were very pleasant and precise and dignified in their movements. I visited Nova Scotia this summer and the fastest ride that I ever had over curves and mountains and dells was a ride in which I saw behind the wheel, and I can tell you, I really prayed! (Laughter). But now, when I got out I am praising Earl Peverill, because he and the machine are one; and I am glad to say that they weren't separated during that journey.

Now, New Brunswick. Are there any here from New Brunswick? (Applause). Well now, listen, I received a nice letter from your Premier, wishing the Conference success. You are most welcome!

Now then, I expect this building is going to rock at the next Province I am going to call upon. I am going to call upon the glorious old mother Province of Quebec. Stand up! Everybody; the press table, too. (Applause). Now, all together! Il a gagné ses epaulettes, etc.

Thank you! You see that I remain standing for Quebec, because I'll tell you, they say that where your heart is, there your treasure is also. And I have my pocketbook here with all the money I have in the world, and I'm right here, so, I'm a Quebecois, this evening.

However, I'm going to stick by my native Province. As the Irishman says, "You know, we're all proud of our Native Land, whether we're born there or not." (Laughter). Any from Ontario, please stand! (Applause). Welcome! You people from Ontario; I'm glad to welcome you to my city! (Laughter).

Now, Manitoba! Will you please stand? (Applause) Thank you!

Now, I am going to over, my astral body moves over one province, because I don't think there is anybody here from Saskatchewan.

Now, the Province of Alberta is represented here tonight, I know, by one of our distinguished members of the Council. If you're alone, would you stand up? (Applause).

Now British Columbia! Any from British Columbia, here? (Applause). Welcome!

Now, I'm going to ask for two other groups. I won't ask, yes, I will ask, I'm going to ask those who are from our sister nation to stand, because, I know the ladies want to see these two gentlemen, and if there is anyone here in the audience who was born in the United States of America will you please stand with our two distinguished visitors, Dr. Gulick, and Dixwell L. Pierce? Will you please stand? (Applause). Well, I'll say you Americans do get around in our country! (Laughter).

Now will you please, those who are representing this great nation from the great capital city of Ottawa, will you please stand? (Applause). Ladies and gentlemen, you see why our taxes are so high to support this army of civil servants. (Laughter). Well now, we are all acquainted and all initiated and all duly received.

I now have a very pleasant task. I am going to ask Mr. Jean Bruchési, the Deputy Provincial Secretary of the Province of Quebec—I have assigned the honour to you because I think that you are the most deserving. I now throw the torch to you and ask you to introduce our distinguished guest. (Applause).

MR. JEAN BRUCHESI: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: After having listened to so many amusing stories told to you by the Chairman, I suppose that you are expecting one from me. I am not quite sure that it will be amusing. But I remember the story of that old Irish woman, travelling from Southern to Northern Ireland. When she came to the customs agent, he asked her, "Have you anything to declare?" She answered, "Well, not exactly, I have a bottle." "What do you have in your bottle?" "Well, it's water." "What kind of water?" "Holy water," she said. But the agent- came and took the bottle and smelled it, and said, "Hmm! Whisky!" So, the Irish woman said, "Oh, glory be to Saint Patrick! He made a miracle!" (Laughter). "He made a miracle to comfort me in the land of infidels." (Laughter). Well, I hope that you do not need any whisky or any holy water to listen to my very short remarks.

The day before yesterday, I received a call from my friend, Georges Shink, a man whose duty is to control himself (Laughter), to control his wife and (Laughter) to control the revenue of the Province. I wonder which is the most difficult subject to control. Mr. Shink told me: "Our guest of honour, at the banquet on Monday evening, is a very important man in the United States, Dr.

Luther Gulick, President of The Institute of Public Administration. To introduce him we need someone who is at least, almost as important as he, and we thought of you." (Laughter). Useless to add, that I did not accept the invitation because I believe in my own importance. On the contrary, if I had had any illusion in that respect I would have lost it in reading in the American "Who's Who," the four or five full pages concerning Dr. Gulick.

Now if I wanted to read to you those pages it would take half an hour, but an introduction must be short; the more so in the present case, as I have been told that Dr. Gulick dislikes publicity and usually avoids it. Without going into many details, it is my duty and my pleasure to recall that our guest of honour, the son of a missionary and of an educator, was born in Japan some 57 years ago; that he was educated in the United States and in Germany; that he has been for many years a professor at Columbia University. During the First and Second World Wars, he was entrusted with special and delicate missions. Since the end of the last war he has been active in international organizations like UNRRA. He has directed extensive inquiries in the United States in the field of education and public administration. He is the author of books which have been translated into various languages. As President of The Institute of Public Administration, he is ranked as one of the top men in his field. We are told that he is particularly considered as a tax authority and we do hope that, as such, he may contribute some day to alleviate the burden of the taxpayer.

When studying in Oberlin College in Germany, he was called "a fresh kid, talkative, boasting and energetic". We have also learned, and you may judge now by yourself, that Dr. Gulick is of medium height, of mild appearance and wearing silver-rimmed glasses; that he is a lover of modern music and painting—so much the better for Shostakovitch and Picasso—a rather bad tennis player, an amateur mechanic and a confirmed hiker. This latter point may explain why he feels so much at home in exploring the budgets and making the figures dance.

Pour un très grand nombre de personnes,* mesdames et messieurs, l'administration civile est un moyen de gagner sa vie à ne rien faire. On y entre, on y progresse et on en sort pour toutes sortes de raisons, sauf celle de la compétence. C'est, sans doute, dans cet esprit, que fut, un jour, composé la **Pater** de l'employé

* Translation on page 210.

civil, de l'employé civil de Québec tout au moins qui, j'imagine, le recite tous les matins: "Notre Pere, qui êtes au Parlement, faites que nous soyons bien payés, que nos congés arrivent, que notre besogne soit faite par d'autres, sur la terre comme au ciel. (Laughter). Donnez-nous, aujourd'hui, notre repos quotidien. Pardonnez-nous notre indolence comme nous pardonnons à ceux qui nous font travailler. (Laughter). Ne laissez pas succomber notre augmentation et délivrez-nous des élections. Ainsi soit-il!" (Laughter and applause).

Et pourtant, on en convient de plus en plus, l'administration civile est, dans les Etats modernes, autre chose que le simple fonctionnarisme.

Qu'on le déplore ou qu'on s'en rejouisse, elle a pris une extrême importance, et, du soin qu'on met à la bâtir, à la maintenir et à l'orienter, dépend dans une large mesure le bon ou le mauvais gouvernement des Etats. Les hommes passent, mais l'administration demeure.

M. Gulick est, sans doute, l'un des hommes qui ont le plus contribué à souligner la place de l'administration dans la vie contemporaine, les soins et l'estime dont elle doit être l'objet. Et c'est ainsi qu'il s'est fait l'intrépide défenseur des employés civils, notamment qu'il a condamné à plusieurs reprises le—spoils system, to use up public payrolls for charity and the indiscriminating criticism of public employees. Pour les mêmes raisons, il a toujours cru et il croit encore—that politics must be taken out of Administration.

Ladies and Gentlemen : Dr. Luther Gulick.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AS A PROFESSION

DR. LUTHER GULICK

President, Institute of Public Administration of the U.S.A.

I deeply appreciate the beauty of the introduction in spite of its somewhat extravagant misquotations from certain records. But I arise with great diffidence, Dr. Walters, on this occasion, because what you really need is a great oration which will fill the soul and inspire men to press forward to a nobler appraisal of the present world and to a more dynamic leadership in the days that lie ahead. Instead of that, I have come here among a group of friends, engaged

in the humdrum task of administration, to discuss a very tough subject: one that is not going to amuse you even after this excellent and pleasant dinner. It will require some hard thought. And, I suspect, it may lead to some differences of opinion. Yet, I venture on this course, because I know from having participated in the early days of the organization of the British Institute of Public Administration and in the organization of the American Society for Public Administration, which is the American counterpart of the British Institute, and now of your Institute here in Canada—I know from that participation in those organizations, that we have made more progress by hard thinking, facing the facts, than we have by patting each other on the back or endeavoring to draw inspiration from grandiose discussions. So I have come here tonight to talk about public administration as a profession and as a career.

On this historic occasion when you are gathered for your first convention, my thought naturally goes back, first of all, to those early days in the organization of the British Institute of Public Administration. I remember very well in those early years, Lord Haldane was the first president. Shortly before that, he had been in charge of the Royal Commission which made a report on the machinery of government in England—a report which is still famous among students of public administration. I remember Henry Bunberry, Controller of the Post Office Department, later Sir Henry, was present at those meetings. So was a young man by the name of John Anderson, now Sir John, and only very recently here, following a terrific load of administration at the very top of the British Public Service during the period of the war; William Robeson, now Professor of Public Administration at the London School of Economics; John Lee; I. G. Gibbon, later Sir Gwillam Gibbon; William Hart of the London County Council, later Sir William Hart; Arthur Collins, the consultant in the field of Management Engineering; and many others were present in those early days, meeting together to talk about public administration in the interests of the advancement of the effectiveness, both of the democracy and of the management of the government, national and local.

My thought also goes back to the first days of organization, just ten years ago, of the American Society for Public Administration. William Mosher was first President; later, he was the Dean of the School of Public Administration, the Maxwell School of Syra-

cuse University, for many years. Another member was Lewis Brownlow, later the Chairman of the President's Committee on Administrative Management during the Roosevelt administration. And the third of the individuals who met to organize the American Society was myself. And I can say, Mr. Walters, that at our first meeting called shortly after the initial meeting of discussion, we had less than half of the number that is gathered together here. So that you can see an organization which is now well up over 3,000 in its membership, with 20 Chapters throughout the United States started with small beginnings, with great enthusiasm, with the readiness to experiment and explore. I am sure from seeing your programme and listening to the discussions in the corridors, that that is precisely the point at which you are starting, though you are starting with more numbers and, I am sure, with equal enthusiasm because of the leadership which has already come to your project.

The success of this kind of an operation depends in great measure upon the ideas that lie back of the group; in other words, the philosophy that is woven into the organization and its programme. That is my justification for talking tonight about public administration as a career and as a profession. I am not going to make this an oration. I suppose you all know the story of the cleaning woman in the church, who found some loose papers by the pulpit, dropped, apparently, by the minister. As she picked them up, she discovered they were not only the text of the sermon which he had given the prior Sunday, but they also contained, on the margin, some notes. She was a little curious, as one naturally would be and, there they were: the suggestions which he himself had made as to his gestures. At one point, where the sermon talked about the whole world, it had in the margin, "two hands". A little further down, he had a side-head on "Wrestling with sin" and it said, "breath hard". A little further down it said, "argument weak, shout like hell". Laughten). Now, I hope you won't think that there are parts in what I have to say where I have to shout like hell, because here, in this intimate family, I am sure that isn't necessary, even though the argument may seem a little weak.

I intend to approach the problem by dealing, first of all, with four major questions: the first of these is, the growth of governmental activities and personnel; second, the nature of specialization in governmental service; third, the functions of top management;

and fourth, the nature of a profession. Then on the basis of the discussion of those four points, I plan to go on and see whether we can reach any tentative hypotheses or conclusions with reference to this problem of public administration as a profession.

Perhaps I ought to define one or two terms before we start. I have recently been taken over the coals by some of the young philosophers for failing to define terms, so I'll start off here by saying that when I use the word "should", "we should *do this*" or "we must do that", I am thinking of measuring the action in terms of the broadest possible benefit. When I say "should", I mean "should" in the interest of the public interest. I am going to use the word "administration" and the word "management" synonymously. I shall not distinguish between the two in this discussion tonight. And when I talk about conditions in the United States or conditions in Canada, I am talking about the two as representing the same broad stream of culture, the same background of economic resources, the same types of people, actuated by the same kind of motives. So I shall talk of your situation and our situation as one situation, because of the fundamental underlying oneness of our life, our interests and our destiny.

First then, as to the growth of governmental activities. You don't need to argue about that today. Everybody admits it. Some bewail it, some condone it, some glory in it, some advocate further growth, some take it as an historic fact. I take it as an historic fact. That growth can be measured in the percentage of national income taken for government. The percentage has distinctly changed in the last generation. Here I am more familiar with our statistics than yours, though I think they are not too different. A generation ago, we were devoting about 10%, 11% or 12% of our national income to government—national, state and local, and I suspect that yours was not too far differing from that. Now we are devoting about 25% or 26% of an immensely increased national income to meeting the costs of past wars, defending the nation against future wars and carrying on the social services and controls by national government, state government and local government. One thing that throws off this kind of a computation is, of course; the national debt and the cost of the war. But when you turn to the number of people who are working for government, the men whom we hire on the payroll of government, you see an equally striking change. In

the United States, in 1900, one out of every 24 of those who were gainfully employed throughout the whole economy, was working for government, all levels, national, state and local. In 1920, this had shifted from 1 in 24 to 1 in 15; in 1940, after the depression years, to 1 in 11. It went up higher during the war years, of course, but after demobilization of the major part of the armed forces, we had, in 1948, 1 in 8 of the gainfully employed now working for some aspect of government, federal, state or local. Thus, from a little over 4% of the gainfully employed, we have now shifted to 11½% of the gainfully employed. When you look to see when these changes came, you see they came during and after wars and during depressions. So it is wars and business cycles which have brought on these changes in our situation. When you look to see where these changes have taken place, in the main, the great changes have taken place in our national government during the latter years. In the earlier years it was in state and local government. So that over the period of two generations, you have both expanding and at not too different a rate, though at different times. From this you can pick the causes, national security in the international sense—the military and the international economic relations which are of very great importance from the standpoint of our budget—economic security, looked at from the standpoint of the individual; the public educational system of the country; fourth, health and hospitals; and then fifth, what I have put down as ventures: governmental ventures, dealing with conservation, transportation and power.

Here again, I suspect that the course of events in the United States is not too different from the course of events in Canada. Is there any end in sight to this general progress of the increase in the amount of work which the public demands from government and therefore in the increase of the amount of people who are called upon to work for government? I think, we cannot, at the moment, detect any certain sign of a reduction in the demands which are being made. At least, that is true in the United States. We hope for a reduction in the international strains; we hope for a very important reduction in the costs of international security. We hope that the international economic life will be restored to a point where it will not need as large a backing from the budgets of the solvent countries of the world.

However, when you look at education and the needs of the people; when you look at the demands for social security; when you look at the tremendous possibilities of gain from various types of ventures; when you look at the campaigns being waged by political leaders, you find no indication of a change in trend. Even the most conservative political leaders today are not asking for marked reductions in the services performed by government. When you see that the most conservative leaders are calling for additional ventures, and are not calling for a reduction of social security, you'll realize that there is no serious possibility that this trend of events to which we have referred will be reversed suddenly.

When you study with care the areas of growth and the areas of reduction, you find that the only reductions have taken place in the antiquated services. We don't have street lamplighters any more. We don't have the dog-catchers in the cities, as we used to have them. A few of these antiquated activities have disappeared. The only other area in which you find a decrease in the percentage of personnel on the budget is, where? It is at the top. With every one of these expansions of governmental service, you have a smaller and smaller percentage of the total assigned to general management, fiscal administration and control; not less people, but a smaller percentage. So that while government has been growing and expanding, the total growth being 500% in 50 years, the growth in the top administrative personnel has been less than 100%. So that you have a smaller and smaller proportion of manpower assigned to the top management posts. That's also true in big business. The larger the business, the smaller is the top overhead group. The same thing has been happening in government.

The second point to which I want to turn your thought is the nature of specialization in government service. In government you will find every skill represented of the culture in which you happen to live. You even have experts in the operation of the abacus; you even have experts all the way down the line to zoo administrators and xylophone players; from A to Z they are all represented in government service somewhere. Dividing the categories a little differently, however, as was done by the Commission of Inquiry on Public Administration and Personnel, you have the following categories of governmental service: the elected and appointed representatives; the technical experts and professionals, including the

doctors, the lawyers and accountants, a trained professional group; general office workers; skilled tradesmen, carpenters, masons, type-setters and so on; unskilled workers, who can be moved from job to job without great loss of competence under proper supervision; and then finally the administrative and executive personnel. I take it, when we are talking about careers in the public service in public administration, we are not thinking primarily of the professional personnel of the regular professions, doctors, and so forth. We are not thinking of the skilled trades, a carpenter who is working for public service as compared to a carpenter who is working in private service. We are thinking primarily of this last group: the administrative and executive personnel. But it is well to remember that in government you also have these other groups—you have the elected and the appointed political representatives; the technical experts and professionals; the general office workers, who are not unlike those in private business; the skilled tradesman; the unskilled workers; and finally the administrative and executive personnel. A moment ago, I said that all groups have expanded. All groups have expanded, but the one that has expanded least is this group of administrative and executive personnel.

I turn now to the most difficult problem which arises in connection with our discussion this evening. That is: the nature of the functions of top management. There was no systematic thought on this problem, except possibly by Montesquieu and some of the writers in politics, from the time of the Roman Empire down to about 1900. And then systematic thought in this field cropped up in three places: in France, in the United States and in England. It is rather interesting. In France, Henri Fayol, a great steel administrator, started writing and talking about the problems of general administration and top management as early as 1900. But he was a steel worker and not a college professor, so he didn't write about it systematically until after the World War I, when he wrote his famous book, "Administration, General and Industrial". It has just been translated again this last year, into English, though they call it "Management—Industrial and General".

Fayol's great contribution was his analysis of management, top management, as a series of functional activities: planning, organizing, commanding, co-ordinating and controlling. These were the words he used to describe the functions of top management. And

he suggested the further important idea, that the responsibility of general management is greater and greater as the organization is enlarged and as a man rises in the scale of responsibility. And he points out, in a very small concern the main task of the general manager is technical production. Above everything else, the manager has got to get production, he personally has got to have technical knowledge to get production. And Fayol says, "in my big steel plant, I have forgotten all about the techniques. I don't need to know anything about technology; I have competent men under me that know more about that than I ever knew or that I need to know." He said the same thing is true of the public service, and he went out of his way to talk about the public service in France. He said some very cogent things. One of them, you will all appreciate, is the need of continuity in the direction in the affairs of the state.

Another great writer, starting about the same time, was the American, Taylor. Now, Taylor started from the bottom in the shop, also a steel man. Isn't that interesting? He started at the bottom within a shop, and was concerned to achieve the best utilization of manpower and machine-power. He suggested that the way to get efficiency in the shop is to specialize along functional lines. He concluded that every shop ought to have eight foremen. It ought to have a planning foreman or a clerk as he called it; an instruction clerk, who made out the exact description of what the man was to do; it had to have a speed expert; a machine expert and so on, advising the man at the machine exactly how to set his tools, how to handle his steel, how to get the maximum production. It was his notion that no one man should be asked to perform more than one activity. In order to do that, the activities had to be split up into their natural technical divisions. So he went through his time and motion studies, and said, "There is one best way, and we'll find out that best way by the application of scientific methods". So, scientific management became the code of the Taylor doctrine. And he carried his notion from the shop on up through functional foreman, through functional advisors, through the whole organization, until at the top all functions were pulled together in the general manager. Fayol started at the top and came down through the assignment of functions. Taylor did just the opposite. You can see a very interesting meeting of minds coming from two opposite ends of the same problem.

Then there was an American woman, Mary Parker Follet. Mary Follet became interested in problems of management through political science. She was a sociologist, a psychologist and an industrial engineer. Mary Follet presented a point of view which has since had a tremendous impress upon the thinking of management engineers. It is the doctrine that human beings work together best and most productively, not when they are ordered around, but when they are organized in a team and work together because they want to work together, because they are driving for the same great objectives. Mary Follet said, "Co-ordination; yes you get co-ordination by command; you get co-ordination by a boss sitting over the workers, but that's not the real way to get productive human effort. The way to get it is through teamwork and co-ordination through the spirit, co-ordination through driving for the same objectives." That same concept has been taken up by the American industrialist, Chester Barnard, who came up through the telephone company where he was president of the New Jersey Bell System while he did his great writing in the field of private and governmental organizations and administration. Barnard has identified "decision making" as the crux of administrative action.

Then there is Colonel Urwick, a British management engineer, who got his ideas in part through the army. What he noted as the secret of effective action, leadership and co-ordination, is the staff services which worked with, and advised, and shared the command function of the military chief. So Urwick developed and expounded the concept of the staff function in government. He has also been the leading interpreter of Fayol's work to the English-speaking world. I think he understands Fayol better than almost any of the subsequent students of administration, even than those who followed in Fayol's footsteps in France. This point of view of Urwick, on the significance of the staff function in administration, was elaborated independently by Frederick A. Cleveland and Henry Bruere when they pressed for the development of the budget as the great tool of administrative control. It was their work which led to the establishment of the budget system throughout the United States, both at national, state and local levels.

Then there is Mooney, Vice-President of the General Motors Company of the United States, who got greatly interested in the problem of administration. To him we are indebted for the term

"the scalar chain"; the chain of command going down as the links of a chain. But, he said, "Co-ordination is both perpendicular and horizontal. The vertical is the line of scalar authority, the horizontal is the line of mutual co-operation of individuals who are working toward the same objective and the 'service of knowledge' supplied by the staff agencies." And you've got to have both of them, according to Mooney, in order to achieve an effective working organization. You see, in a measure, he was pulling together the thinking of Mary Follet, who was talking about the team action, the horizontal co-ordination; and, shall we say, Fayol, with his general vertical structure, which brought men together in a framework of authority, and then Urwick, with his ideas on staff.

Thus, you have in Fayol, Taylor, Follet, Urwick, Mooney, and others an effort to define the nature of the function of top management. This is the problem we are thinking about now. It seems to me that all of these discussions somewhat understress what I am going tonight to call the "neural", the nerve function of top management. What do I mean by this "neural" function? I mean the responsibility for bridging the gap between (a) the political leadership, the elected and appointed political representatives, who play an important part in our type of civilization and our type of government, and (b) the rank and file of the permanent employees of government. I am talking of the bridge which carries problems and facts, and the drafts of programmes and plans, from the **civil** service side to the political side and carries decisions, and assists in the making of the decisions so that the decisions will be practical, in carrying those decisions to the permanent operating side of government. That's one of the "neural" functions. The other, is the function of standing between (a) the technical experts of government and (b) the public to explain why we have to do things certain ways, why technology requires certain types of action, and thus brings about co-operation and assent on the part of the public generally with the programmes as they are being carried out. This "neural" function carries information from the permanent service to the political responsible heads, helps in the making of decisions, carries those decisions back, puts them into operation, and has the second function of helping to explain the technical expert to the public. That also is a function of the political side. Both have a responsibility there, and the balance of the two is a matter of great

difficulty which I shall not discuss tonight. But I maintain that in the structure of government, this "neural" function, this function of two-way creative communication, is extraordinarily important. And I think that those who have studied the problem of administration and have come at it, primarily from the side of industry, have under-emphasized this aspect. Now mark you, this problem exists in big industry, but not all of the managers have recognized it, though more and more, they have come to see what is involved in their relationship to the public. But the function I am discussing is really more highly-developed in any large governmental enterprise. If then you add this "neural" function to the list that has already been developed and written about by the analysts of administration, you have some such list as the following:

Subfunctions of the top administrator

1. The leadership function developed by Follet and others;
2. The neural function, which I have just described;
3. The planning function;
4. The organization function, under which, following Fayol, is included the development of duties, the securing of staff, the personnel function, the securing of housing and materials, and the general development of the financing;
5. The command or decision function, emphasized by Fayol and Chester Barnard particularly;
6. The control function, emphasized by Fayol; and
7. The reporting function, which I add because of its importance—there I include in part the budgeting, reporting, accounting, control, and audit, which are of such importance in the public service.

These are not mutually exclusive, and I am not one who says that you can put down seven neat subfunctions and say it's all there and nothing else is needed. I put them down to show what is the general content of this task of general management which we have been talking about.

I now come to the last of my tough nuts and I hope you are not all dead by now. This will bring me to the conclusion.

What is the nature of a profession?

We are going to consider whether we can make a profession out of this thing that we've been talking about. Before we answer that, we have to say to ourselves, what is a profession? Here we have doctors around us, we have engineers, we have ministers of the gospel, we have lawyers, we have accountants. These are all professions. What do we mean by professions? I have tried to put this down with some care, because I think a great deal of our thinking goes haywire at this point. Here is what I think are the elements, all of which must be present to have a full-scale profession :

1. A core of organized and formalized knowledge, practice and theory.

The field of endeavor must be built around, and significantly dependent upon, an interrelated scientific or pragmatic formulation and interpretation of phenomena.

2. Public recognition.

The field of endeavor must be recognized by the general public and by dominant groups as a "noble calling". The field must command respect, and include the individuals to whom others will turn for the skill and knowledge required in the solution of a given type of problem or the performance of a given type of service.

3. A livelihood, and a career.

The field of endeavor and activity must give its members a living and it must offer a career, that is opportunity for growing knowledge, competence, recognition, influence and fulfillment in return for training, ability, effort and devotion.

4. Education for entrance.

Entrance into the field of endeavor must normally be preceded by an extended and systematic intellectual effort to master the core of knowledge and theory and by some attention to the operating techniques of the field.

5. Formal induction.

The right to enter the field of endeavor is formally and impressively conferred by the profession or by the representatives of the profession as trustees for society.

6. Group solidarity and responsibility.

Those who constitute the members of a profession must have a sense of belonging together and a sense of responsibility to serve mankind. The group must take pride in the advancement of its science and art through the researches of qualified members of the group, through the immediate dissemination of advances and through encouraging and training new members of the group.

That is a pretty heavy dose of criteria, but I think when you get the proceedings of this conference, if you will ponder over them, you will find that these six paragraphs do represent the things that we look for as an ideal, for any field of activity which we recognize as a profession, in the free society of western culture. These criteria are, of course, relative. They change with changes in culture. As we develop more scientific techniques, we get finer and finer divisions of the professions.

When you look at public administration, can we honestly say that we have a core of organized and formalized practice and theory? Do we have public recognition? Do we have a decent livelihood and a career? Do we have a clear line of education for entrance? Do we have formal induction? Do we have group solidarity and sense of responsibility to the public? If not, we had better be a little modest as to what we say about public administration, in the top management level, as a career and a profession.

I think the truth is that we stand on the threshold. We have the beginnings of the core of knowledge and practice. Too much of it, particularly of practice, is locked up in the minds of wise administrators like Dr. Walters here. Not enough of it has been gotten out where the young fellows can get at it through the quicker but nonetheless accurate processes of education as compared with the longer and slower processes of hard knocks. We're beginning to have a livelihood and a career. We're beginning to pay more decent salaries.

Is there a clear line of education for entrance? There is not. But there will be, and we are beginning, through the development of that core of knowledge, to lay the basis for something that can be utilized as a foundation in education.

Is there formal induction? No, not yet. However, there is a fine public recognition of men who render real service through the structure of government.

Is there group solidarity and a sense of responsibility? This meeting tonight shows that there is group solidarity and that the foundation of responsibility is being laid for the future.

On this basis, I think, we can say a number of things about the situation.

1. The work of government is growing in extent, range and complexity. Without predicting the future, we can, nonetheless, recognize that most of the effective political forces today call not for a reduction in the role of government, but for improving the quality of service, greater efficiency and economy in terms of getting more for our money, but no reduction in the nature of the functions performed.
2. The function of top management becomes more and more important for the success of government as a whole. This includes the political side which we are not discussing tonight, and the non—or shall I say less—political side, the administrative side.
3. The functions of top management in public administration have been well defined, though we can improve on that definition. They can be broken down into a number of sub-functions for which theory, doctrine, factual content and technology are already partly known.
4. Men do not spring into management when they come out of school, but work their way into it from lower posts of administration and finance, general office posts, top professional posts, and from the skilled and unskilled trades and by transfer from private business.
5. Men who come to top management in this way, must learn a good deal about the leadership function, the "neural" function, the planning function, the organizing function, the control function, and the reporting function, either by hard knocks, trial and error, or consciously, with the aid of organized theory and facts, and with the conscious co-operation of others who have gone further than they and who have learned more than they, in practical administration.

6. This being the case, there is good reason for:
 1. A governmental personnel system which reaches for young men and women who have special advance awareness of the theory and facts pertaining to governmental administration.
 2. University education, designed to supplement a broad general education and to give an awareness to these problems of administration. I believe most firmly that courses in administration can be introduced in existing educational institutions even though we do not at this stage, perhaps, establish degrees in public administration. I believe that it is the function of a college or university to infiltrate ideas on public administration into medicine, law, engineering, business, education, and these other professional lines from which so many of our top administrators are destined to come in the future. And in due course, I suspect that we will find that we will carry our knowledge of the art and science of administration far enough to justify the development of definite degrees in the field of public administration and definite lines of training which will be valued by personnel administrators when they are looking for men and women to come in at the lower ranks of the general, clerical, fiscal administrative groups with a view to promotion. (Applause).
 3. There is justification for carefully designed in-service education within government departments and for systematically transferring people around to give young men and women expanding administrative experience.
 4. There is justification for research in the problems of public administration and top management, particularly in cooperation with colleges and universities, professional societies in the field of public administration and the management group in private industry. And finally,
 5. There is justification for a broad nation-wide association of those who are interested in public administration and wish to contribute to the knowledge, to the ethics and to the sense of solidarity and responsibility on the part of those who are engaged in public administration.

So, Mr. Chairman and members of The Institute of Public Administration of Canada, I stand here with a profound sense of

historic importance in this event. You have set your faces to the future; to the future in which we will see the institutions of government become more effective instruments of that advancing mankind which we all serve. (Applause).

MR. R. B. BRYCE: Mr. Chairman, Dr. Gulick has given us, not only a great deal of encouragement, but a great deal to think about. I think that most of us who are concerned with administration have come to it through something else. When we get together we are more apt to talk about policies than the underlying principles and problems of administration. This Institute is intended to be a forum for the discussion of these principles and problems of administration.

Dr. Gulick, in this well reasoned address has given us a great start in this field.

I am sure that I can express on your behalf as well as my own, our great appreciation and thanks to him.

DR. WALTERS: Dr. Gulick, the Chairman of this Conference, Mr. R. B. Bryce, has very briefly, but very effectively, expressed what I believe is in the minds of all of us. The motto on our armorial bearings is "Fiat Lux"—"Let there be light". Your address has been most illuminating. It will be printed. Not a word will be lost, and it will be for us a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night. Accept the sincere and grateful and enduring thanks of The Institute of Public Administration of Canada for your great and inspiring address. (Applause). I would ask you all to rise and give expression to your appreciation of this great speech that we have heard tonight. (Prolonged applause). Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you share my emotion. This is a great beginning for us. We are only beginning. As I tried to say in my very humble address this morning, that we are on the verge of grand accomplishments. Ladies and gentlemen, the meeting is adjourned.