LOCAL GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE
AND ORGANIZATION
PROBLEMS OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

Papers presented at the
World Conference of Local Governments

WASHINGTON, D.C.
JUNE 15–20, 1961
LOCAL GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE 
AND ORGANIZATION

PROBLEMS OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

Papers presented at the
World Conference of Local Governments

WASHINGTON, D.C.
JUNE 15-20, 1961

1962
MARTINUS NIJHOFF, THE HAGUE, FOR THE
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES
## CONTENTS

### Preface

7

### General Aspects

*Background and Fundamental Principles of Government Structure in a Democracy*
  by Robert F. Wagner, Mayor of the City of New York  
  11

*Recent Trends and Developments in Local Government Organization*
  by Dr. G. E. van Walsum, Burgomaster of Rotterdam  
  15

*Local Government Structure and Organization in Various Lands*
  - Ceylon — by M. H. Mohamed, Mayor of Colombo  
  - Nicaragua — by Francisco Arauz, Mayor of Matagalpa  
  - Yugoslavia — by D. Jojkić, Former Mayor of Belgrade, and V. Holjevac, Mayor of Zagreb  
  - New African States — by Mayor Nathan C. Ross, Commissioner of the Commonwealth District of Monrovia, Liberia  
  - 26  
  - 27  
  - 28  
  - 30

### Legislative Body or Council

*Local Government Councils in the U.S.*
  by Dr. Arthur W. Bromage, Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan  
  33

*Local Government Councils in Great Britain*
  by Alderman Sir Francis Hill, Lincoln, England  
  38

*The Council*
  by M. A. B. Sarpong, Principal Secretary, Ministry of Local Government, Ghana  
  44

*Discussion*
  47

### The Executive

*Executive Powers and Obligations under the Strong Mayor Form of Government*
  by De Lesseps S. Morrison, Mayor of New Orleans  
  51

*The Executive in Scandinavia*
  by Kjell T. Evers, Executive Director of the Norwegian Unions of Towns and Rural Municipalities  
  55
The Municipal Executive
by Dr. Chamnan Yuvapurna, Lord Mayor of Bangkok, Thailand.............. 60

Discussion................................................................. 66

The Executive in the Netherlands
by Prof. A. Kleijn, Burgomaster of Meppel. ......................... 67

The Administrative Machinery

The Administrative Machinery of Baltimore
by J. Harold Grady, Mayor of the City of Baltimore, Maryland.................... 71

The Administrative Machinery in France
by Gilbert Noel, Mayor of Saint-Maur-des-Fosses. ......................... 77

Trends in the Administrative Machinery of Local Government in Japan
by Minoru Yoshida, Governor of Toyama Prefecture. .................... 81

Discussion................................................................. 84

Aspects of Local Government Administration in Cape Town
by A. H. Honikman, Deputy Mayor of Cape Town, South Africa................... 85

Summaries

Legislative Body or Council
by Ruy Ramos, Deputy of the Federal District of Brazil..................... 87

The Executive
by Dr. Charles S. Ascher, Professor at the Institute of Public Administration, New York City ... 91

The Administrative Machinery
by George S. Mooney, Executive Director, Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities...... 95

Problems of Metropolitan Areas

The Projection of Urban Growth
by Edward Connor, City Councilman, Detroit, Michigan .................... 101
The Organisation of Local Government in Major Urban Areas
by Sir William Hart, Clerk of the London County Council 105

The Emergence of Urban Development as an Issue of National Policy
by Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C. 109

The Coordinated Planning and Financing of Major Public Facilities and Services for the Urban Areas and Evaluation of Organizational and Fiscal Alternatives
by Murray V. Jones, Commissioner of Planning for the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board, Toronto, Canada 112

Discussion 116
The main theme of the World Conference of Local Governments, which was held June 15—20, 1961 in Washington, D.C., was "Recent Trends and Developments in Local Government Structure and Organization." Under this general heading, on which two introductory speeches were given, emphasis was placed on three sub-headings: the legislative body or council, the executive, and the administrative machinery. Each of these topics was introduced by three speakers who represented Europe, North America and either Asia or Africa, respectively; following their presentations, time was allotted for a question and answer and discussion period. At the conclusion of the four sessions on the main conference theme a summary of each of the three sub-topics was given by a reporter. The successive chairmen of the sessions were members of the IULA Executive Committee.

In addition to sessions on the main topic, seminar meetings were held on Public Relations, Personnel Management, Administrative Mechanization and Automation, and Metropolitan Areas, respectively. The proceedings of the latter seminar have been included in this book because today any discussion of local government structure and organization always turns to the manifold problems which have resulted from the world-wide explosion of urban populations. The problems which conurbations engender, therefore, are not a separate topic, but are an integral part of any discussion of the main problems local governments now face. Four presentations were given in the Metropolitan Areas seminar on various aspects of the conurbation phenomena and time was also devoted to questions and answers, discussion and statements by the seminar participants. The able chairman of this seminar was Dr. Luther Gulick, President of the Institute of Public Administration in New York City. And finally, two Congress sessions were devoted to the discussion of Town Affiliation.

In contrast to previous conferences, where papers on the main topics were submitted by each of the participating countries prior to the congress, the Washington preparatory reports were all presented by American experts. Indeed, one of the purposes of the congress was to make a comparison between American experiences and the experiences and problems in other parts of the world. Printed under the title of "Local Government in the United States of America", the American pre-congress reports are publication number 57 in the IULA series. Because of this plan, therefore, the American speeches given at the congress are, on the whole, shorter than are those of the European, African and Asian speakers.
Another break with the tradition of past years is that the speeches and discussions related to the main conference theme, to each of the seminars and to Town Affiliation are being published in separate books. It is hoped that this arrangement will prove useful and convenient, not only to the congress participants, but to all those who may have a general interest in all the congress topics, but a particular interest in one of its special aspects.

N. ARKEMA,
Secretary General of the 
International Union of Local Authorities
Senator Hubert Humphrey gives the keynote address for the opening session of the IULA Congress. To his immediate left is Monsieur F. Cottier, Chairman of the Washington Congress.

Mr. Mark Tobriner (right), Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acknowledges the traditional presentation of the IULA flag to his city by Mr. E. Shecter, Deputy Mayor of Tel Aviv.
Dr. G. E. van Walsum, Burgomaster of Rotterdam, discusses recent organizational trends and developments in local government.

Mr. M. H. Mohamed, Mayor of Colombo, describes local government in Ceylon.
GENERAL ASPECTS

The chairman of the opening session on Local Government Structure and Organization was Monsieur F. Cottier, Mayor of Geneva, President of the Swiss Union of Towns and First Vice-President of IILA. The two main speakers were Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York City and Burgomaster G. E. van Walsum of Rotterdam. Following their addresses are brief comments on the topic as it relates to three specific countries and to several African countries. Although these comments were not made at the session itself because of the lack of discussion time, they have been included here because of their pertinence to the topic.

BACKGROUND AND FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE IN A DEMOCRACY

by

ROBERT F. WAGNER
Mayor of the City of New York

A hundred years ago the dominant factor in the development of local government was the Industrial Revolution, a revolution which had its genesis in Western Europe. Today the impact of that revolution is being felt in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

One direct result of the Industrial Revolution in the United States was a dramatic change from a rural to an urban society. A hundred years ago over half of American manpower was involved in agriculture. Today less than 10 percent of our population finds employment on the farm.

In the United States, as indeed in many other nations, the Industrial Revolution has evolved into the Metropolitan Revolution. Nineteenth century technology was symbolized by the steam engine and the horse-drawn vehicle. Modern technology is symbolized by electric power, the automobile, the telephone and the mass data computer. This new technology makes possible the greater concentration of people, which brings with it a greater concentration of economic activities.

The shift from rural to urban areas has produced in the United States a new governmental phenomenon — the metropolitan area — so that today over 111 million people live in 212 of these conglomerations. Characteristics of these areas are threefold: bigness, relatedness and move-
ment. The New York metropolitan region covers an area of over 7,000 square miles, with more than 15 million people governed by over 1,400 units of local government.

We have heard much in the past few years of the world-wide population explosion. In the United States this has meant that, since the end of World War II, we have added to this nation a population equivalent to the entire population of France. Some communities in my own metropolitan region have had population increases in the last ten years higher than 300 percent. This incredible growth rate has placed great strain on local governmental services. New streets have to be paved; a new generation of children must be educated; the sick, the aged and the indigent must be provided for; people and goods must be allowed to circulate freely.

More and more local governments in the United States have been taking advantage of new advances in the field of management and personnel in order to meet their mounting local problems. The same ingenuity and resourcefulness that has come to characterize the American business community is now being used to good advantage in the American local governments. One of the most popular devices being utilized by local governments in order to meet mounting pressures for municipal services has been the employment of city managers — the so-called Council-Manager Plan.

In a number of our larger cities this plan has been modified to meet the particular requirements of large, heterogeneous population centers. In my own city we have a City Administrator appointed by me who acts as my management arm, supervising and coordinating the work of the various municipal agencies.

I am an advocate of the "strong mayor" type of city government, with the top elected official directly responsible and answerable to the people. But I also recognize that because of the growing complexity and changing needs of our great cities, the mayor must have at his hand the administrative machinery necessary to carry on the day-to-day workings of local government.

Earlier I spoke of the emergence in the United States of the metropolitan area as the dominating factor in our development. This new revolution has set in motion an entirely unique set of governmental problems which make outdated many of our existing governmental relationships. More and more, we local officials find ourselves confronted with problems over which we have no direct control, as they defy our existing political and geographic borders. Polluted air shows no respect for city, county, or even state lines. Commuters must be moved to and
from work, a movement which crosses numerous governmental jurisdictions. New sources of water must be found for growing population sub-centers; often these sources are many miles from the place of need.

These new regional problems are not unique to the United States. They can be found in and around Tokyo, Toronto, Tel Aviv, Paris, London. In the case of London, a Royal Study Commission has recently recommended a course of action for that great city in meeting its regional problems. Here in the United States, we too are beginning to take action in the face of this new and growing challenge.

We are experimenting with new forms of local government and new kinds of governmental organization. In my own area, the New York metropolitan region, with 550 municipalities in 21 counties in three states, we local officials have joined together to form a Metropolitan Regional Council, where we can bring our mutual problems for mutual discussion, and assist each other in finding solutions. Here in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area, the Washington Metropolitan Regional Conference was formed in 1957, modelled on ours in the New York area. Other such organizations have sprung up all over the country.

Our experience in the New York area has been that we could go just so far on a voluntary basis, and it is for this reason that the Council, of which I have the privilege of serving as chairman, is seeking legal status from the three states as a federation of local governments. The local officials reason that if local government is to remain effective, they must be provided with a mechanism for dealing more effectively with emerging regional problems. If no such mechanism is provided, then the job will go by default to other units of government — probably the federal. I for one am a firm believer in strengthened local government, because it is government closest to the people and therefore most responsive to their needs and aspirations.

Other approaches are being taken throughout the United States in meeting the metropolitan challenge. These include city-county consolidation, metropolitan special districts and authorities, and federation.

There is no one formula for governmental organization which is universally applicable to all metropolitan areas. But one thing is clear: our governmental structures must be made responsive to the needs of the Metropolitan Revolution which has engulfed us. It is imperative that we rid ourselves of any narrowness of view which may prevent us from working together to seek out common answers to common problems. I recommend to you as one of our most important tasks — finding new ways in which local government can operate in light of new conditions.
Local government in the United States is at the crossroads. On the one hand, the demands imposed upon it are growing astronomically. On the other hand, its financial and governmental ability to satisfy these demands is diminishing. As I see it, the way out of this impasse is joint efforts among local governments. None of us can go it alone. If we fail to cooperate, it will be useless to talk about home rule or local sovereignty, because there will be no local government, which means we will deny our people their most direct access to democratic rule.

A little over a hundred years ago, Alexis de Tocqueville, a young French nobleman, came to this country to appraise the meaning and actual functioning of democracy in order to understand how it might serve to supplant the outworn aristocratic regime in Europe. In his great political classic, *Democracy in America*, de Tocqueville wrote: “I think that in no country in the civilized world is less attention paid to philosophy than in the United States.”

However, we do have a philosophy here in the United States. For us, the end result of our collective labors is the enrichment of human life, the raising of the dignity of man and the creation of equal opportunities for all.
RECENT TRENDS AND DEVELOPMENTS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

by

Dr. G. E. VAN WALSUM

Burgomaster of Rotterdam

One of the great difficulties we encounter in discussing local government structure and organization is the diversity found not only in different parts of the world, but also in the different countries of the same continent. This diversity is expressed in the scope and content of the tasks local government has to fulfill as well as in the way it is organized.

Over the years my contacts with local authorities of other countries have led me to see that those local government systems I had rejected or found less desirable, in light of my own country’s tradition, functioned satisfactorily after all. The reverse, of course, is just as true. A striking example of this concept is, I believe, the way in which a burgomaster is designated in my country. Contrary to the practice prevailing in all other countries of Europe, the burgomaster is not elected in the Netherlands, either by the population in direct suffrage or by the municipal council, but is appointed by the Queen on the recommendation of the Central Government.

I have often heard representatives of other countries condemning as completely undemocratic this system of the non-elected burgomaster who, moreover, is not only chairman of the council, but is also the chief executive. In the Netherlands, however, this system is apparently viewed in a different light — and in my opinion rightly so — since no serious efforts have ever been made to change it. The reason why the burgomaster is at the same time the chief executive and the president of the council is because in the Netherlands there is not the distinct division between the executive and the legislative branches of government which exist in many other countries.

Therefore, if we want to understand and assist one another, we would be well advised not to over-emphasize the differences existing in the local governments of the countries we represent. Instead, we must try to highlight our likenesses and work together toward the solution of common problems, always keeping in mind that the solution which is suitable for one country may not be feasible for another.

Permit me to illustrate this with an example which will also take us right to the core of our subject. Some months ago a report was published
on the findings of a Royal Commission investigating the government of Greater London. Broadly summarized, the Commission’s proposals amount to the following: matters which affect the whole of the London area should be settled by one authority, whereas the remaining matters should be left to the different boroughs which go to make up the Greater London area. In actual practice this would mean that the present-day London County Council would be replaced by a new body, the Council for Greater London, which would cover a larger area and would have fewer tasks to discharge than does the existing London County Council. At the same time, the existing boroughs would be replaced by the Greater London Boroughs, which would have a larger number of inhabitants each, and would take over a number of the tasks now entrusted to the London County Council.

The underlying principle is clear: Modern developments require of local government, if it is to keep abreast of the times, an enlargement of the scale of its activities. This, however, does not apply to all tasks with which local government has to cope. Therefore, a difference must be made between those tasks which can be dealt with on the local government level in a wider context, and centralized, or those that can be discharged by smaller units, and decentralized.

I consider this as one of the most important possibilities in dealing with the problems arising from the ever-growing urban concentrations. In the past, whenever additional space had to be found for towns spilling over their boundaries, annexation of some surrounding municipalities was often the remedy. I do not think that there are many countries where this can be implemented rapidly or easily and without conflicts. There is almost always some resistance to any attempts at making profound changes in relationships that have developed historically. Besides, units arising in this manner may get so big that they become even more difficult to govern. In my opinion, the most important aspect is, however, that in most instances annexation is advocated in regard to one function or a combination of functions. In that case, the remaining functions can very well be dealt with by the extant smaller units. As regards those matters requiring solution in a wider context, they would be handled by the constituent governmental units as a whole; the remaining points of concern would then be dealt with by each of the units separately.

If one does not wish to adopt this method, the danger may arise that functions which require being administered in a wider context are removed from the competence of the local authorities and are transferred to centralized administrative organs; obviously this would constitute an encroachment upon and a weakening of local government.
The measures now being undertaken by London to remedy its previous uncontrolled development can serve as an example to other urban concentrations. However, the establishment of a two-tier system of local government which takes into account the needs of the urban area as a whole as well as of those of the constituent units, need not be applied exclusively to metropoli such as London. Another example is my own town of Rotterdam which has 730,000 inhabitants and has developed important installations, called Europoort or Gateway to Europe, on the territory of other municipalities. Rotterdam has adopted the viewpoint that this entire port area, which is the property of Rotterdam and which is being developed and administered by Rotterdam, should be legally joined to Rotterdam. However, it is obvious that the development of this area, which goes hand in hand with extensive industrialization, also affects the neighboring municipalities if only because some of the people who work in the Rotterdam port area are bound to live in adjoining municipalities.

It is therefore desirable that a special body be established at the local government level to administer those functions which concern the entire area of approximately 25 large and small municipalities. Under this system the constituent municipalities would retain their individuality although they would have to be satisfied with tasks of a more limited scope. In actual fact, however, most of these municipalities will assume a much greater importance than they have ever had before, since the number of their inhabitants is rising appreciably, due to the construction of the port and the location of industries in that area. On the other hand, although they will assume greater importance, they will not be as independent as before, since they will have to take into consideration the regulations laid down for the entire area by the administrative body yet to be established. Instead of remaining autonomous units, which obviously they were only to a limited extent, they would now become parts of a larger whole with its own administrative organization.

In theory, an investigation similar to that undertaken by London should be made of possible territorial changes in the constituent municipalities of the port area. However, such an investigation would undoubtedly be met with even greater resistance than have the plans for a new local government body, and can therefore better be left to the future. The question of resistance has also been recently raised in London and it is far from certain whether the proposals submitted by the Royal Commission will be accepted.

In a discussion of the plans elaborated for Greater London, so competent a person as Prof. Robson advocated the sub-division of Greater London into boroughs with the number of inhabitants varying from 250,000 to
500,000, whereas the Commission declared itself in favor of taking as a yardstick a population numbering between 100,000 and 150,000. Prof. Robson's contention is that a borough with a larger number of inhabitants can be administered more easily. A comparison with Rotterdam demonstrates the relativity of these points. If we were to apply his standards to Rotterdam, the city of Rotterdam itself could be divided into two boroughs and all other surrounding municipalities would have to be fitted into one borough whose number of inhabitants would still be below the minimum advocated by Prof. Robson.

In problems such as this, the historical development and political structure of a country, as well as its geographical and sociological relationships, must be taken into account. Moreover, our experience in the densely populated Netherlands, which has only four major cities with more than 250,000 inhabitants, has demonstrated that municipalities with a smaller number of inhabitants need not necessarily lack administrative vigor. We should not forget, moreover, that small administrative units have the advantage of a larger number of men and women being called upon to assume civic responsibilities and that possibly, the population can be more readily and easily won over to active participation. While I do not wish to idealize this point nor assert it in too dogmatic a fashion — since too many other factors enter in — it is certainly not a matter to be lost sight of. These considerations may, in my opinion, bear a certain amount of weight as a possible additional advantage of a form of local government organization which is intrinsically right.

Although it is highly deplorable, on the one hand, that the implementation of this two-tier form of local government is so frequently opposed because of lack of vision, excessive concern for local interests and fear of the new and unknown, it must not, on the other hand, be looked upon as a solution which can be applied everywhere and at all times. If we are not clearly faced with the case of a conurbation whose interests are integrated in such a manner that a unity of government in major points of concern is indicated, it would be better to strive at bringing about inter-municipal cooperation.

As regards inter-municipal cooperation, there are many possibilities. One might be satisfied with simple arrangements; on the other hand, cooperation might also be based on legally valid agreements, or again such agreements might be concluded under corporate law if the country concerned permits of such agreements. The envisaged cooperation may concern one particular aspect or it may comprise a number of them. In the latter case, provided the same municipalities are concerned, inter-municipal cooperation may become a transitional form leading to further administrative integration with a special administrative organ for dealing with the common interests.
Why do we find more need for inter-municipal cooperation in many countries than ever before? I believe that several factors come into play here. The most important of these factors are, in my opinion, technical progress on the one hand and rising prosperity on the other. Technical progress has rendered possible, in many instances, the serving of a larger area, a fact which moreover appears to be economically more favorable; besides, the rise in prosperity entails an extension of those areas where public services are expected. Furthermore, increased demands are frequently made of such services in general.

It would be erroneous to assume that cooperation makes sense only in densely populated areas. It may be of importance also in less populous areas. There, inter-municipal cooperation would allow for the provision of modern amenities which would otherwise not be available to the municipalities individually. This does not even chiefly apply to the acquisition of material aids. Cooperation would enable municipalities to employ scientifically trained staff and other leading personnel in various fields who would satisfy wide demands, because in this manner it would be possible to offer attractive careers and adequate salaries.

These are the same factors that have generally brought about an extension of the activities of local authorities, quite apart from the problem of cooperation. I do not infer here the extension of the scope of extant tasks, but the assumption of new ones. The new tasks concerned are those assumed by local authorities on their own initiative; however, it also happens that local authorities are entrusted with new tasks by the central authority or that the central authority calls upon them to cooperate in implementing some tasks.

It is evident that this development will lead to an increase of personnel employed by local authorities, although the tasks of the authorities can be extended also in another way which has not quite the same consequences. I am thinking here of subsidies and grants to private organizations and institutions. This system enables the authorities to have tasks they consider to be essential performed by others, who are outside the direct sphere of the authority proper. Such action may be dictated by various motives. It may be adopted because of a conviction that such tasks can be performed more effectively and cheaply by private organizations or agencies and it may also be done in order to prevent the state from penetrating too deeply into society. Still another motive is that the implementation of certain tasks is left to organizations to which people of the same creed or persuasion are affiliated.

I believe that this last mentioned motive will require some further explanation because it may not be readily understood by everyone. It is one which is very typical of Dutch conditions. In the Netherlands
there is no unity in the religious sphere; on the contrary, the country is deeply divided. Stated roughly, the country is divided into a Protestant group, a Roman Catholic group, and a non-denominational one, none of which has a majority. The Roman Catholic and the Protestant groups have organized themselves very thoroughly in all spheres of life right down to politics; we even have Roman Catholic and Protestant political parties in our country. I cannot now go into the why's and wherefore's of this typically Dutch historical development. However, I have to acquaint you with it, in order to make you understand why the authorities in the Netherlands prefer to have certain functions discharged by means of granting subsidies to organizations of religious and non-denominational character. This development is obviously also linked to the political power which the different groups have acquired, although the most incisive motive is, on the one hand, the belief that the task will be discharged in the best manner if carried out by and on behalf of people of the same religious and political persuasion, and on the other hand, because the conviction prevails that every section of the population is entitled to be approached in its own sphere.

I can hardly imagine that state interference by means of subsidies granted to certain activities has been developed to such a far-reaching degree in any other country as it has in the Netherlands. Both central and local authorities apply this type of subsidy individually, but the central government or the provincial authorities may also, as a condition of subsidizing certain activities, stipulate that the local authorities assume a certain percentage of the expenditure too. It is not my place to pass judgment on the Dutch system of governing by applying a policy of subsidies, but I believe that I remain within the limits of objectivity if I state that the condition imposed on the municipalities to contribute a given percentage is not appreciated by the local authorities, since they consider it a limitation of their freedom of action. It has to be borne in mind that the local authorities are under strong pressure in such a system, for if they do not make the required contribution, the private organizations will not receive anything from the central or provincial authorities either. Besides, it may happen that the authority bears all or almost all expenses, a fact which rules out almost entirely the concept that the organizations as such must assume part of the charges themselves, for this may be one of the very motives for applying the subsidy system.

It is striking to note that the extension of the local authorities' tasks is often coupled with a reduction of their tasks in other spheres due to the fact that regional or central authorities will assume these latter. This may be an inevitable consequence of changed relationships, since certain interests can be better dealt with in a wider framework, that is to say, on a provincial or central government level. We see a parallel to this
development on an international level in Europe. In certain spheres such a close cohesion and interdependence has arisen on an international level that there is an increased feeling that the extant national frontiers are restrictive, and integration into wider communities is being sought. This endeavor has been stimulated by the fact that integration into larger entities implies increased chances of prosperity. In this way, the European Coal and Steel Community, the European Economic Community and Euratom were created within the framework of the Six. This development has not only caused economic problems to arise, but also political ones. Unfortunately, I cannot go into details of these fascinating problems here. The reason why I make mention of them at all is to explain the plausibility of a similar development in a national framework. And, inasmuch as this development necessitates the transfer of functions from local authorities to regional and central authorities, it would be stupid and shortsighted to object to it. However, it is necessary to remain critically alert, since it also happens that endeavors are being made, in reference to this trend, to transfer tasks which could very well be left in the care of local authorities, to regional and central authorities for purely centralist motives. The contra-distinction between centralization and decentralization remains, although there has been a shift in the area where it becomes manifest. A point not to be underestimated in this development is that local authorities should not become financially too dependent on the central authority.

In a changing society such as the one in which we live, we may well expect the local authorities to look further than the boundaries of their own territories. They can only discharge their tasks properly if they take notice of what is happening in their own country and in the world as a whole. Local government can remain strong only if it does not hamper new developments but promotes them by seeking to adapt itself suitably to these developments. Therefore, one may expect local authorities to take into account, in determining their policy, regional and national interests too. Obviously there will always be differences of opinion regarding this point and, as in the past, there will also be friction and collisions in this sphere in the future. However, the local authorities will be all the stronger in such conflicts if they give evidence of a greater understanding of the trend of society’s development.

I fully realize that this will not always be easy and that it will require a great deal of flexibility on the part of the local authorities. These difficulties will arise particularly when small agricultural communities, which have lived quietly for centuries, grow suddenly into urban centers of considerable importance in the space of a few years. The difficulties ensuing from such a development for the population and the city fathers of these rural municipalities should not be underestimated. I know from
my own experience that if one has to initiate and stimulate such a
development in one's capacity of burgomaster of a neighboring city,
one can only acquiesce to it if one is convinced of its absolute necessity.
Is is evident that the question automatically arises, in the light of this
development, whether the organization of the local authorities is still
adequate for the new relationships.

It is sometimes said that the quality of councillors is deteriorating.
I believe one has to be very careful in making such a statement. People
are only too ready to idealize the past in this respect. It may happen,
however, that people are less ready to serve as council members nowadays.
There may be different explanations for this phenomenon. Persons who
would be very suitable are sometimes so occupied by professional demands
that they cannot find time to devote to a public function. Possibly, too,
the political constellation is such that they do not qualify for election.
A further explanation may be that the task of the council has become so
comprehensive and specialized that people no longer feel attracted to
stand as candidates. It is also possible that the general interest in public
affairs has diminished.

However, one of the most important foundations of local government
is the participation of the local population. The community must be
governed by and for the people and it is generally accepted that this
can best be accomplished through the election by the local population
of its own representatives. This implies, however, that these representatives
have to be accepted, even if their quality is not as high as might have
been deemed desirable.

The foundation of any system of local government which lays claim
to being called democratic must be that the elected representatives of
the local population exert a decisive influence upon the municipality's
business. There are many possible variations within this framework. The
council may want to settle all affairs on its own or it may delegate its
competence in different ways and confine itself chiefly to a controlling
task. These may be called the two extremes, between which there is
a whole gamut of other possibilities. In my opinion, preference should
be given to a choice of the form of government best suited to the
prevailing circumstances. Therefore, a uniform type of government for
all municipalities, whether they be large or small, as we have in the
Netherlands, does not appear to be the most desirable; rather should
preference be given to legislation which leaves a margin for diversity. In
my opinion, the individual municipalities must be given a certain amount
of freedom in the organization of their administration.

At the same time, I believe that some general outline can be set forth.
The recommendation could be made, particularly as regards larger
municipalities, that the councils confine themselves to the main directives of their policy. In that case, it will be important to leave a great deal of the work to the committees composed of council members. Good preparation of a given task in committee is apt to lighten the council’s burden; one may even call it a prerequisite for the smooth functioning of a council, at least if it has a large number of members. It is evident that a thorough preliminary consultation within each party represented on the council will be essential. If, however, the preparation, both within the committees and the party groups, has been so thorough that the council has no other task left than to adopt decisions taken elsewhere, the general public may soon lose interest in the council’s work. Nevertheless, if the councils are to be relieved of extraneous tasks, so as to be enabled to confine themselves to setting forth the main outlines of their policies and to controlling the executive, the presence of any other organs that can take over certain functions will be of predominant importance.

We must now direct our attention to functional and territorial decentralization within this context. Functional decentralization is, as I understand it, the transfer of a given task to an ad hoc organ which is responsible to the local authority. Thus, matters such as sports, recreation, and the arts can be taken care of by such a body. Inasmuch as such a body has no or inadequate revenue of its own, it will receive its income from the exchequer of the local authority, which implies that the latter will want, as a rule, to determine the composition of that organ or, at least, to have a say in it. The advantage of such organs is that experts may be invited to sit on the boards. The action of the council can therefore be confined to appointing the board members of the organ concerned, to determining the latter’s budget and to controlling its policy. The danger is, however, that these bodies which have in the meantime proved their right to existence would, in actual practice, tend to lead too independent an existence. Efforts to prevent such trends include the appointment of members of the council, the executive, or other officials to the board. Objections raised against such practices state that these officials may be identifying themselves too much with the body in question. The subsidizing of private organizations, which I mentioned earlier, can also to a certain extent be considered as a form of functional decentralization.

Territorial decentralization takes place when certain tasks previously undertaken by local authorities are transferred to a body which has administrative authority over a district of the municipality. An example of this form is found in Berlin: the city is sub-divided into a number of districts, each of which has its own council and mayor. In Rotterdam, too, we have the beginnings of such an organization. The councils established for various districts of the city have, however, only a consultative
function, since the law of our country does not permit the transfer of governmental competences. In Rotterdam these councils have been specially created in those districts that had previously been independent municipalities before and were later integrated. Our experience has shown that the councils in those parts of town closest to the periphery are most viable since they still form entities retaining most of their former independence.

In theory, territorial decentralization has very attractive aspects, but in actual practice it is not so easily carried out, particularly in an urban community which has already been integrated. The number of functions that lend themselves to decentralized treatment within an extant municipal entity will in all likelihood not be so great. This must not, however, be an excuse for not applying territorial decentralization wherever it is possible to do so, for it has the merit of involving the population more closely in local government. On the other hand, allowance will have to be made for the possibility of increased friction, which is an almost inevitable consequence of the creation of a central municipal administration out of its component districts. But why should not the advantage of such internal decentralization outweigh this drawback? Within the limits of what is possible, the representatives of the population will have to be given the opportunity of running their own affairs.

I mentioned earlier the advantages of closer participation of the population in local government. This can be stimulated in several ways, one of which is to have the council members elected from among the inhabitants of a local area. Another way is for the local areas to have their own administration. Still a third way of stimulating interest and participation is through the convening of public meetings, at which subjects of interest to the area residents can be discussed. In Rotterdam this method is used when we wish to explain to the inhabitants of a given district any important plans which have been elaborated for their particular area.

If a system of territorial decentralization is adopted, such information meetings should be organized by the council of the area concerned. Even if such a council does not exist, a similar system can be used. I saw an interesting example of this technique in Frankfurt, where the Oberbürgermeister and his staff regularly hold district meetings at which anyone may discuss matters with which he is concerned. The items that are brought to the notice of the city administration in this way are then dealt with by a special department at the town hall. Moreover, anyone who has asked a question which could not be answered immediately at the meeting later receives a written reply.

In conclusion, I should like to say that we who are active in the field
of local government realize that the matters with which we are concerned may not be of the same importance as those dealt with on a national level. However, let us not forget that the decisions we have to take within the local government orbit help determine how people in our towns and villages will live. It is therefore well worth our while to make the organization of local government as effective as possible.
The present structure of local government in Ceylon was modelled after the pattern of the United Kingdom. Apart from certain differences in nomenclature, the chief variation has been the attempt to revive at rural levels the ancient panchayats, or gansabas as they are known in Ceylon, and to integrate them into the local government machinery. In several ways this variation had much in common with ancient primary units in other countries, of which the English parallel is the still-existent parish council unit. There was, however, the difficulty of adapting the panchayat idea and of infusing vitality into an organism taken out of its original milieu of an enlightened and, in a way, democratic patriarchy.

The only unit of local government which Ceylon does not have, as compared with the United Kingdom, is the County Council unit. The need for such a regional unit has, however, long been recognized; and while the services and functions which only such a large unit can perform have hitherto been done by decentralized agencies of the central government, the increasing necessity of creating local interest and ensuring local participation has emphasized the desirability of this local government reform. A similar need for reform has been felt in the rural units where economic development through effective programming and implementation can only be achieved as a result of popular interest and participation.

There has been considerable discussion of late in Ceylon toward gearing the local government structure to function in a planned development context and toward improving organization to ensure effective results. The inadequacy of resources has hitherto restricted not only the scale of services provided by local governments, but has also kept at low level, particularly in rural areas, the caliber of administrative and technical personnel and therefore standards of performance. All this has tended to discourage people from entering local government service, with the result that a vicious circle has developed of negligence, irresponsibility and fear of further delegation to the local units, by the central government, of needed services.

At the present time there are in rural areas, in addition to the local government authorities, innumerable societies and agencies which claim to serve and sometimes to speak for, various groups within the area. Their existence has had a disastrous effect upon the authority of the local government units and has also led to conflicts and rivalries between the organizations which negate their very purpose.
At this juncture, the urgent need in rural areas, which include by far the major portion of both the population and economy of Ceylon, is an integration of the various local agencies around the local government authorities and the establishment of adequate executive and administrative machinery to coordinate the local programs of social and economic development.

NICARAGUA
by Francisco Arauz, Mayor of Matagalpa

With the exception of the capital, there exists but one form of local government in Nicaragua today, a form which has gradually developed over the years. The 123 municipalities in the country are sub-divisions of the provinces into which the Republic is divided and each municipality covers an average of 1,130 square kilometers and has approximately 11,020 inhabitants. In addition to the municipalities there are numerous villages which are, for the most part, so sparsely populated that they lack both the qualified people to administer public functions and sufficient economic resources to provide some of the basic necessities for a minimum standard of living.

The chief officials of the municipality are the mayor, the treasurer, a regular alderman (Sindico) and a fiscal alderman (Regidor Fiscal). The first three officials belong to the majority party in the community and the latter to the minority party; all are appointed by the President of the Republic for two year terms of office. The fiscal alderman is appointed from a list of three names submitted by the minority party, which thus has an opportunity to participate in the local government, with a resulting greater harmony in local life and better administration of municipal affairs.

According to the Constitution and the Municipal Code of 1957 the Nicaraguan municipalities have economic and administrative autonomy under the supervision of the national executive, through the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The municipal officials can thus pass local ordinances, levy taxes and plan for and carry out beneficial public works projects, although all matters must first be approved by the higher authorities before they can be put into effect. Although theoretically complete autonomy for local authorities may be preferable, in practice close supervision by the Executive Power is often necessary to ensure the proper use of greatly limited municipal funds and goods.

Citizen participation in local government is provided for in the Municipal Code in the form of consultative committees, each of which is
composed of four members representing industry, commerce, agriculture and the trade unions and selected, respectively, by the industrial cooperatives, the Chamber of Commerce, the association of farmers and the boards of the workers' social centers. The task of the committees is to study and give advice to the municipalities and the Ministry of Internal Affairs on new or revised local ordinances, as well as on any public works project whose value exceeds 5,000 Cordobas.

To help the municipalities improve local conditions despite serious financial difficulties, the government of the Republic has created two bureaus. One, the National Bureau of Urbanism, offers advice to municipalities on all topics concerning urbanism, including urban planning and development. The other, the National Department of Municipal Services, provides technical assistance to municipalities in any project they may wish to carry out and may sometimes also give economic assistance in the undertaking of essential public works. Whereas the work of these two bureaus is limited by insufficient financial resources, they are nevertheless doing a highly commendable job.

The government of the National District is entrusted to the President of the Republic, who performs this task through the Ministry of the National District. As is the case with the municipalities, the government of the National District must also submit for approval to the Ministry of Internal Affairs all proposed projects as well as all drafts for new ordinances or modifications of the old ones.

YUGOSLAVIA

by D. Jojkic, Former Mayor of Belgrade
and V. Holjevac, Mayor of Zagreb.

Local government in Yugoslavia is based on the principle that the citizens themselves administer all the affairs of the community, either directly or through their representatives. In structure, local government consists of the commune and the district, which is composed of several communes.

The Constitution defines the commune as the basic political and territorial unit of the country and outlines its rights and obligations, which cannot be transferred to any other body except by constitutional amendment. Thus, the commune may establish its own administrative structure; elect its own representatives to the communal and the district committees and other bodies; independently manage all local matters; establish a plan aimed at developing not only services, but the local economy as well;
and enact legislation on all matters of direct communal concern or enact supplementary regulations on other matters when expressly authorized to do so.

Local revenue is allocated on a unique criteria for the distribution of the national income. Under this system the total resources of the commune depend directly upon the level of the personal income of its citizens and the total income of the economic organizations within its territory. Once the revenue has been allocated, the commune is free to use it as it sees fit. Through its budget the commune provides for the economic development of the community as well as for the basic communal services of health, education, housing, public works, cultural affairs, etc.

The general representative body of the commune and of the district is the people's committee or council. In the commune the people's committee has first-instance competence, which means the right and duty to administer all social and state affairs with the exception of those which are assigned by law to higher bodies, such as the district, the republic or the federation. The district committee, as a rule, deals only with matters of common interest to the communes of which it is composed and has second-instance competence as far as administrative matters are concerned.

In both the commune and the district the people's committee is a bicameral body consisting of the general chamber and the chamber of producers. The communal general chamber has 15 to 50 members who are directly and universally elected; the district general chamber consists of 50 to 100 members who are elected by the members of the general chambers of the communes within its territory. As for the chamber of producers, in the commune it consists of the same or a slightly smaller number of members as has the communal general chamber and all are representatives of the local working collectives in industry, transport and trade; its counterpart at the district level is composed of members elected by the constituent communal chambers of producers. All committee members serve four year terms of office; meetings of the total committee or of the respective chambers are held when necessary, but at least once a month. Meetings of the total group are prepared, with the help of the secretary, by the president of the people's committee, who also presides over them. The meetings of the respective chambers are presided over by their chairmen who are elected for one year terms of office.

To help carry out its tasks the people's committees of the commune and of the district, or their chambers, elect from within their ranks smaller working bodies, one of which is the 3 to 9 member commission. As a rule, the approximately 7 to 10 permanent commissions set up by each people's committee examine all material previous to its presentation to a
meeting of the people’s committee. Additional commissions may be established ad hoc as the need arises.

Of great importance among the smaller working bodies established by and directly responsible to the people’s committees, are the boards. These have the executive function of implementing the decisions and regulations established by the local people’s committees as well as by higher bodies, and at the same time the direct supervision of the various activities of the people’s committee, such as housing, education, public health, social welfare, labor and employment relationships, economic affairs, protection of children and mothers, etc. In these matters they initiate legislation which is then discussed and decided upon by the people’s committee or, if it is within their legal competence, they may also adopt regulations and measures to ensure that the policies of the people’s committee in regard to these matters is put into effect. In addition, the boards may also solve administrative questions within their competence, and in general assume responsibility for coordinating all activities in their respective field. The boards each have a chairman and from 7 to 12 members, at least two of which are elected from the membership of the people’s committee, while the others are elected from among the general population or represent various concerned bodies and organizations. All board members have a one year term of office.

An important role in local matters is played by the president of the people’s committee who also serves a four year term of office. The president calls committee meetings, approves the draft agenda and sees to the implementation of the decisions of the people’s committee. The general administrative head of the community is the secretary, who is a senior employee of the people’s committee. His main duty is to coordinate the work of the administrative organs and at their request prepare proposals and materials for the plenary meetings of the committee, commissions and boards, and to carry out the decisions of these bodies.

NEW AFRICAN STATES

by Mayor Nathan C. Ross, Commissioner of the Commonwealth District of Monrovia, Liberia

1960 was “the Year of Africa” — the year in which nearly twenty African states attained independence. In many areas the democratic regimes established at the central government level are not yet accurately reflected in the institutions surviving at the local government level, for the latter still retain the framework devised by the old colonial rulers. In my view, one of the prime requisites of national policy in most of the newly liberated African states is that the changes brought about at the
central level should be disseminated, as quickly as possible, to the grass roots level. This means that for the next few years there must be a close and vigilant concern with the reform of local government administrative structure and with the assertion and protection of basic principles in the exercise of the rights of citizenship in village, town and country.

This is applicable, not only to the African states which have emerged from the era of alien control, but also to the handful of nations in my continent which were subjected briefly or not at all to colonial dominance. Of these Liberia is one. Since 1847 we have been free, but one of the prices we paid for the retention of our sovereignty was an inability to admit foreign investment in more than limited quantities for fear that political subservience would follow. Since World War II Liberia has embarked on an “open door” policy designed to bring prosperity to all its inhabitants, including the tribal elements of a substantial hinterland which until now has remained largely unexplored and unexploited. One of the aims of our President is to make the benefits of prosperity and progress generally available to the people — and this argues an increasing devolution of the responsibilities of domestic administration to the local government level.

The problem which the African states face in regard to local government is not merely one of modernization, but of the reconciliation of two contrasting methods of attaining the loyalty of the main segments of the population. The Chieftains' paraphernalia still has its mystique and its traditional grasp on the imagination of the ordinary peasant. It is losing ground, however, in the struggle against new ideas which are less trammeled with superstition and less hampered by convention.

I think we are justified in assuming that, quite apart from the operation of other forces making for change, the rapid growth of industrialization in Africa during the next few decades will result in a continuing movement of people from the countryside into the towns. As our towns grow bigger, the number and complexity of the problems confronting our local authorities will increase. There will be a need, and I am sure a disposition, to accept friendly guidance. Much of this guidance, it seems to me, could be made available through town affiliation projects. Here is a field which I hope will be fully explored by those who are anxious to find new ways and means of aiding the development of other nations.
Mr. M. A. B. Sarpong describes local government councils in Ghana. Seated to his left are speakers Sir Francis Hill and Dr. Arthur W. Bromage.

Mr. Kjell T. Evers speaks about the executive in Scandinavia.

Mayor J. Harold Grady of Baltimore explains the administrative machinery in his city. Seated to his left is Monsieur Gilbert Noel, who described the local administration in France.
LEGISLATIVE BODY OR COUNCIL

Sir Isaac Hayward, Leader of the London County Council and Chairman of the British Section of IULÁ, was chairman of the plenary session devoted to this topic. The following are the three main speeches given on this subject and a summary of the question and answer and comment period which took place immediately after their presentation.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COUNCILS IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Dr. ARTHUR W. BROMAGE
Professor of Political Science
The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Two major trends exist in the United States today regarding the function of city councils. County boards (councils) are not as clearly differentiated, but on the map of American municipalities it is easy to pinpoint the distinction.

The first of these trends about the council’s role in urban government prevails where there are council-manager cities. Here, the council is dominant, has no rival in community representation, and controls the manager, who is the administrative generalist.

The second trend about the functioning of councils is coincident with the strong mayor system. The council is there regarded as a body co-ordinate with the independent, elected mayor who is in command of the administrative hierarchy.

Divergent as are these two interpretations of the council’s function, both reflect the need that has arisen for an executive officer of one kind or another to relieve the council of responsibility for administrative supervision. Both trends also reflect in varying degrees the need to assist councils in the initiation of public policy. So intensive and extensive is decision-making in our municipalities that it has given rise to policy initiation in the executive office.

In actual practice, appointed city managers have a role in policy formulation that circumstances have thrust upon them. No longer are they passive neutralists who only carry out policy handed down from the council chamber. Even more so is this change visible in the office of a strong mayor in great cities. It is a fact that policy is originating from the
elective strong mayor who persuades and induces the city council to take action on programs he postulates.

The division of labor is different in cities retaining a so-called weak mayor. The weak mayor (strong council) plan still prevails in our small cities and villages. It was the dominant system of American municipal government in the nineteenth century. With a weak mayor, the council controls administrators by sharing in the mayor's appointment of administrators and through council committees dealing with specific functions. Larger, ward-elected and partisan-elected councils are more common in this scheme. In the feature of councilmanic control over administrators through committees, the American weak mayor plan is analogous to the English system. Committee meetings become a workshop for councilmen and administrators alike.

As corruption infiltrated certain American cities late in the nineteenth century, reformers urged that councils be counterbalanced by a powerful, elected mayor with broad executive powers. The weak mayor (strong council) system was considered inadequate for large cities. As strong mayors were established, they became formidable rivals in power and prestige to the legislative bodies in their cities. Within the past ten years, some of the strong mayors have been even further strengthened by the provision of a chief administrative officer, as in New Orleans and Philadelphia. This provided professional administrative assistance for the elective chief executive.

The council-manager form, on the other hand, was an outgrowth of an American experiment with government by small commissions. Government by commissions still persists in some three hundred municipalities, after its widespread popularity early in the twentieth century. This was a reform movement designed to highlight responsibility in small councils. Each elected commissioner serves both as a councilman and as administrative supervisor of a particular group of departments. The representative council is also a plural executive. But the elected amateur is not necessarily always a good administrator. Commissioners found themselves struggling with a dual burden of policy-making and administrative supervision. As early as fifty years ago, Richard S. Childs, the father of the council-manager plan, urged that small commissions or councils should appoint a manager to supervise municipal departments. With the growing complexities of administrative management, the council-manager form spread and commission government declined.

No matter what the nature of the executive in American municipalities, councilmen have certain obvious duties to perform. The duties, for the most part legislative in character, have expanded. Councils are called upon to act in at least seven fundamental matters:
1. Enactment of regulatory ordinances
2. Passage of appropriations and establishment of tax rates
3. Determination of salaries, wages, and working conditions of employees
4. Ratification of major contracts and purchases
5. Service as a representative body between the voters and the administrative bureaucracy
6. Decisions concerning inter-governmental policies
7. Public relations and ceremonial duties

In a complex urban and metropolitan society, councilmen cannot fulfill these responsibilities expeditiously without assistance from administrators in policy formulation. The use of the executive budget to shape fiscal policy is one illustration. Most of our councilmen serve as elected amateurs. They receive a small honorarium or no pay at all for their services. They carry on their public duties in addition to their regular work, business, or professional occupations. The exceptions appear in great cities and in commission-governed communities.

In freeing the elected amateur from administrative details, the city manager plan has proved popular and successful. It has been adopted in some 1700 cities, villages, and towns. Thereby, the city council becomes a small board of directors and appoints a manager to serve as head of the administrative bureaucracy. The council still has an ample work load in the final process of decision-making. Aside from the great and very small cities, the council-manager plan has been the most prevalent American answer to blending representation and executive management.

The council in a manager plan has its closest analogy in the elective board of the independent school district. Thousands of school districts are governed by a small board elected at large on a nonpartisan ballot. Administration of the schools is vested in an appointed superintendent.

Whereas cities have experimented with councils within different forms of government, county boards have remained relatively static. The typical county board is either elected at large or from districts and often by partisan balloting. Administrative officers like the clerk, treasurer, and sheriff are often elected directly, and others are appointed by the county board. Without an elected chief executive or appointed manager, the result is widespread use of committees within county boards to discuss policy and exert some supervision over administrators. On the county side of American local government, the committee workshop is most prevalent. Only a few metropolitan and urban counties have been touched
by municipal trends to develop elected executive officers or appointed managers.

The municipality and the county continue to be the major units of local government. Great metropolitan regions exist but as yet no great metropolitan government has been established. Recourse has been taken to specific special district authorities. Where metropolitan district authorities have been created by state law or interstate compact for water supply, sewerage, park facilities and other functions, public administration has been fragmented thereby. In such specialized service agencies, only a small minority use a directly elected board. The trend has been to gubernatorial appointment of board members, to state-local unit sharing in appointments, or to local constituent-unit representation. Indigenously elected boards are lacking in a majority of metropolitan authorities.

With respect to the appropriate role of the city council, the greatest conflict has arisen in American local government. One point of view about urban institutions regards the city more as a business enterprise to be controlled by a small, elected board of directors. Such a council calls upon a professional manager for administrative implementation and for policy recommendation as well. The council-manager plan is the embodiment of this view and it has gained in acceptance by rapid growth since 1912, and especially since World War II. Cincinnati, Des Moines, Hartford and San Diego are examples. Critics of the council-manager system challenge the use of small councils as representative bodies, question the emphasis on nonpartisan balloting, and urge that policy formulation should come from an elective chief executive.

The other view of council operations puts more emphasis upon politics in urban government. Politics, the feeling is, will be best expressed by partisan or nonpartisan election of a chief executive, the strong mayor. The council is then a coordinate body with legislative power. Political leadership of the elected strong mayor will find expression both in policy initiation and in supervision of key department heads. He will stand apart from the council and directly represent the community in his own right. The council will no longer be the only center of political gravity. The mayor is a political leader, as in Cleveland, Denver, New Orleans, Philadelphia and San Francisco. Critics of this system argue that it puts too much emphasis on the power of a single officer, the elected strong mayor.

The very divergence and experimentation in the council's role from city to city is perhaps the one common characteristic of American urban government. Since home rule exists among some twenty-five states of the Union in the writing of charters, cities have been free to find their
own answers in terms of their variables in size, tradition and political climate. Great cities have been moving to the strong mayor system. Small cities and villages still favor the weak mayor (strong council). In cities intermediate in size the council-manager system has gained its greatest acceptance. Commission government, although declining, still survives. The future of the American city council will lie in this constant process of experimentation and adaptation.
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COUNCILS IN GREAT BRITAIN

by

SIR FRANCIS HILL
Alderman, Lincoln, England

In Great Britain Parliament is by law supreme. There is no law so fundamental that it cannot alter it and there is no constitutional law which requires a specially elaborate legislative process for its amendment. Furthermore, Great Britain is a unitary and not a federal state, and there is no division of governmental authority between a federal government and a number of state governments.

It is within this framework of parliamentary supremacy that local authorities exist and carry on their functions. They must have statutory authority for what they do, but within the limits of that authority they are independent and do not act under the direction of the government. Each local government unit (except small parishes) is controlled by a council. This is an elective body consisting of the men and women, called councillors, who are chosen by the residents of the several electoral areas by secret ballot to represent them by serving on the local authority. In all county councils and some rural and urban district councils they all retire every third year. In the boroughs and the rest of the rural and urban districts one-third of the councillors retire every year.

In the counties and boroughs there are also aldermen, who in number are not more than one-third of the number of councillors, and who are elected by the councillors for six years, half retiring every third year. When elected, they have exactly the same powers as the councillors, though they are frequently higher in age and are sometimes regarded as higher in dignity. When the institution of aldermen was preserved from earlier days by the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835, the reason given was that it ensured continuity. It can still do so, and it enables the council to retain or procure the services of useful people who are not disposed to stand at local government elections. In these days aldermanic seats are sometimes disposed of on political lines: sometimes they are divided between the political parties in the same proportions as the councillors' seats, and sometimes the majority party takes them all.

It is a fundamental principle that service in local councils in Great Britain is voluntary and unpaid. One result of the principle is that some people who would like to serve cannot do so, especially young people whose work limits their opportunity of giving time. This difficulty has been partially removed by the introduction of a rule that members
of councils can claim payment of "financial loss allowances" of limited amount where their council work causes them loss of earnings or additional expenses.

It is these elected councils in whom are vested the powers and duties granted to or imposed on local government by Parliament. Precisely how they exercise those powers and duties is a matter which the councils in the main decide for themselves: in a few instances, the law requires the appointment of a committee for the purpose, such as the education committee. Except in the very small areas, it would be impossible for the council to attend to all the details of business itself. In many of the urban areas, the council meets monthly: in some of the counties it meets only quarterly.

Much of the work of the council is assigned to committees. These committees consist of a limited number of members of the council (sometimes with some members added by the council who are not themselves members of the council), and each committee deals with a particular function or group of functions. In a typical county borough there are committees for education, housing, welfare, children, health, finance, transport, police (watch committee), fire and highways. It is the general practice for the detailed administration to be delegated to the committees although all questions of policy have to be decided by the council itself. It is the practice at meetings of the council, frequently monthly, for reports of committees to be received with recommendations upon the action to be taken: and the council decides whether to accept, with or without variation, the recommendations submitted to it. In the authorities where important questions are delegated to committees, the committees report to the council the decisions they have taken and acted upon. This applies particularly to the larger authorities, and some where the whole council meets less frequently — notably county councils — but even so, the larger matters of policy and principles are generally reserved to the whole council.

The extent of the responsibilities of local authorities is such that they employ large staffs of both clerical and manual workers. These staffs are the servants solely of the local authority. Whatever powers of control the central government may have are exercised over the council and not over its officers, and no minister or civil servant can give its officers orders. There is an exception to this general principle in that the clerk to a county or county borough council is responsible to the central government in matters of electoral registration. Like the Civil Service, the local government service provides a career for life, but there are seldom interchanges between central and local government staffs.

For practical convenience, the staffs are divided into departments
corresponding to the work to be performed. Each department is under the control of a chief officer and it has become the British practice for the chief officers to be members of the professions most concerned with the activities of their department. Each council also has a clerk and a treasurer who assume over-all responsibility. The treasurer is the chief financial adviser to the council and is also responsible for the whole of the accounts of the local authority.

The clerk — be he the town clerk or county clerk — is responsible for the minutes and records of the council and its committees and he is the official correspondent of the local authority. It is to him that government communications are sent and he is, as a rule, the only person who can express officially the views of the council. He is regarded as the chief administrative officer of the authority and he has an over-all responsibility for seeing that the instructions of the council are carried out and that the work of the various departments is co-ordinated. The classical description of his relationship with the other chief officers is of "the first among equals"; but it may be doubted whether this phrase is any longer adequate. There is an increasing tendency to regard the town clerk or county clerk as the general administrative manager, especially in the larger authorities, and the development of centralized establishment control and the scientific study of organization and management seem bound to enlarge the clerk's sphere of influence.

All the chief officers, who are appointed for their professional competence, have executive responsibilities. It is they who are required to carry out the instructions of the council given at meetings of the council, or, where power is delegated to committees, at meetings of those committees. The clerk sees to it that the execution of these decisions is co-ordinated. At the stage of decision upon policy, the duty of the chief officer is to advise. He is expected to give full information, to explain the advantages and disadvantages of the several possible lines of action, and even, where appropriate, to express a preference for one line of action over another. This is particularly the province of the clerk, who must survey the whole field of council policy.

It is the usual custom that at meetings of the council (when actual decisions are taken) chief officers do not speak. The town clerk may give advice to the mayor or chairman on points of order, but on business before the council nothing is said by an officer unless on rare occasions when he is asked to give information. He may help the chairman of his committee to reply to questions or debate, but it is the chairman who speaks for the department, thereby indicating where responsibility lies. Although in committee the officer speaks freely, the ultimate decision is taken by elected representatives alone. At no point does the officer have a vote.
This is not to say that the officer has no influence. He has great influence. The good officer may get his own way, but he gets it only by satisfying the committee or the council that he is right. It is a fundamental principle that responsibility of decision is borne solely by the elected representatives, who are responsible to their electors.

The elected representatives know best what the electors will stand, and technical and expert advice has to be considered in the light of wider considerations of social and economic policy. It is thoughts of this kind which lead to the clear-cut rule in Great Britain that local government officers have no vote or voice in the actual taking of decisions. Yet the council’s regard, and indeed the public’s regard for, say, a good town clerk or county clerk, and the vast influence he can wield, are a complete answer to any suggestion that we belittle the value and importance of our officers.

Political parties in local councils have already been mentioned. Many councils are organized on political lines, though there are also many councils in which political divisions play little or no part. The association of political parties with local government has become marked in the last 25 years, though this is not the first time that national political parties have taken a hand in local government. The result has been that councils have tended to be controlled by one party or another. The essence of the system is that the majority vote decides an issue. The incursion of national party divisions has several advantages. Greater interest is aroused among electors, and the percentage of electors who vote is higher where the election is fought on party lines than when it is solely a contest between individuals. Voters are voting for principles rather than persons, and the elected representatives vote according to party policy and are not so likely to yield to their own whims and prejudices. Members of the council of each party meet in groups independently and privately and upon matters which they regard as of political importance they agree upon the course they will all take. This can make for decisive action in accordance with clear policy. In a matter where several committees are concerned the group can have a co-ordinating influence.

There are also disadvantages. Group discipline can easily be imposed in matters which have no political bearing at all. Tight discipline can become oppressive and drive independent members out of local government. Secondly, actual control of the council is held by the majority of a majority group, which can be a minority of the whole council. Thirdly, the effective decisions are taken without public discussion between those holding different views and by a portion of the council only. Fourthly, where a strong party organization exists it can tend to identify the council with the majority party as alone responsible for its actions and to dissociate the minority from that responsibility, thus preventing the
public from regarding the whole council, irrespective of party, as the guardians of the ratepayers. And fifthly, decisions taken in party meetings must necessarily lack the benefit of the oral advice of the chief officers. By his conditions of service “A chief officer should not be called upon to advise any political group of the council, either as to the work of the group or as to the work of the council, neither shall he be required to attend any meeting of any political group.” This difficulty can be technically met by converting a group committee into an official council committee in which all the seats are held by the majority party, but this in the minority view is only a device for getting round the above quoted conditions of service.

In the course of time rigid party control of non-political decisions may decrease. There is some evidence that the process is beginning. For example, I have heard of one large city in which the party whip has not been used for the last two years, although the party in power has a fair but not overwhelming majority and elections are conducted on party lines. It would be a healthy thing if party discipline were confined to major questions with a political significance, and these are relatively few in number.

All this talk of decisions being taken by councils or committees with delegated powers meeting monthly or less often may well sound very slow, and inconsistent with prompt and efficient administration. The picture, however, is not complete without reference to custom and practice which in Great Britain often take the place of law. The formal rules about the control of the council and the limited delegation of power to the committees do not mean that day-to-day decisions are not delegated. Many detailed matters, such as the letting of council houses, some points under the Public Health Acts, the institution of proceedings before the magistrates, are generally delegated, not only because they are not of great or general importance, but also because they involve information about individual persons which it would be unreasonable or offensive to make public.

Furthermore, the chairman of a functional committee may in practice acquire considerable authority, acting sometimes with and sometimes without his vice-chairman. He comes to have a great knowledge of his committee’s department, and he knows by experience what view the committee will take of a particular question. His committee will expect him to anticipate their decision in a clear case. The chairman knows the committee will not let him down if he acts reasonably and in good faith. There is no legal authority for this practice, and the extent to which a chairman can safely act in this way depends upon his personal relationship with his own committee and with the chief officer of his committee’s department. In like manner, a committee may sometimes exceed its powers
by anticipating a council decision, seeking ratification afterwards. If they have the confidence of the council and they have acted reasonably, their action is sure to be confirmed. Furthermore, chief officers have a wide authority to act in matters delegated by custom and within the limit of the council's policy.

Changes, of course, are constantly going on, but in Britain changes come by stages and never completely cut us off from our origins. The continuity of present and past is expressed in the ancient county divisions, and in the pomp and circumstance of our boroughs whose constitutions and charters go back for many centuries. In my own city of Lincoln we are proud of the knowledge that 750 years ago our first mayor, Adam by name, took part in the fight against King John which led to the grant of Magna Carta, the first great national symbol of English liberty. Our great political thinker, Edmund Burke, said: "People will not look forward to posterity who never look backward to their ancestors." Because we can look back for inspiration, we are all the more able to look forward with confidence, ever ready to adapt ourselves by experience and experiment in a changing world.
In older nations local government has been established for many generations and has become one of the accepted and cherished institutions. I wish to examine briefly the role of local councils in Ghana, a young, developing country.

I must state at the beginning that we do recognize certain basic points of similarity — those fundamental principles upon which democratic local government should be founded. To mention but three examples:

1. Councillors are elected by the people of our localities and, as a corollary, they recognize their duty to represent these people and their interests within the general framework of the needs and interests of the whole area of jurisdiction of that particular council.

2. Each of our councils is the policy-making body; its officials are there to carry out the policy.

3. Councillors realize that they must be prepared to explain the policy of the council to the people and accept responsibility for the acts of officials for carrying out the policy.

Given these basic points of similarity, however, there are many ways in which the functioning of councils in Ghana is different and more exacting than is the case in older nations. In Ghana local government in the modern sense can be said to have begun only ten years ago when, in 1951, our first Local Government Act was passed. Before this time the Native Authorities purported to undertake the functions of local government. A Native Authority was the traditional council of an area and was composed of the Chief and his elders, who acquired their positions through inheritance. Their main function was concerned with matters of customs, but in the pre-1951 years the central government employed them to a very limited extent in the carrying out of local activities; in this respect they were not responsible to the people.

Thus, it is on this framework that the modern form of local authority was grafted. However, when one compares the methods that these traditional authorities employed over the ages in the performance of such limited functions as the collection and accounting of levies and the
unique administrative, legislative and judicial power that they wielded in their locality with the role of a modern local council established on democratic principles, one can visualize what the problems are. For instance, whereas the people in a locality now properly expect to be provided with a variety of amenities in the shortest possible time, they naturally do not take lightly the imposition of high rates. Thus we are continually experimenting, studying and researching into ways and means of improving our administrative machinery. May I cite two examples of this from our recent experience:

In establishing local authorities, the government felt that the structure of society as it existed at that time should not be unduly disturbed and that the link with the past should be maintained. Accordingly, under the 1951 Act, one-third of the membership of the new local authorities was reserved for representatives of traditional authorities. These representatives were not elected in the usual way, but were nominated by the traditional authorities. True, the traditional members provided a link with the past, but it was a link between two institutions which, to all intents and purposes, were incompatible. The elected members were very often hard put to it to convince the traditional members that this was a democratic institution which could not employ the old traditional methods.

This transitional period ended in 1959 when representation of traditional authorities was abolished, and today the council is composed entirely of the elected representatives of the people.

The second example of this experimentation and research refers to the Local Government Commission of 1957. In 1956, there were in Ghana 282 units of local government administration. Most of these showed concrete evidence of instability, not because the councillors were inefficient, but because in most cases the unit of administration was financially and otherwise not viable. With the implementation of the Commission's report, there are today, besides the Accra City Council, 3 municipal councils, 10 urban and 56 local councils. Thus, the councillor who was used to a small number of other councillors in his immediate neighborhood has now become a member of a larger council. He now has to think in terms of a considerably bigger area and therefore bigger responsibility and, perhaps more important to a people until very recently living in tribal units, he has to convince not only himself but also his electorate that local government administration transcends tribal or traditional units.

All this requires a greater demand on the imagination and magnanimity or tolerance of the members of the council. Although people are becoming accustomed to the idea of local government, we still have to convince a great many of them that local government is a good institution. To do
this successfully we must show them clearly, by visible signs, that they are getting value for their money. In this respect it is not easy to convince a great many people that costs of administration are an inevitable burden of local government.

Our country, like all developing countries, is developing socially, culturally and politically. Our councils are therefore obliged to reflect these developments at the local level. Thus, it follows that we are not only concerned with the efficient management of basic functions of local government, but we must also carry out special development responsibilities assigned to us by the central government.

In each of the successive past four years, local authorities have been allocated nearly £G 1½ million sterling (the actual figure for the current financial year is £G 1,384,000) for local as distinct from national development projects. Considering that this is in addition to ordinary grants to councils and relating it to the whole national budget, this local development grant is a by no means small sum. This sum is divided amongst the eight regions according to population. In each region a Regional Development Committee, on which councils in the regions are represented, considers and allocates grants for projects submitted by the constituent councils, which themselves constitute local development committees. In addition to their normal activities and the carrying out of new projects financed from their own resources, therefore, our councils have to plan and execute what may be termed semi-national development programmes. In other words, local development and consequently the raising of the standard of living and health and educational advancement of the people, is put on the shoulders of councils — they have to build the new schools, clinics, water supplies and those purely local amenities which, nevertheless, are necessary complements of the national advancement. The central government cannot do it all. But why can’t it do it all?

The reason is that the central government is trying to achieve, and needs to achieve, in a few years what other nations have achieved in hundreds of years. The central government therefore looks to councils to carry out local development. With considerable central government financial and technical assistance local government is playing its part in creating a modern nation — there can be nothing passive about it. The task is exciting and demands enthusiasm, energy, receptivity to new ideas, constant vigilance and self-sacrifice. The local authorities in Ghana are therefore happy to belong to the International Union of Local Authorities because in your company we hope to take inspiration, on one hand, from the experience of local authorities in the older nations and, on the other, from the ways and means in which local authorities in new nations like ours are tackling what we believe are common problems.
DISCUSSION

Participants in the question and answer period with the three speakers, following the presentation of their papers were: Ngadjijo Prodjo, Indonesia; Samuel Humes, United States; M. H. Mohamed, Ceylon; E. G. Tindale, South Africa; Ted C. Wills, United States; Dr. Charles S. Ascher, United States; Dr. K. Chahriar, Iran; Prof. Leslie Green, South Africa; Ashton G. Wright, Jamaica; Mr. Le van Hoi, Vietnam; L. G. Huddy, Great Britain; Mrs. Stella B. Warner, United States; Dr. Cesar Cueva, Ecuador and Emil Sady, United Nations.

One of the questions raised was whether or not councils, of which all or part of the members are appointed, could be considered as democratic. Mr. Sarpong stated that a democratic government is one which is directly responsible to the people for whom it is legislating and administering and cannot, therefore, by definition, include appointed members. However, in countries which have just gained independence, it is necessary to maintain a link between the old and new forms of government and one of the ways in which this can be done is through the appointment of local government councillors by the central government. Dr. Bromage pointed out that local self-government is a training ground in democracy and that in developing democracy, one of the goals should be the strengthening, at the base, of representative government.

Further explanation was given by Sir Francis Hill on the English system of local government in response to a question on how the executive work of the local government committees is coordinated. This is through a General Purposes Committee which helps resolve differences between two or more committees on a given matter. At the executive officer level, coordination is accomplished through the clerk of the council. Although the position of the clerk vis-a-vis the other chief officers is prima inter pares, the degree of influence which he can exert is dependent on his own personality. There is a trend, however, toward the clerk becoming the chief executive officer and eventually he may approximate the position of city or town manager; in practice, this may actually be the position which a vigorous, active and able town clerk now holds, although it is not recognized as such.

Mr. Sarpong, giving a few details on local government in Ghana, stated that the term of office of locally-elected councillors is three years, although a councillor may be removed before the end of this time for sufficient cause. Councillors may also run for re-election. As for who assumes responsibility for the streets and highways in local municipalities, the former are usually maintained by the local government and the latter by the central government. There are various arrangements, however,
between the two governments which provide local grants for certain types of streets which may be regarded as highways.

Further information on city managers in the U.S. was supplied by Dr. Bromage who explained that these administrative generalists are appointed by the local councils, usually by a majority plus vote because few people want to accept employment if a council is evenly or very closely divided on their appointment.

There is usually very little in city charters about the qualifications for city manager; instead, the qualifications demanded are made clear by the council and the council committee which interviews applicants for the position. In the past many city managers came from the engineering profession, but today they come from a variety of professions, such as finance, personnel, etc. There are also many universities which provide a one to two year training course for young men interested in this profession. After completion of such a course the young men go out as apprentices to city managers for several years and ultimately seek employment in a small city or village and then work their way up through various changes in employment, to the big cities. Basically, managers have no security of employment. They are subject to removal at the pleasure of the city council and although some charters provide that a manager can only be first suspended and that he may demand a public hearing before his ultimate removal, in actual practice, if a manager feels that he has lost the confidence of his council, his immediate step is to resign. With the growth of the manager plan, if there are certain things which are political in character in relation to his resignation or removal, this will not hurt his future career and he may even, in fact, move to a larger city with a greater budget even though he has suffered a loss in one particular city.

Dr. Bromage continued that the council-manager form of government has largely replaced the commission form of local government, which was a reform device that came into being about 1900-1901. There are now about 300 commissioner cities left in the U.S. and under this system a small body of elected commissioners serve as councilmen, policy makers and supervisors of various administrative functions. As for the council-manager system, this can now be found in over 1700 towns and villages in the U. S. On the whole, the councils under this system are small, frequently nonpartisan, and provide for overlapping tenure of office. This is, of course, in direct contrast to the English system which has large councils whose members represent various districts of the city. Whereas the English system is certainly more illustrative of grass-roots local democracy, many cities in the U. S. had difficulties in making this kind of council operate. There is still, however, a difference of opinion within the country on the best size of a representative council
and there are cities which still have from 15 to 25 council members, although these are mostly the large cities.

As for participation of American voters in local government elections, only about 35-40% of the registered voters participate. However, even though this may indicate a passive democracy, Dr. Bromage said that he, as a former councilman, could testify to the interest shown by non-voters in municipal matters when mistakes are made or councilmen do not vote on issues as the electorate would like them to do so.
Dr. Luther Gulick opens the first meeting of the seminar on Problems of Metropolitan Areas. Seated to his left are speakers Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Mr. Murray Jones, Sir William Hart and Councilman Edward Connor.

Monsieur F. Cottier, Chairman of the Washington Congress, in an informal moment prior to the Closing Session holds the olive wood gavel presented to IULA at the 1960 Israel Congress.
THE EXECUTIVE

This session, which was under the chairmanship of Mr. S. Hjarsø 1), Director of the Danish Union of Towns, featured main speeches by Mayor de Lesseps S. Morrison of New Orleans, Mr. Kjell T. Evers, Executive Director of the Norwegian Unions of Towns and Rural Municipalities, and Dr. Chamnan Yuwapurna, Lord Mayor of Bangkok. Following these is a short summary of the discussion period and a paper prepared by Prof. A. Kleijn, Mayor of Meppel, Netherlands, which could not be presented at the session because of the lack of time.

EXECUTIVE POWERS AND OBLIGATIONS
UNDER THE STRONG MAYOR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

by

DE LESSEPS S. MORRISON

Mayor of the City of New Orleans,
Louisiana, U.S.A.

I should like to devote the bulk of my comments to a discussion of the strong mayor system as it exists in my own city of New Orleans. In order to do this it is first necessary to give you some brief background information on the recent history of our city charter.

Prior to 1954 our form of government was the commission-council system. The five principal city officials served in both administrative and legislative capacities. In other words, four days a week I served as mayor and, as such, was the city’s chief executive. Yet, every Thursday I took my seat in the council chamber and voted as a legislator. In the same fashion my four fellow legislators also served as heads of city departments.

In 1951 a commission of prominent citizens was appointed to study our city charter and to recommend such changes as would promote more efficient government. Their study lasted almost a year, during which time they examined the charter of practically every city in the United States as well as certain cities in other countries. The result of these deliberations was our present city charter which was ratified by our citizens in 1952 and placed in effect in 1954.

1) We deeply regret to announce the death of Mr. Hjarsø on June 29, 1961.
The principal difference between our new charter and our old charter is that the new charter provides for a clear separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of our government and the installation of real home rule. Thus, all executive direction is vested in the office of mayor and from him down through the administrative chain of command. In the same way all legislative functions are handled by our seven-man city council who are part-time legislators and who meet weekly to handle the city's legislative affairs.

One of the problems of the strong mayor form of government is that the duties and obligations of the mayor are so extensive that it becomes almost impossible for him to carry them all out. He must not only function as his city's chief executive, but, in addition, he must serve as a salesman for his community, as an official greeter, and as the head of his political organization.

The citizens who drafted our city charter knew this full well. Their solution was the creation of the post of chief administrative officer who functions directly under the mayor and whose principal obligation is the day-to-day administration of the city's affairs.

It might be interesting here to contrast the functions of the chief administrative officer with those of a city manager. As you know, many American cities use the city manager form of government in which all executive powers are vested in a professional municipal administrator who is hired by the members of the city council. But, although he serves as his city's chief executive he is still subject to the wishes of the council since they have the authority to discharge him should they decide to do so.

On the other hand, the strong mayor-chief administrative officer form of government is actually a compromise between the city manager form and the old commission-council form, for the chief administrative officer is also a professional city administrator. However, in this case, he is directly appointed by the mayor and although he handles day-to-day executive chores, he is not the final authority on policy matters. Thus policy, because it is determined by an elected mayor, is more directly responsive to the will of the people than it is under the city manager form.

You may be interested in a brief description of the organization of our city government for I think it will explain how the strong mayor system works. Under our city charter the mayor appoints the chief administrative officer and the city attorney. In turn, the chief administrative officer, with the approval of the mayor, appoints the heads of our individual city departments. In the case of New Orleans, we have 13
individual department heads. These appointments are made without the necessity of confirmation by the city council. Thus, the mayor and the chief administrative officer have direct control of every city department, except for the department of Civil Service which functions under its own three-member nonpolitical board.

I might mention here that our City Planning Commission also functions independently, operating under its own nonpolitical board, although the board members themselves are appointed for staggered terms by the mayor with the approval of the council.

In addition to his appointive powers, our chief administrative officer also serves as the city’s budget officer. As such, his is the responsibility of annually preparing the city’s operating and capital budgets. Among his other important duties are the supervision of the directors of our various city departments, the coordination of the activities of our municipal boards and commissions, and the conducting of all types of investigations and studies of municipal functions, with the aim of producing greater efficiency.

As you can see, the executive powers under the strong mayor system are of considerable magnitude. To counter this, the citizens who drafted our city charter made certain that it contained checks and balances against the unlimited exercise of power by the executive branch of government. The most important of these is the fact that, while the operating and capital budgets are prepared by the executive branch, all final decisions on financial appropriations must be made by the city council. Another factor is that although I, as mayor, have veto power over actions by the city council, the council can in turn override my veto by a two-thirds vote.

But the greatest check and balance against unlimited power is, of course, the people themselves since every four years the mayor and, in fact, the entire city council must re-submit themselves to the voters for election. In the case of the mayor, our charter contains a limit that no mayor can serve over two consecutive terms of office. Thus the people themselves are in a position to either approve or disapprove of the manner in which their affairs are conducted.

You may be interested in the organizational structure of our city council. It is composed of seven councilmen, two of whom are elected citywide and the other five from our city’s five councilmanic districts. Thus, in addition to having two members who are responsible to the electorate as a whole, each of five areas of the city also has representation on the council. This, of course, insures a hearing at the council table for those problems which are purely neighborhood in scope.
Incidentally, the charter provides that every ten years it is mandatory that the city be re-districted so that the five districts are equal in population.

One interesting feature of our charter is the provision for an acting mayor when the mayor himself is either out of the city or incapacitated. When the mayor is scheduled to leave the city he can appoint one of the two councilmen-at-large to serve as acting mayor in his absence. Should he fail to do this and should he be gone for a period in excess of 10 days, the five district councilmen are then required by the charter to appoint one of the two councilmen-at-large as acting mayor. By the same token, if the mayor resigns, the five city councilmen elect a mayor for the remainder of the term, from the two councilmen-at-large.

The importance of this is that the acting mayor of the City of New Orleans is mayor in fact and may exercise any executive function including the right of veto. Incidentally, this is the only instance in which councilmen, by charter, actually exercise executive powers.

You may well ask why New Orleans chose the strong mayor system rather than the city manager form of government. The basic reasons were: 1) it was felt that although the city manager form works excellently in smaller cities, it would not function as well in a community with a population of some 628,000 people. 2) It was felt the strong mayor system was more directly answerable to the will of the people and therefore more consistent with the democratic processes. 3) It was felt that in a city the size of New Orleans strong executive direction was needed to see long-term projects through from inception to completion and that only an executive directly responsible to all the people would be able to furnish such direction.

This is certainly not to be interpreted as a criticism of the city manager form of government. However, New Orleans, by American standards, is a very old city. It is 243 years old and its population is made up of many diverse elements — truly cosmopolitan. Thus it was felt that only a strong chief executive could function with efficiency and speed under the conflicting viewpoints and mixture of various groups and nationalities which exist in our city.
The executive in Scandinavian local government is in reality a three-headed creature. Each of these "heads" will be discussed in this paper and will be identified respectively as The Municipal Council Chairman, The Executive Board and Executive Board Chairman and The Professional Administrator.

The municipal council chairman

The authority of the municipal council chairman in Scandinavia differs widely from country to country as well as between urban and rural municipalities. One factor in common, however, is that all are elected by and from the council membership.

In Norway the chairman must be elected from among the members of the executive board and he subsequently serves a dual two-year term as council chairman and as chairman of the board. Primarily, his official duties as council chairman concern planning and presiding over council meetings and acting as ceremonial head of the municipality; he may also assume administrative leadership in the smaller municipalities which do not have a full-time professional administrator. Unofficially, the influence of the council chairman in municipal politics and affairs is dependent upon his own interests and personality.

In Sweden today, although it is not required by state law, the chairman of the municipal council and of the executive board are usually different
people. The latter is the most powerful elective executive position and is therefore usually claimed by the majority party in the municipal council. In like manner, the council chairman is also chosen from the majority party or from a coalition of the larger council parties. On the other hand, the Finnish Municipal Law forbids the municipal council chairman to be a member of the council executive board and thus draws one of the clearest legal distinctions between executive and legislative bodies in Scandinavian local government. In both Sweden and Finland the functions of the council chairman closely resemble those of the other Scandinavian countries.

The executive board and the executive board chairman

Throughout Scandinavia the prime source of executive decision-making and control among the elected officials is the council executive board, which ranges in size from five to ten members, and the executive board chairman. The executive boards are generally composed wholly or in part of municipal councilmen and reflect the political make-up of the council. On the whole, the Scandinavian executive boards in the larger municipalities meet once a week and the board members receive regular remuneration commensurate to the time and effort required by their duties.

By virtue of his position, the Scandinavian executive board chairman can usually exert decisive leadership over both municipal policy development and the professional administrative staff. In practice, however, his effectiveness depends upon his initiative and personality, the stability of the political climate both within the chairman’s own party as well as throughout the entire community and the presence of competent professional administrators.

Executive boards in Finland, where members are elected either from within or outside the municipal council, are very powerful organs, both by law and practice, for the constant growth of the number and size of municipal problems has resulted in more and more authority being devolved to them by the municipal councils. Moreover, to ensure good liaison between the council and the board both the executive board chairman and vice-chairman attend regular council meetings and an executive board member sits on each municipal committee. For the last several decades the municipal councils in all Finnish cities and towns have been required by state law to appoint a professional director with indefinite tenure to act as the city’s chief administrator and to serve as the permanent chairman of the executive board. In 1948 the option to inaugurate this system was given to the rural municipalities, approximately 1/5 of whom have now put it into effect.

56
The position of the Swedish executive board is considerably weaker than that of its Finnish counterpart. Moreover, although the municipal council is not required to elect council members to serve on the executive board, this is often done in actual practice and the board chairman is then elected by the council from among the board members. As is the case in other Scandinavian countries the Swedish board, as the central executive body, must review the proposals of the municipal committees and boards in light of the total municipal picture of needs versus revenues. As is also the case in Norway, there are no formal executive board representatives on the Swedish municipal committees and to some degree this might account for the “go it alone” attitude occasionally evidenced by Swedish and Norwegian municipal committees, particularly those created by national legislation rather than by council enactment.

In Norway and in the largest Danish cities the municipal council first elects its executive board from the council membership and then chooses one of the board members as both chairman of the board and of the council. In the large Norwegian cities this dual chairman is usually a full-time official, but regardless of the size of the municipality the chairman always receives some remuneration for the demands of his office. Once elected, the Norwegian executive board exercises general supervision over the municipal administration and particularly devotes its time to screening proposals of the various municipal committees and to keeping a close watch over municipal finances. Although the Municipal Law of Norway stipulates that certain matters must be considered by the municipal council, the Law also allows the council to delegate broad areas of authority to its executive board, which delegation has been willingly done by many of the city councils and somewhat less enthusiastically by their rural counterparts.

In Iceland all of the executive authority in the rural municipalities is invested in the council chairman who is elected by the council from among its own membership. In the cities the council elects, in the same manner, not only a chairman but also a full-time executive officer.

The professional administrator

Throughout the world the constantly increasing complexity and scope of local government affairs has raised the corresponding demand for their efficient administration. In Scandinavia this demand is being met by council-appointed professional administrators who usually perform their duties for life, except in cases of pronounced neglect or prolonged ill health.

The Finnish Municipal Law provides the council-appointed chief administrator in that country with greater authority and independence
than has any other of his Scandinavian counterparts. Each administrator serves both as the full-time director of the municipal administration and as the permanent chairman of the executive board, positions for which he is well equipped in terms of training and knowledge of municipal administration and problems. However, the determination of where administrative responsibility should end and political sensitivity begin would seem to be a sizable burden for one man who must serve both "masters" with equal diligence.

Reflecting a traditional distrust of a single executive, elected or appoint­ed, Swedish law has not given its administrators in the large municipalities the authority that is granted to their counterparts in Finland and Norway. Thus, council-appointed department heads have considerable independence in their work and are responsible, in the first instance, to one of the policy-making and supervisory committees elected by the council. Central coordination, then, is accomplished through the council-appointed chairman of the executive board who often serves on a full-time, salaried basis. Similarly, in the smaller Swedish cities the executive board chairman is the official leader of the administration, although in practice the professional department heads exercise considerable influence over daily administration. It is in the rural municipalities, however, that the chief administrators exercise a proportionately broader scope of authority for the executive board and board chairmen function only at weekly meetings and therefore do not exert daily leadership over administration. Here, too, administration is segmented into areas of municipal service, each of which is supervised by a committee, but in contrast to the cities, the administrators responsible to these committees are under the informal but positive supervision and financial control of the chief administrator.

In the numerous rural municipalities in Denmark the council chairman is the single head of the administration; in the smaller cities he is usually assisted by an administrative officer and accounting and other technical personnel. The largest Danish cities have appointed administrators who function under the central supervision of the council chairman.

Second only to Finland in terms of municipal executive authority is the Norwegian chief administrator who is directly responsible to the executive board. The Norwegian Municipal Law puts prime emphasis on the chief administrator's responsibility for budget preparation and control and requires that he make personal recommendations only on financial matters. In reality, however, the administrator goes far beyond the demands of the Municipal Law in developing policies and programs for the consideration of the executive board and council. The result is that the Norwegian chief administrator, like comparable administrators throughout the world, also faces the difficult problem of knowing where,
on any matter, his influence should stop and that of the elected representatives of the community should begin. Proposed solutions have ranged from a more highly developed council committee system to elected commissioners in place of the council-appointed administrators.

Conclusion

In Finland, Norway, Denmark and Sweden, wherever a chief professional administrator is employed he is recognized as the municipal executive. As the permanent board chairman, the Finnish chief administrator plays an unusually prominent role in the development and implementation of municipal policies and programs. The Norwegian chief administrator, although subordinate to the municipal council, both prepares and administers policies and programs for the council and executive board and often joins in "selling" these policies and programs to the public. Although they are not mentioned in law, most of the Danish and Swedish chief administrators function with the same authority and influence as do their Norwegian counterparts.

Wherever they are found, executive boards and professional administrators tend to lessen the executive authority of the council chairman although, by virtue of their position, Scandinavian council chairmen can exercise considerable influence over the scheduling and debate of council matters. In contrast, the chairman of the executive board, except in Denmark and Norway where he is the same person as the council chairman, is usually much more familiar with and thus influential in the development and implementation of municipal policies and programs.

In Scandinavia today the executive boards seem to be gaining greater authority at the expense of the municipal councils. To some extent this trend can be traced to the fact that the large size of the Scandinavian municipal councils renders them unfit to cope with the growing number and complexity of municipal matters. Despite the increased stature and work load of the executive boards, however, there has been no standard division of functions among the board members, with the possible exception of Finland where each board member is formally appointed to sit as a representative on one or more municipal committees and could conceivably, therefore, develop a certain amount of expertise and partiality.

In the Scandinavian countries it is not uncommon to find friction between the municipal-wide orientation of the executive boards and the more specialized outlook of the various committees. However, most of Scandinavia views this "give and take" as neither a problem of overlapping responsibilities nor inefficiency, but as an essential ingredient of responsive municipal government.
THE MUNICIPAL EXECUTIVE

by

Dr. CHAMNAN YUVAPURNA

Lord Mayor of Bangkok, Thailand and
President, National Municipal League of Thailand

A study of the executive function in the world's municipalities shows several ways in which that function is being performed today. I shall mention briefly and broadly the major, most common systems and then explain the trends in Southeast Asia.

1. The Council as Executive

In Great Britain and most of the Commonwealth countries, an elected city council has most of the executive power. Under this system the council elects a mayor whose duties are mostly ceremonial, with the result that he does not have much control over administration. Residual executive power is in the hands of the full, elected council. In practice, the policy-making and control of administration rests with council committees, particularly the committee on finance, whose prior approval is required for funding the programs.

2. The Elected Commission as Executive

In Switzerland, some Canadian cities, some U.S. cities and elsewhere, a system exists in which the executive function is not in the hands of an elected mayor, but rests with a small group of individuals selected by direct vote of the people. For example, in Zurich the commissioners are presided over by the mayor who is elected for the same term and at the same time. However, the commissioners perform the executive function in specific areas of operation as the working heads of municipal departments. In principle, all important policies are decided by the whole commission. In actual practice, however, especially under the commission form of government in the United States, the programs affecting the departments of individual commissioners are left pretty much to the discretion of the commissioner. In order to avoid overlapping responsibility in situations that affect the interests and work of more than one operating department, the full commission may lay down the policy guides. In such cases, the mayor may also play a decisive administrative role.
3. The Elected Mayor as Executive

The most frequently found form of municipal executive in the United States, the Philippines, Japan and some other countries is that in which a directly-elected mayor holds the executive power. Theoretically, the council remains aloof from administration and the mayor is held responsible for the functioning of the municipality. He is considered the chief executive as well as the ceremonial head of the city. Variations are found and some systems are called "weak mayor systems" and some are called "strong mayor systems". A survey of actual practice reveals, however, that a mayor with a strong personality in a "weak mayor" city, reinforced by strong political power, will still be the controlling influence in municipal affairs. This is true even if he does not preside over council meetings.

The elected mayor as executive holds and wields power only so long as the electorate shows its confidence in him at the polls on election day. This electoral mandate is, in fact, the source of executive power and not mere charter provisions. The elected mayor as executive has been brought to the peak of perfection in democratic countries favoring the two ideas of separation of powers and popular choice of the executive.

4. The Professional Administrator as Executive

A recent major trend in the municipal executive function has been towards the appointment of a professional municipal administrator as executive. The rise of the council-manager plan has been spectacular and is proving very successful. Thirty-five years ago, outside of Germany, hardly any professional administrator executives were at work in city halls. Today there are more than seventeen hundred and fifty cities in the U.S.A. and Canada with city managers. Another seventeen hundred and fifty cities use the plan in Finland, West Germany, Ireland, Norway and Sweden. An average of one hundred cities per year, throughout the world, have adopted this plan for the past thirty-five years. This distinguished record surely constitutes a major new development in municipal government.

The popularity of the professional administrator as executive comes from the recognition that our modern cities are complex organisms requiring full-time, professional administration. The trained city manager, selected as a career official because of his intimate knowledge of municipal government, offers a partial solution to the baffling complications of the executive function in modern cities where administration ranges over amazingly complex subjects. The best practice in those cities where a professional career administrator is the chief executive calls for
identification of political activities and policies with the mayor and council. The city manager is identified with efficient and economical development of operating programs to put the policies into effect.

To date, the strongest recognition of the career nature of the city manager is in West Germany where 50% of the population lives under the council-manager plan. Here the manager is appointed for a twelve year term and if not re-appointed is retired on a pension of fifty percent of base salary. Eventually, retirement is offered at seventy-five percent of base salary. During his twelve year term, the manager can be removed only after conviction by a court for improper conduct.

5. Assembly Committees as the Executive

In Italy, Canada and the Scandinavian countries the executive function is sometimes performed by an executive committee appointed by the municipal assembly. Under this system, there is sometimes a mayor who presides over the meetings of the full assembly. He may submit recommendations to it and to the executive committee of which he is usually a member. However, the mayor's executive authority is usually diluted and shared with the executive committee. Generally, he is subordinate to the executive committee in the fulfillment of his nominal duties of enforcing municipal ordinances and by-laws. The executive committee is ultimately responsible for the executive function with supervisory power resting in the mayor.

In some Danish cities operating under this system, the executive committee is chosen by the city council and consists of one chief mayor and five other mayors. While our Danish friends may appear to have too many mayors cities such as Stockholm, using an executive committee system, have no mayors at all. In such cases, the executive function rests entirely with the committee chosen by the council.

6. The Executive Appointed by the Central Government

By far the most common form of municipal executive is the one who is appointed by the central government. In the Netherlands, Brazil, Argentina, Paris, Thailand, Indonesia, India and most of the countries of Southeast Asia and Africa, the executive function is performed in whole, or part, by an appointee of the central government. It is not my purpose to debate the relative merits of this system compared with the five others previously described. However, cities with this type of municipal executive should not be lightly dismissed without thought and study. They too have a proud history and tradition. Cultural attainments, throbbing industrial and commercial life and the well-being of millions of people in these cities compares favorably with those in what may appear to be a more "democratic" atmosphere.
It is not wise to jump to conclusions as to which type of municipal executive is the "best". The history, background and attitudes of each country must be taken into account, separately. The lessons of history and political realities regarding subversion cause the national governments of many countries in Asia and Africa to keep control of the municipal executive function. This is particularly true with reference to the large cities and the capital cities. We remember that the control of Paris has often determined the fate of the French regime; that Mussolini's march on Rome brought him to power; that Hitler's Reichstag fire and Berlin panic started Germany on the road to World War II.

An even more important reason for the appointment of the municipal executive by the central government is the scarcity of trained, capable public administrators in Asia and Africa. In the developing countries it is just as urgent and necessary to allocate scarce personnel resources as it is to allocate scarce monetary and physical resources. It is an imperative of national progress for the central government to make certain that the most capable, trained and dedicated public administrators serve where they will most benefit the country.

In Thailand, we have had a quarter of a century of municipal experience since adopting a Constitutional Monarchy. We have experimented with various methods of selecting the municipal executive. Experience has taught us that we cannot afford the luxury of political whims which often result from the popular choice of municipal executives. In order to advance the status of municipalities and make certain that Thai urban residents receive the benefits of modern municipal services and functions, it is necessary for us to utilize professional, career men. Our present system of central government appointment of the municipal executive assures that the most efficient executives are at the helm of municipal affairs. Many of the same standards of performance applied by a city council towards a city manager are applied by the Ministry of the Interior towards our appointed municipal executives. Municipal executives are expected to concentrate on executive duties instead of spending time politicking for office. The regulations of the Ministry of the Interior prescribe the administrative structure of municipalities in accordance with the Municipal Act which authorizes "... such executive branches as may be required by the quality and volume of services".

In Bangkok we have an appointed municipal assembly and a five man municipal council. The Lord Mayor is the chief executive officer. The law assigns control and responsibility "for the execution of municipal affairs" to the council "under the leadership of the Lord Mayor". In addition to being titular head of the city's government the Municipal Act entrusts the Lord Mayor with the execution of certain specific func-
tions. Portions of this executive function are delegated to individual members of the council who also assume responsibility for the control and direction of specific city functions similar to situations where an assembly committee acts as the municipal executive.

Not only in Thailand, but in all of Southeast Asia there is a growing trend toward more attention to municipal governments. The expansion of the powers of the municipal executives is noticeable and consistent. This is in keeping with the growth of municipal functions. India, for example, has recently reversed a trend toward central control of community development and in January 1961 established a new national policy of developing urban communities only through existing municipal governments — the so-called *Panchayati Raj* movement.

Many capable and dedicated municipal executives are struggling with the problems of modern urban living. Democratization of the municipal executive function has been going on in the Republic of the Philippines, where mayors are now all elected. Similarly, Japan has a completely new system of electing municipal executives which has replaced the centuries-old feudalism that formerly characterized Japan's municipal governments.

The rise of municipal leagues in Southeast Asia, including our own Thailand National Municipal League, has created unique opportunities for in-service training. Most of them conduct special training courses and a well-developed League program is the best method of providing municipal executives with the knowledge and information they need to face the problems of increasing urbanization. Just as America has, in this century, changed from a rural to an urban nation, so urbanization is completely changing the old way of life in the agricultural countries of Southeast Asia.

*The Hearts of Men are more Important than Laws*

I should like to make some final observations in this survey of the municipal executive function. In the last analysis the worth of a municipal executive and his position depends not only on the laws but on his individual personality and approach to his job. Constitutions, by-laws and charters tell only part of the story. The city and its laws exist for the individual and not the individual for the city. The municipal executive function is merely a device by which men are enabled to live together in just and liberal relationships with the greatest amount of freedom consistent with a disciplined society.

We have no "oath of office" for municipal executives in Thailand, but we are duty-bound by the strict rule of Buddhism called the "Four Sublime States of Consciousness". I commend these ideals to you. They
are: (1) Kindness, (2) Compassion, (3) Sympathetic joy and (4) Equanimity. These are bred into the hearts of Thai municipal executives and it is necessary that you understand them if you want to understand us. I believe, however, that they have universal application for all municipal officials in the performance of the municipal executive function.
DISCUSSION

In the period reserved for that purpose following the presentation of the previous three papers, questions were asked and comments made by Prof. D. Simons, Netherlands; Prof. Leslie Green, South Africa; Samuel Humes, United States; Tien Hsin Chang, China; Ngadjijo Prodjo, Indonesia and Mrs. Felisa R. de Gautier, Puerto Rico.

Mayor Morrison, in reply to a question as to whether general state laws were subject to approval by, or with the agreement of, the New Orleans city council before being considered valid, said that a state law must affect four or more cities in order for it to have application in the city of New Orleans without the approval of the city council. This home rule provision, of course, is not applicable to general state laws that affect all communities in the state. Mayor Morrison was also asked: if the mayor is the leader of the majority party on the city council, are not the checks on his power, in practice, seriously weakened, if not entirely removed? He answered that in his city his party did have a majority on the council and therefore, on political matters, the council members of his party usually went along with the mayor. As for ordinary matters, however, there was usually variance of opinion, regardless of political affiliation. A further check on the power of the mayor is provided by the law that states no mayor may serve over two terms consecutively.

The question put to Mr. Evers as to whether or not the department head in Scandinavian countries has divided loyalty to his committees and to his professional administrator, was answered in the affirmative. However, Mr. Evers pointed out, although the department head must loyally support the resolutions of his committee, primarily he is subordinate to the chief administrator. In response to a question on the work of local government in the field of public welfare, the speaker explained that this service in Norway is primarily a local government responsibility, for these are the officials who are closest to those who must be helped. As may be expected, however, much of the money for this service does come from the state.

Mrs. de Gautier, mayor of the City of San Juan, Puerto Rico for the past 14 years, pointed out that politics play a leading role in the selection of that city’s chief executive. For each of her terms of office, she was first elected by her party as their candidate, was then victorious in a general election, and after that was appointed as mayor by the city’s municipal assembly, part of whose membership is also elected and part of which is appointed. As executive head of San Juan, Mrs. de Gautier prepares the budget, carries out studies at the request of the municipal assembly, supervises the department heads and, in general, coordinates the municipal administration.
I should like to comment on the position of the "executive committee" in the Netherlands, giving special attention to the unique position of its president, the burgomaster, which has proved its worth for more than a hundred years. In addition, I should like to say something about the trends of development that we can observe in the executive function of local government.

The Netherlands comprise one unified state; this unity was attained in 1813 when the Republic of the Seven United Netherlands became the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The transition from united states to one unified state brought with it a greater measure of national integration. For this reason, although the national government never exercises direct control over the 11 autonomous provinces and the thousand autonomous municipalities, national policy cannot be frustrated by the acts or decisions of lower public corporations — the municipalities and the provinces — or their officials. Thus, local law is considered as being of a lower order than national law and leading local and provincial functionaries — who are nominated by the Queen — have to act according to national law.

Let me explain, first of all, that the structure of municipal government in the Netherlands is very simple. There is one uniform scheme of organization for all Dutch municipalities whether large or small towns, villages, or extensive municipalities with the character of a district. Each municipality has three organs: the council, the executive committee and the burgomaster. The council is the legislative and controlling organ while both the executive committee and the burgomaster have an executive and a representative function.

One of the most noteworthy characteristics of Dutch local government is the manner in which the functions of these three organs are interwoven. The position of the burgomaster is especially interesting in this respect. The whole construction is an ingenious system of balanced antitheses, which are twofold.

First, there is the contrast between national unity and the autonomous municipality — the necessity of coordinating municipal and national policy being more than ever essential in the Netherlands with its exceedingly high density of population. Then there is the antithesis between local government in its policy-making capacity and the techniques of public administration, the know-how of government and administrators as such.
To emphasize that an autonomous municipality is also an integral part of the national state and works in the same common public interests, the Dutch burgomaster is nominated by the Queen. But this does not mean that he is a representative of the national government in the municipality, that he represents national interests on the local level, or that he is a servant of the State. On the contrary. Although nominated by the highest national authority he is a typically local functionary and the law, as expressed in the Municipal Act, characterizes him as such. He does not have to answer for what he does or does not do either before the Commissioner of the Queen in the province where he works or before the Minister of the Interior. There is no hierarchical relationship between these higher officials and the burgomaster; the burgomaster is a wholly free agent, who is only responsible for what he does and what he does not do before his own conscience and before the law.

Strictly speaking, the law alone is his master and it is only from the law that he receives his orders and precepts. Thus the burgomaster is a free man, a servant of his municipality, who can say and do what he thinks must be said or done. However, he can be dismissed directly — by the Queen again, at the responsibility of Her Minister of the Interior — if he abuses the freedom given to him by the law or if he acts against the law or the general principle of morality. Such a dismissal, however, is an exception and always causes a great stir in the world of local government.

In this system where national unity and municipal autonomy are carefully balanced, where the burgomaster, though a typical local functionary, is nominated by the Queen at the responsibility of Her Minister, the question arises: Who is politically responsible for the possible errors of the burgomaster? The answer is: The Minister of the Interior is responsible before Parliament. How could he have nominated such a person! But the burgomaster himself can only be dismissed, as sometimes he is, when his actions conflict with the law or when his moral standards are obviously too low. He cannot be dismissed, however, because he refuses to do what the Minister or the Commissioner of the Queen wish him to do, unless, of course, what they wish is at the same time a legal duty of the burgomaster.

The burgomaster has no political function. Possibly, though by no means necessarily, he may have been before his nomination a fervent politician. Once he has assumed the office of burgomaster, however, he is supposed to stand aloof from the political parties and local political life. Since he is nominated by the Queen and is not involved in local politics, it is obvious that the burgomaster, as chairman of the municipal council, has no vote. He is the leader and the adviser of the council, but no more. The council, as the highest political authority, or "head of the municipality" as our Municipal Act says, makes its political decisions exclusively within the political sphere of its elected members.
I just stated that the burgomaster was the leader and adviser of the council and thus approached the other aspect in the structure of the Dutch municipality — the balanced antithesis between government in the sense of policy-making and public administration as a technical job. Within this system of balance, the burgomaster is the man with the expert knowledge, while the council and its politically elected members are responsible for the decision-making and the local politics. Politically, the council is responsible for its decisions before the local electorate.

A few words now about the task of the burgomaster as a one-man executive. First, the burgomaster is chief of the local police, chief of the fire brigade and chief of the civil defence. Then, as a special municipal organ, the burgomaster has to do the thousand and one odd things that national legislation has heaped upon his shoulders. In this respect, he is the man who carries out at the local level, and on his own responsibility as a local authority interpreting the law, what this law dictates to him as being his task. I would emphasize that, in this respect, he is acting not as caretaker of the national government but as a free and independent exponent of local government.

The burgomaster is also president of the third and perhaps most important and powerful municipal organ: the municipal executive committee. The members of this committee are elected by and from the municipal council. In the smaller communities the committee is composed of the burgomaster as its president and at least two members, and in the larger ones the committee has up to six members, plus the president. Committee members, therefore, always have the possibility of establishing a political majority over the burgomaster, their president. In the Executive Committee the burgomaster is once again the expert who functions as a manager and is well versed in public administration. As I see it, it is this clever combination of the public administration expert, the manager and coordinator as a minority, and the political members of the committee as a majority which so fully guarantees political democracy and gives, as it always has given, the characteristic and intense driving force to Dutch municipal life.

In earlier days the function of the municipality, as indeed the function of the whole nation-wide government, was primarily a protective one — protecting the private rights and the personal security of the citizens, protecting order, morality, public interest, law, national sovereignty, etc. In those days, the function of the burgomaster was that of the magistrate. The period when government fulfilled a purely protective function has now passed; the modern welfare state has other aims. Although the necessity for protection has lasted, the notion was born that social welfare, social care and economic planning lay within the scope of government. And so government began to stimulate leadership which could direct
and administer community life in all its aspects, cultural, social and economic. In this new climate the task of the municipal executive committee increased immensely, not only in range but also in importance.

This development constitutes a trend towards the strengthening not only of bureaucracy, but also of the executive organs to which parts of the legislative tasks are now delegated. Moreover, although the municipal council formally is the head of the municipality, the real leadership in local government shifts more and more in the direction of the executive organs. In the executive committee itself we can also observe a change, from a real committee which makes its decisions after group discussion to a more or less coordinated group of local managers. So coordination has become a real problem, especially in the biggest towns and we see in municipal life a similar development to private enterprise: the advent of the manager, the beginning of a managerial era.

The managerial attitude is characterized by a display of know-how. It will be clear that a well-trained burgomaster with the knowledge and qualities of leadership that his office requires of him can be a very important factor in local development. He will be the stimulating and coordinating force in the development of the community. His first duty, however, is to stimulate the working together of the executive committee, to see to it that responsibilities do not overlap, and to be a self-confident and unselfish leader.

Although the function of the burgomaster is a typically representative one — in this respect he is the spokesman for his municipality — he will never represent his municipality as a politician, for he is supposed to stand aloof from political parties and their struggle. Rather does he represent his municipality as its first citizen.

The preliminary selection of burgomasters is done by the Commissioners of the Queen in the provinces where the municipalities are situated. They send a short list of candidates to the Minister of the Interior who makes the final decision. The criteria of selection are not very clear. The Minister, a politician himself, is sometimes inclined to give too much weight to the political background of the candidate, possibly at the cost of his knowledge of matters of local government and public administration. During the last 15 years, however, managerial skill and governmental experience have been taken more and more into account.

I hope I have given you some idea of what is, on the one hand, the simple construction of Dutch municipal government, uniform for every town and village without exception throughout the country, and of what, on the other hand, is the ingenious way in which political democracy is fully guaranteed, while at the same time an element of expert knowledge, leadership and coordination are ever present at the center of the political setup.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY

Monsieur P. Horace Boivin, Mayor of Granby, Quebec, Canada and President of the Canadian Association of Mayors and Municipalities, was the chairman for the final session on Local Government Structure and Organization. The following are the three major speeches given at this time as well as a summary of the subsequent discussion period. Also included are the comments made at this meeting in regard to local government administration in Cape Town, South Africa.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY OF BALTIMORE

by

J. HAROLD GRADY

Mayor of the City of Baltimore, Maryland

It has been my observation that the political scientists seem to handle matters concerning local government in a much more orderly way than do we practical people. They manage somehow to fit our forms of local government into neat, definite categories and classifications while we, who are occupied in the day-to-day task of keeping the administrative machinery of government reasonably well oiled, seem to have little time left to ponder the broad, basic philosophy of administration.

On the other hand, we do have the advantage of actual experience, which is generally reputed to be a good teacher. And while we hardly can claim to know all the answers, no one will doubt that we are very well informed on the problems involved — because they confront us daily in the course of our ordinary duties.

As Mayor of Baltimore, I head the municipal government of a metropolitan city with a population of more than 900,000 actual city residents who are surrounded by another 800,000 residents of the metropolitan area just beyond the city limits. I would hesitate to characterize Baltimore as a typical American city, for we are, in a number of respects, unique. Baltimore is one of the few American cities, for example, which is a completely independent sub-division of the state, and thus wholly separate from any county; consequently, there is no overlapping of county and city functions. Again, in contrast to the prevalent American practice of vesting the administration of education in school districts, the City of Baltimore operates its own school system. On the other hand, for reasons that are
principally historical, our police department is a state agency, headed by a commissioner appointed by the Governor of Maryland — although the financial support of the police department is provided in our city budget.

I find it difficult to fit Baltimore precisely into one of those neat categories of the political scientists to which I referred previously. When I am asked whether we have strong mayor or the weak mayor system, my answer at any given moment is apt to be influenced by the number of votes I can count on in the city council on that particular day.

However, we share with all local governments the continuing problems of coordinating the activities of a great variety of municipal departments, the constant necessity of maintaining liaison between the legislative and executive branches, and the increasing complexities of our vertical relations with higher levels of government — state and federal — and our horizontal relations with our neighboring jurisdictions in the metropolitan area.

While we all strive for perfection in the administrative machinery, for clear lines of command and responsibility, for well-defined areas of function, for the elimination of overlap and duplication, we must also remember that efficiency of governmental machinery is not an end in itself. Mere efficiency is not a guarantee of the liberty of the people. In fact, it can serve tyranny as well as freedom.

It is well to bear this in mind when we are tempted to grow impatient with the apparent inefficiencies inherent in the checks and balances of the democratic process. For instance, the city council, as the embodiment of representative democracy in local government, is an important link between citizens and administrative action; and the interaction between the people's representatives in the council and the administrators is fundamental to the political ideology of the United States and the free world. Therefore, the legislative prerogatives must be carefully observed.

This is not to say, however, that initiative and leadership must be abandoned to the legislative branch. The executive branch must take the lead in formulating programs and then, by various processes of education and persuasion, generate support for them in the council.

In Baltimore, we have adopted a number of devices which serve to maintain essential liaison between the executive and legislative branches. The vice-president of the council is traditionally the administration floor leader. His position is strengthened by the fact that the mayor has the veto power and rather extensive powers of appointment. In passing, I might mention that the Baltimore City Charter of 1796 was the first in the United States to grant such powers to the mayor — nearly a century in advance of the modern tendency toward the strong executive.
Department heads and administrative officers, of course, testify at hearings of council committees on legislation affecting their departments. In fact, councilmen are encouraged to discuss such ordinances with the affected department head before their introduction, a device which frequently smooths the path for desirable legislation. For example, I recently signed into law an ordinance which gives our Building Inspection Engineer greatly increased powers regarding the condemnation and removal of abandoned buildings. This had its genesis in the following manner:

A member of the council had received complaints from residents of his district to the effect that number of empty, boarded-up structures were causing a nuisance — harboring rats and refuse accumulations, and offering shelter to vagrants. The councilman took the problem to the Building Inspection Engineer, who said that his powers were restricted by antiquated legal procedures, particularly in those cases where absentee owners were distant from the city, or where the heirs of deceased former owners could not be located. The Building Engineer suggested certain legislative changes to correct this situation and also was able, from the records of his department, to give the councilman accurate information as to the extent of the problem in various city districts. The councilman consequently was armed with persuasive arguments to enlist the support of colleagues in districts other than his own.

The Building Engineer secured the concurrence of his immediate superior, the Director of Public Works, and the support of the mayor. As mayor, I directed the City Solicitor to work with the sponsoring councilman and the Building Engineer to insure that the proposed ordinance would afford due process of law to absent and missing owners, thus safeguarding its constitutionality.

On introduction, the ordinance was given full administration support. The Building Engineer testified in its favor before a council committee, the City Solicitor and the Planning Director expressed approval, and various neighborhood improvement associations added public support. Under these auspices the legislation had relatively smooth sailing and was enacted. When I signed it into law I invited the sponsor and representatives of the improvement associations to attend the ceremony and pose for newspaper and television pictures. The media of public relations, of course, should not be overlooked as a useful means of lubricating the machinery of government.

One of the devices which municipal corporations have employed to maintain communication between the executive and legislative branches might be likened to the practice of interlocking directorates in business corporations. This can be done either formally or informally. An example of the former is a legal provision that the mayor of Baltimore must appoint
one member of the city council as a member of the City Planning Commission. Informally, I have sometimes followed this principle in appointing various ad hoc commissions of citizens. Recently, I appointed a 21-member commission on the problems of the aging. The citizen members of this commission are representatives of the community’s civic, spiritual and minority interests, joined with labor, industry, the medical profession, the housing industry and other groups concerned with the special problems of our “senior citizens”. I also included two councilmen and the heads of the city departments of health, education, recreation and public welfare. In this way, the legislative and administrative arms of the city government will be prepared to take appropriate action on recommendations of the commission, since they will have been represented from the outset in its deliberations and studies.

While coordination between the legislative and executive branches is highly desirable, even closer coordination between the various administrative arms of the executive branch is an absolute essential. Shortly after I took office there was a great flurry of newspaper publicity over allegations that the preceding administration had failed to take advantage of some tens of millions of dollars in federal funds which had been designated for the construction of the city expressway system as a part of the federal interstate road network. It was of the utmost importance, since these federal funds represented ninety percent of the cost of the project. It appeared to me that past delays and missed opportunities were due principally to the lack of teamwork between the many different government agencies involved. We have, therefore, set up a system under which every agency concerned must be represented at a bi-weekly meeting at which the progress of all federal-aid highway programs is thoroughly reviewed. The Deputy Director of Public Works has been given responsibility for supervision of these programs and he acts as the chairman of these meetings. They are attended by representatives of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and of the Roads Commission of the State of Maryland, since that is the agency through which the federal government deals with the City of Baltimore. The city agencies represented include the Bureau of Highways; the city real estate officer, who is responsible for land acquisition; the Mechanical and Electrical Bureau, which provides for street lighting; the Transit and Traffic Department, which provides traffic engineering; the Bureau of Surveys; the Bureau of Tests; the Water and Sewer Departments, which must often relocate facilities in the path of these urban highways; the budget director’s office and, occasionally, other departments which may be affected either directly or indirectly by the federal urban and interstate highway programs. The meetings serve to familiarize each administrator with his colleagues’ current problems; to establish good working relationships generally and I suspect that, beyond the items on the agenda of
these meetings, many other problems affecting the various departments are informally resolved when the administrators assemble for these regular get-togethers.

In any event, we have solved most of the problems and have managed to throw a lagging expressway program into high gear, with individual projects running months ahead of schedule.

Another field in which I have utilized regular meetings of department heads to produce inter-agency teamwork is exemplified by my Mayor's Committee on Neighborhood Conservation, which meets monthly. This committee's membership includes the head of every agency even remotely concerned with the prevention of urban blight and slums, along with the judge of our municipal housing court, which has exclusive jurisdiction over housing code violations. I act as chairman of the committee and the director of our Urban Renewal and Housing Agency is vice-chairman. Among the agencies represented are Sanitation, Building Inspection, the Police and Fire Departments, the Departments of Education, Welfare, Health, Zoning, City Planning, the Liquor Licensing Board, Recreation and Parks, the City Forester, Traffic and Transit, and the City Solicitor. Between meetings work is carried on by various sub-committees — one for instance, chaired by the Deputy City Solicitor, is working on Housing Code revisions; another, chaired by the Health Commissioner, acts as operating committee for an area of the city set aside as an Experimental Conservation District, which we are using as a proving ground for techniques in inter-agency cooperation in an all-out fight to stem urban blight and property deterioration. This committee is separate and apart from the city's formal urban renewal and redevelopment effort, and presents an example of the interlocking directorate idea carried to the ultimate.

As far as I have been able to find out, Baltimore was the first city to unify its public housing and urban renewal agencies. The device used to accomplish this unification was the simple one of appointing the same five persons as members of the Urban Renewal Commission and as members of the Public Housing Authority. The same individual also serves as director of both functions. The agencies share personnel all down the line, and occupy the same headquarters. This has worked to the complete satisfaction of all concerned for several years and Baltimore has attained a position in the forefront of the cities making progress in urban renewal and redevelopment.

With regard to our relations with neighboring jurisdictions, we are probably farther advanced than many metropolitan areas, although I believe we are very far from the day when we can expect to institute an over-all metropolitan government. For example, the City of Baltimore
operates what amounts to a metropolitan water system, with the city Water Department not only supplying water to a large area in the metropolitan region, but also reading the meters of county residents and billing them directly. We also supply sewer service to suburban areas in the surrounding counties. Formerly this was on the basis of a flat rate per connection, adopted many years ago and providing what we regarded as totally inadequate compensation to the city. In the last few weeks we successfully concluded negotiations for a new five-year agreement with our neighboring county, adopting a formula which will allot overhead, operating and amortization costs to city and county in accordance with the proportionate use of the system by the respective jurisdictions. I am also hopeful that we will some day be able to reach agreement on the joint use of incinerator facilities. At the present time, the city needs a new incinerator plant and logic dictates that it should be located where it can be shared by the city and the suburban areas which are rapidly becoming urbanized. Recently the state legislature created a Metropolitan Transit Authority of five members, one of whom will be appointed by the Governor, two by the mayor of Baltimore, and two by Baltimore County. This authority will serve as a regulatory agency over the transit system serving the two jurisdictions and, eventually, will have authority to acquire the system and operate it as a public enterprise.

From what I have said, it is obvious that Baltimore's approach to the improvement of administrative machinery has been gradual and perhaps very piecemeal. I suspect that our steps in this direction come closer to the general pattern in other communities in contrast, for instance, to the example of Toronto's metropolitan government or the sweeping revision of the structure of Philadelphia's city government under the charter reforms of 1951. There are usually many practical and political difficulties which prevent the majority of us from taking such giant strides, but surely there is nothing to prevent us from a continuing and constant effort to update and improve the tools and techniques of administration. The instances I have cited from my own experience represent no dramatic departures. However, I do believe that they represent steps forward — and oftentimes, if we take enough such steps, never relaxing our determination to improve — we will find we have made as much progress as those who are able to take the giant strides.
I should like to define the total body of authorities, services and administrative machinery that may be found in a medium-sized French commune. I should first point out that the French commune has a council whose members are elected by universal suffrage to serve 6 year terms of office, which may be extended by re-election. The number of councillors is always uneven and is determined by the size of the commune. The council elects one of its members to serve as its presiding officer and to also assume the duties of mayor. In his latter capacity the mayor must execute the decisions of the council as well as perform those duties, particularly in regard to public safety, public health, public works and personnel, which are specifically assigned to him by law. Thus, it may be said that the council represents the legislative power and the mayor the executive power in the French commune.

The council selects several assistants from among its own members to aid the mayor in carrying out his various duties. These assistants are designated as first, second, third, etc. and their number is fixed by law in accordance with the importance of the commune. The council can also designate supplementary assistants, up to the same number as the regular assistants, should these also be needed. The law clearly delimits the powers and responsibilities of the assistants, to whom all the duties of the mayor may not be delegated unless the mayor is out of town or is incapacitated and cannot carry out his normal responsibilities. Should this be the case, the first assistant assumes the full powers of the mayor, or should he also be absent or incapacitated, the duties are assumed by the second assistant, etc.

While the council deliberates all questions concerning the administration of the commune, some of its decisions cannot be put into effect until 15 days after they have been submitted to the approval of the prefect; other decisions must be approved by the prefect before they can be executed. The general responsibility for carrying out the decisions of the council rests with the mayor. In actual practice, however, execution of decisions, coordination of municipal administration and supervision of municipal personnel is delegated to the secretary general who is appointed to this post for an indefinite period of time by the mayor. To aid the
secretary general in his tasks, the mayor also appoints an assistant secretary general, department heads and various other communal personnel.

In general, the departments of the French commune are as follows: The Secretariat General: Vital Statistics, which registers births, marriages, divorces and deaths and prepares the voters' list; Personnel, which is responsible for recruitment, salaries, leaves, discipline, social security, resignations and retirements of communal personnel; Accounting, which executes the budget, prepares payment vouchers and is responsible for the management of the communal debt; and Hygiene, which sees that the regulations concerning public health and safety, as pertains to housing and to individuals, are carried out. Other departments are: Health, which supervises clinics, health centers, crèches, etc.; Public Works, which is responsible for the maintenance of roads, drainage systems, garbage removal, etc.; Architecture, which maintains public property and supervises the construction of new public buildings; Ceremonies and Celebrations, which organizes various public events decided upon by the commune; Holiday Camps, which makes arrangements for taking children to the seashore or the mountains during school holidays; Social Welfare, which gives assistance and provides medical and social services; General Supplies, which buys furniture and supplies for the various departments; and Municipal Management, which maintains municipal buildings, automobiles, etc.

As a rule, the organization of each department is department head, assistant department head, senior clerks, clerks and stenotypists. In addition, technical services are carried out under a Director of Technical Services and include division and assistant division engineers, technical assistants, Supervisor of Weights and Measures, draftsmen, Supervisor of Roads and Public Works, officer of the Department of Hygiene, health inspectors, and their various staffs.

To ensure the permanent functioning of this administrative machinery, in 1952 the French Parliament unanimously approved a general statute concerning the personnel in all communes, regardless of their size. This statute provides that all personnel are treated on an equal basis and that they have the same working conditions and receive the same benefits as do national government employees. It should be noted, however, that the strength of the communal personnel and their salaries are established by the communal council, although the sole responsibility for hiring and firing of employees rests with the mayor, under the terms of the law and regulations governing these matters.

Thus, the law states that candidates for communal employment cannot be more than 30 years of age at the time of recruitment or during the
probationary period. This age limit, however, makes allowance for military service, employment in a public organization and the possession of children. In regard to physical aptitude, candidates must be able to prove that they do not have or are cured of tuberculosis, cancer or mental illness. Professional aptitude is determined through examinations and the requirement of diplomas and various qualifications. A candidate does not become a permanent communal employee until he has satisfactorily served a one year probationary period, which may be extended one year further. During this period, the probationer can be dismissed without having claim to the guarantees concerning disciplinary action which are provided in the general statute for permanent employees. Once he receives an official appointment, the probationary worker then becomes a permanent communal employee.

In regard to salaries, the Minister of the Interior establishes the maximum scale which the council can adopt for communal employees. The council can then allot to its employees positions on the salary scale from the lower to the highest salaries established by the Minister. Communal salaries are based on an index number which represents a number of points, to each of which is affixed a value in francs. If, for example, the value of a point is established at 25 N.F., the communal employee who has the index number of 100 receives a salary of about 2500 N.F. Salaries may be increased by various compensations, as for residence, low salary, family supplements and dangerous or unhealthy work. Over-time work is also compensated, as are expenses which are incurred in the course of carrying out the job. Communal employees also receive family provisions which are provided by the social security scheme, as for maternity, housing, family allowance, etc.

In regard to advancement in the communal service, an employee may be promoted within his own rank at a regular time schedule established by law, in accordance with his length of employment or he may be promoted more rapidly if he shows special ability. He may also be promoted from one rank to another within the administrative hierarchy. The latter occurs exclusively at the decision of the mayor, who may fill a vacancy at a higher rank either by direct recruitment outside the communal personnel or by choosing from a list of communal employees who are qualified for the higher position. Such a list is drawn up by the mayor with the advice of a communal or inter-communal commission composed of an equal number of mayors and of communal employees selected by their peers.

The general statute establishes nine disciplinary actions which can be taken against municipal employees, ranging from a warning, to suspension, to delay of advancement and finally to dismissal. Although the mayor announces the disciplinary action to be taken against an employee,
the most serious measures are determined by a council which is composed of three councilmen and three representatives of the communal employees. Such a disciplinary council is composed of inter-communal representatives for communes which have less than 40 employees, or of communal representatives, if there are more than 40 public employees. The council is presided over by a sort of Justice of the Peace, which is the oldest such judicial office in the arrondissement. In case of a grave breach of duty or of an infraction of the communal law, the communal employee may be immediately suspended by the mayor before the matter is brought before the disciplinary council. Once suspended, the communal employee may receive his full salary, or it may be reduced or halved.

Communal employees may be in active service; detached service, whereby the employee requests to work in various positions enumerated by the law, or whereby he fills some public elective function, either communal or inter-communal; unattached service, whereby the employee is employed outside the administrative hierarchy and thereby ceases to receive the benefits and the right of advancement and retirement of the communal service; and in military service. All communal employees receive a 30 day paid vacation each year and also have paid sick leave as provided in the law.

Communal employees leave public service for the following reasons: retirement; resignation; honorable discharge, due to lack of ability to carry out the job, exhaustion of sick leave, cessation or abolition of job as decided by vote in order to avoid a disguised dismissal; or dismissal. Employees being honorably discharged are eligible for a pension according to their age and length of service and also have priority for similar available positions in the communal service. In addition, such employees receive one months' pay at the time of discharge.

All communal employees have the right to receive a pension from a pension fund which has been established especially for communal employees and consists of funds paid by both the commune and the employees. The pension is based on the salary attained by the employee six months prior to his retirement and on the number of years he has been in the communal service. In addition, pensioned employees also receive various Social Security benefits.

This, then, is a review of the French administrative machinery. Communal employees are now assured of stable employment and have guarantees against arbitrary actions. As a result of the general statute, there has been established in France a truly public service through which local French administration is carried out.
TRENDS IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN JAPAN

by

MINORU YOSHIDA
Governor of Toyama Prefecture

The most significant trend in local government in Japan today is the increasing scope of local government activities and the expansion of local administrative machinery. Examples of this trend are the transfer of the police and educational functions, which were formerly under the control of the central government, to the local authorities; the creation of commissions for personnel, public safety, election management and local labor; the development of over-all plans for the construction of housing, the adjustment of the food supply, the installation of water, sewage and other public works facilities; and the establishment of social security agencies. Thus, our most important task is to not only meet the increasing demand for administrative activities but to also bring the resultant expanded machinery and the large number of personnel into a more rational, efficient and flexible operation.

Local government administration in Japan is usually organized into several departments, each of which has a chief executive. Each department is, in turn, divided into several sections and each section has several sub-sections. The number of departments on the prefectural level is limited by the Local Autonomy Law in accordance with the prefectural population and varies from a maximum of 10 to a minimum of 5 departments. This limitation is somewhat inconvenient in managing local affairs. For instance, in rural prefectures more sections come under the Department of Agriculture and Forestry, while in urban prefectures more sections are under the Department of Commerce and Industry; the result is an imbalance in the numbers of sections of the various departments. There is, however, no such restriction in the administration of cities, towns and villages.

The administrative machinery of local government has recently become so enlarged and complicated that comprehensive and coordinated planning is required, for one department alone cannot solve all the problems, as it did in former days. For example, should a person wish to secure land for the construction of a factory, he must deal with the Departments of Industry, Agriculture and Civil Engineering; in the prevention of a public nuisance, the jurisdictions of the Departments of Industry, Agri-
culture, Public Health and often of the Police are involved. This means that the old department system is no longer suitable for the smooth execution of local administration. In its place, a new horizontal system has been introduced to facilitate better coordination among the local departments and each local government now has a Planning Board, a General Development Department, and a Governor’s Office or a Mayor’s Office to promote this coordination. For Japan this is quite an innovation.

Under the system of electing a chief executive by popular vote, which is one of the improvements carried out in Japan after World War II, the function of public relations is becoming more and more important in each unit of government. Thus, there are now special sections in each prefectural and municipal government that deal with various phases of an active public relations program. Further innovations are regular evaluation of the administrative process and the development of general plans, sometimes through special sections established for these purposes.

The sole and final goal of any local government should be the realization of a healthy and prosperous community for its residents. To this end the public utilities, such as water, gas, electricity, transportation, etc., have been progressively developing in Japan of late. In principle these public enterprises are operated on a cost basis. Moreover, many local governments are operating public corporations to improve underdeveloped areas and to construct more housing. Although these corporations are now being criticized on the grounds that they do not sufficiently consider the opinions of the local residents, such a state of affairs is inevitable at this stage of progress. It is hoped that in the future there may be more interaction between the two groups.

Now I would like to touch on the problem of promoting efficiency in local government. Democratic, and at the same time efficient, administration is not easy to realize, but it should be, in my opinion, local government’s primary objective. Many local governments are setting up sections, divisions or committees to study the improvement of administrative efficiency and such organs are contributing much to the betterment of our local government. As a result, centralized typing services, purchasing of supplies, payment of wages and salaries, maintenance and allocation of motor vehicles and mail systems are all new measures that have been adopted by many prefectures and larger cities. Many of these measures, however, are still in an early stage of development and leave much to be desired.

As to small cities and towns, they are now interested in rationalizing and bettering their administration through the amalgamation of neighboring cities, towns and villages, a trend that is being encouraged by the Ministry of Autonomy. In addition, there has been a great improvement
in contacts with the public by local government personnel. An example of this is that applications for a "maternal manual", reports of births and the obtaining of milk ration cards, etc. are now all handled by the same office, a measure which has pleased many citizens.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the responsibility for local government administration in Japan is legally concentrated in a chief executive. In practice, of course, much of this responsibility is delegated to subordinate officials. As a result, the higher officials are then freed, to some extent, from routine affairs and can thus devote more of their time to administrative policy-making.
DISCUSSION

Participants in the question and answer and discussion period following the presentations of the three speakers were N. L. Fergusson, Nova Scotia; Kjell T. Evers, Norway; Ngadjijo Prodjo, Indonesia; Prof. R. Dixon, United States; Andres I. Masot, Argentina; José V. de Almeida, Brazil; H. J. Riggenbach, United States; Dr. Vu-Quoc-Thong, Vietnam; Prof. Aguilar, Guatemala and G. Dozza, Italy.

The first question, directed to Mayor Grady, was the following: Are the decisions of administrative officials subject to review? If so, in what manner? Does the "rule of law" apply, or is full discretion usually given such officials? In his answer Mayor Grady said that a distinction must first be made between any administrative ruling which has the force of law and an administrative ruling which is truly internal in the operation of a particular department. In the case of the latter ruling, which would be a purely administrative decision on how a particular job is to be done or how a particular individual employee is going to perform his function, the ruling of the administrative official in Baltimore is, for all practical purposes, final and the mayor seldom, if ever, interferes in the internal working of a particular department. All departments are manned by career personnel who are not subject to political vagaries and consequently are people who have usually been in the city government for many years. As for the "rule of law", a particular administrative ruling cannot violate the powers or the constitutional guarantees established in the city charter, which is the basic law of the City of Baltimore.

Governor Yoshida was asked to describe briefly the organization and function of villages in Japan, the participation of the rural population in village government and the relationship between the people and their village officials. He explained that, in general, the structure of village government was the same as that of the city or town. In the village there is a chief executive, his assistant, a collector of revenue and approximately thirty-three other employees. The villagers are aware of the actions of their local officials and the relationship between the two groups may be considered very close.

The question was asked whether national government incentives, such as loans and grants, would help cities get the cooperation of adjacent governmental units in setting up arrangements whereby the city government may service the entire metropolitan area in such functions as sewage, water, planning, health, etc. Mayor Grady answered that the imposition of higher authority from the state and federal level in the United States would undoubtedly have a beneficial effect in dealing with administrative or executive agencies at the local level, many of which are often jealous of one another and wish to maintain their own prerogatives. Such a system
has already been used in a limited way in the formation of the Regional Planning Council, which includes Baltimore and the surrounding area and which receives some federal funds. The same idea could be carried forward into the areas of sewage, water, health, etc.

In many countries aid from the national government is needed not only by metropolitan areas, but by the rural local governmental units as well. An attempt in this field is the recent establishment in Brazil of the National Service of Assistance to Municipalities, a federal government department which is directly subordinate to the national cabinet. The main goal of this department is to help rural communities located in the interior of the country, in which live 70% of the country’s population, to develop a minimum level of necessary services. Furthermore, a move is also underway to divert more than the present 5% of the national revenue to the local communities. A similar service to local authorities is being provided in Guatemala through the Institute for Municipal Development, which has its own capital and its own budget.

Another topic mentioned was the problem of control over the legality and the equality of the deliberative decisions and the administrative acts of local authorities. In some countries control is exercised through common courts of law; in other countries there is a system of administrative tribunals, with the possibility of appeal to a higher court. If the interests and the rights of the community are to be adequately safeguarded against possible abuses by local authorities, it is important that the control machinery be adequate and the procedure be expeditious.

ASPECTS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION IN CAPE TOWN

by A. H. Honikman, Deputy Mayor, Cape Town, South Africa

Cape Town, the legislative capital of the Union of South Africa, is located at the southern tip of the African continent and has a population of approximately 750,000 people. The city has a heritage of 300 years of local self-government, with the municipal franchise extending to all property owners and occupiers. It is an active, growing city, with great industrial potential.

In attempting to establish the administrative machinery to deal effectively with its large metropolitan area, the City of Cape Town formed The Joint Planning Committee shortly after World War II. This committee deals only with town planning matters which are the concern of more than one local authority and otherwise offers advice only when
it is sought. Membership in this statutory body is voluntary and is open to all local authorities within a given area. Among its features is a technical sub-committee, composed of the town planning officers, surveyors and engineers of the constituent member authorities, whose function is to examine proposals and make recommendations solely from the technical viewpoint. The main committee reports its findings to the local authorities concerned and to the central provincial authority whose approval is required for all town planning proposals in the province.

The Joint Planning Committee, whose status and reputation have grown over the years, fulfills an extremely important function. Primarily, it eliminates much overlapping and duplication of effort and it reduces the possible dissension and discord between neighboring authorities.

While Cape Town has established machinery to deal effectively with planning, it is still seeking a solution to the best way in which compensation can be granted for land required by a local authority for municipal purposes. Formerly a property owner could not develop a site unless he agreed to transfer to the local authority, without compensation, such portion of his land as was required for the widening of proclaimed main roads. However, public opinion has forced the restoration of the principle of compensation, but the problem remains of a fair amount of compensation as well as the question of betterment.

Another problem the city faces is the question of waivers or amendments to town planning restrictions. Whereas it is realized that these restrictions should not be lightly tampered with, there are occasions when their rigid enforcement is unjust or detrimental to the city’s interests. These occur when the nature of the proposed development is such as was never envisaged when the town planning restrictions were framed or where the zone boundaries, arbitrarily placed, perhaps, prejudice good planning or mar healthy site development. The responsible official may hesitate to criticize the zone boundaries recommended by his chief or colleague and the responsible committee may be reluctant to recommend departures from the general plan, in individual cases.

Just as all other cities, Cape Town seeks solutions to certain problems. On the other hand, it has established administrative machinery to deal effectively with other problems. Through an exchange of ideas and experiences with officials in other cities will come, it is hoped, ever new suggestions for dealing effectively with those concerns which are universally common to local government authorities.
SUMMARIES

Following are the summaries of the discussions on the three major topics listed under the general heading of Local Government Structure and Organization. Each was made by a reporter who was selected in advance of the Congress because of his interest and experience in and knowledge of his respective topic. In addition to summarizing the pertinent sessions, the reporters have also indicated new developments with respect to their subject matter and trends which seem indicated for both the near and the distant future.

LEGISLATIVE BODY OR COUNCIL

by

RUy RAMOS
Deputy of the Federal District of Brazil

In the structure of the modern state under any form of government and in any area of the world, the local community continues to exercise an important and growing function, from the standpoint of social stability and economic progress. In the final analysis, that is the heart of the nation in its most real expression. There one finds the geographical basis of the territory and there, too, one finds the family as the epitome of the people as a whole. There can be no strong nation without a workable complex of local authorities. The true democratic spirit of a nation can be judged by the attention it gives to the life and public activities of its municipalities.

With regard to municipal structure, the countries of the world may be divided into two great groups: those in which authority is concentrated under a central government at the expense of the municipal authority and those in which the authority of the government, both national and state, is decentralized through the transfer of an appreciable part of its powers and duties to the local community, together with the appropriate budgetary resources. In the latter group there is, furthermore, a tremendous diversity of types, ranging from those in which special emphasis and predominance are given to urban areas, to those in which rural areas form part of an autonomous administration that takes
full advantage of the political awareness and capacity for leadership of the local population, effectively developing the entire territory and all of the people.

In countries that are underdeveloped or in the process of development, human resources constitute the principal national wealth. More than a country’s territory, much more than its flora and fauna, more than the resources from its soil and sub-soil, more than its mineral, animal or agricultural production, man himself represents the productive source of energy and wealth and the degree of his democratic participation in the machinery of government is indicative of the stage of social and political development of the country.

The local legislative body or the municipal council is the manifestation of this participation. Without positive and effective popular representation in the legislative body of the community, collective participation of the people in government is impossible. Moreover, it should be emphasized that a basic tenet of democratic local government is that municipal councils have for their membership the pick of the best elements of the locality, whether it be city or district, and that the members be drawn from all classes of society. From this local legislative group will normally arise the future administrators and political figures of the state — the governors, the representatives and senators of the national congress, the cabinet officers and not infrequently the chief of state himself. The municipal councilman is thus the potential statesman.

The main feature of public administration in nations today is the over-emphasis placed on the executive branch of government and the minimized importance given to the legislative branch, a fact explained by the increased tempo and the practical dynamism imposed on government activities by the uncertainties of modern life. The people, moreover, making increasing demands in progressively more sophisticated ways, force a corresponding rhythm of activity on their governments, which might today be called “telegraphic, aerodynamic, mechanized, radioactive or multi-valent.” Only a highly concentrated form of executive authority is capable of meeting these needs, and only by using the most rapid processes, such as deeds without words and direct thinking without the rhetorical processes of verbal debate. In reaching such a point, a grave danger is created and an alternative is presented between political and economic dictatorships on the one hand and collective participation in progressive development on the other hand. All people must have access to the genuine democratic processes that result from equal economic opportunity and equal opportunity to enjoy the benefits of education and of a good life, or the dynamic and non-privileged minorities will come to leadership by the forces of their political aptitude or the weight of their economic resources.
In the development of this phenomena, the legislative authority of the community is the fulcrum, the point of departure for planning, the weather-vane of popular trends and the compass by which the aspirations and social concerns of the peoples are guided. When the municipal council or the legislative body at any level, as the representative organ of the community, is not sufficiently sensitive to the vociferous demands of the majority and, above all, to their unexpressed yearnings and hidden grievances, there will be a transfer of representation, and authority now reposed in the legislative body will tend to be shifted to the executive authority that is nearest at hand, ready-made and visible, more closely in touch with the impulses and spirit of the multitude. In this fact can be found the so-called logic of dictatorships.

These brief comments will serve to point out and focus attention on the significance and unique value of the legislative body, from that of the municipal council in the local community to the vast sphere of the national congress. It is unnecessary to refer to or recite the history of the legislative body throughout its struggles in time and space, nor is there any advantage in examining and commenting on how certain of them function now. It would perhaps be more useful to point out certain functions that the legislative authority ought to perform if it is to survive and to continue to exert a beneficial influence.

The primary function of a legislative body, if it is to transform trends and needs into legislative acts, must be that of integration, the true representation of social realities as they appear. If political representation classifies man by color or education, religion or ideology, by object or subject, by class or caste or by sex, the resulting government will not be democratic. Rather will it be discriminatory, deficient and therefore unjust, full of friction and incapable of leading to a lasting peace. Thus, the community as a whole, be it district, municipality, state or nation, must form a legislative body. Only in this way can there be a democratic government of the people, by the people and for the people.

The second requirement for the success of a council must be the celerity of its legislative processes. It is clear that the council as an organ composed of more than one individual must always function more slowly than the executive authority. However, nothing can justify in the eyes of the people the slow progress of proposals and ordinances that are adopted in such manner and at such times as in the end to fail to meet the desires of the people in general. The council must be given technical resources adequate to speed up its legislative processes and to increase the means of public information and education so that the people may follow the progress of its legislative activity day by day and with the help of radio, television and the press, and form their own opinions of the value,
cost, timeliness and possible effects of the measures proposed and those adopted and rejected. For this purpose it is essential that there be a highly qualified technical staff with authority to decide on the matters requiring action, accelerate progress on those considered worthwhile and facilitate the limitation of those that should be postponed or shelved.

The third requirement of the council must be its independence. This fundamental requirement would mean, with respect to the councilman or alderman, a decent salary which would ensure him of the dignity appropriate to his office and enjoyment of the immunity accorded to the members of state and national assemblies. The members of the local councils are just as representative of the people as are state and federal deputies and senators.

With respect to the council as a corporation, independence would result from budgetary appropriations of its own which would equip that body for its functions of planning, financial control, socio-economic surveys by labor groups and technical commissions, administrative investigations and the drafting of special local or regional development programs. Appropriations for the legislative branch are always minimal compared with the allotments to the executive branch. Just now in Brazil the recent budget proposed for the 1962 fiscal year allocates only 0.4% of the tax revenue of the nation to the legislative branch. The legislative branch is always generous in providing funds and appropriations for the full exercise of the powers of the executive branch, but it is always stingy in providing itself with the means for expanding, improving and carrying out the heavy burdens incumbent on itself.

This brief report does not purport to be technical, nor is there the slightest intention of establishing standards of juridical conduct for the legislative branch of any nation. It is merely intended to open debate concerning an old, yet ever new subject: that of popular representation in its many forms and manifestations.
In trying to think through the important ideas presented in the discussion on trends affecting the executive, I have found it impossible to isolate this theme from the discussion of either the council or the administrative machinery with which there is a clear inter-relationship and interplay. In the United States we call this interplay between the legislative council and the executive a system of checks and balances, and despite forebodings to the contrary, there seems to be a clear universal trend to strengthen the executive. Governor Yoshida of Japan brought out in his report the obvious reason, which is the increasing demands for services which require firm direction and which call for a strong coordinative hand.

I was interested by the frank avowal in the discussion of the political role of the executive in municipal government. And from statements made I found reinforcement for the feeling I have had as a participant and observer in government of the importance of the political leadership of the municipal executive, without which the career civil servant cannot play his proper role. Too, I sensed a strong recognition that the role of the municipal executive is to initiate proposals for action, to put forward programs for consideration by the legislative body and to seek popular support for them.

I was very grateful to hear from one of our participants from the United States, Professor Bromage, the strong statement that efficiency is not the only goal of local government and I say that I was glad to hear this from a fellow from the United States, because I suspect that in many countries of the world we seem to be always talking about efficiency. Therefore, I am glad that our discussion brought out that local government carries responsibility for more than efficient performance of services. Mr. Sarpong of Ghana suggested that in his country it also carried a responsibility to further the social and economic development of the country. Mayor Grady of Baltimore said strongly that it must also assure the liberties of the citizen. Only once or twice did I hear the reference to a business corporation, that we must be efficient in municipal government like a business corporation, and I am glad that I only heard that
once or twice because it seems to me invalid. Public action is not like a business corporation. It is political and it will and must remain political.

May I just clarify the sense in which the American participants in the discussion used the phrase “a strong mayor”, which refers to certain legal powers that he has to distinguish him from being merely the presiding officer of the council. A strong mayor has the power to hire and fire; to present a program, through the budget; and the power to veto legislative enactments of the council. I think the debates made clear that in this day of more demands upon municipal government for service, even the strong mayor needs help, support and staff. Mayor Morrison of New Orleans, who is now in his fourth term of office, offered the statement that the strong mayor had three roles to play and I was greatly interested that Mr. Evers, reporting for the Scandinavian countries, distinguished the three-headed executive in the Scandinavian countries. Mayor Morrison spoke of the role of the mayor as political leader to carry the program to the voters and to present to the administrative corps of the city what the voters want; the ceremonial officer — Mayor Morrison spoke of it as being the salesman for the city — and then thirdly, the chief executive.

If I understood Mr. Evers’ report correctly, in the Scandinavian countries the chairman of the municipal council is being displaced in importance by the chairman of the executive board, which is a smaller group, and in at least one or two of the Scandinavian countries, is a career executive. So here is an interesting blending of the career executive with the chairmanship of the policy-making body.

I drew from the debates the strong emphasis that the central role of the executive is coordination; on this point both Governor Yoshida and Mayor Grady agreed. Mayor Grady pointed out the different directions in which the mayor, as chief executive, must seek to bring friends together, not only within the city departments under him, but in relations of the city to the state above it and, as he said, horizontally in relations with the other municipal governments around him.

Sir Francis Hill told us that in Britain it was perfectly clear that there was no blur, as he put it, between policy and administration. This is a formula we hear so often, that the legislature makes policy and it is the role of the executive to administer it. I have never found that distinction very helpful. To me the only helpful definition of policy and administration is one proposed by Paul Appleby, who has had a distinguished career as administrator and teacher of administration in the United States. Mr. Appleby suggested some years ago: “Administration is any matter that can be settled at my level or below. Policy is any matter that is called up for higher review.” The trouble is, of course, that in the kind
of setting in which municipal officers work in our society, you never can
tell in advance which action will be called up for political review. This
is not an intellectually satisfying definition, but it is — as we would say
in my country — operational. I should like to develop this point because
this blur between policy and administration may be the cause of a point
that was brought out in the question period in one of our debates: Is
there not a divided loyalty of the career city employees between the
executive and the council committees in countries like Great Britain or in
Scandinavia where an executive board or a council committee seems to
have an important hand in defining action? And the statement was made
by the speaker to the question: “Yes, there is the appearance of a divided
loyalty.” Well, I think that appearance of divided loyalty arises out of
this very fact that one cannot truly distinguish usefully policy and ad-
ministration.

I was also interested in the reports we had from various parts of the
world about the election or the appointment of the municipal executive —
and I bring into this summary the statements both by Mr. Sarpong of
Ghana and Lord Mayor Yuvapurna of Bangkok, that we should avoid
judgment that it is superior to elect or appoint, that one is morally
sounder than another. The Lord Mayor of Bangkok told us of the proud
tradition of service to the people of the appointed Lords Mayor of Bangkok
and correctly reminded us that the Board of Commissioners of the District
of Columbia are appointed, not elected, that the burgomasters in many of
the European countries and the prefects in some of the European coun-
tries are appointed, but not elected. I know this would be particularly
pertinent to Mr. Sarpong’s point that at the stage of independence of
some of the new African countries, it was still necessary to bridge over
the old traditional tribal organization, to carry the people into a new
understanding of government. And during this period, perhaps appoint-
ment may be important, rather than just the slogan of election.

In his opening statement, Burgomaster van Walsum of Rotterdam
reminded us of the great tradition in the Netherlands of the burgomaster
who is appointed by the Crown. I was interested in the same context
in the answer of Professor Bromage, who has long been a city councilman
in his university town of Ann Arbor, when he stated frankly that in
municipal elections in the United States not a very high percentage of the
eligible voters cast their ballots. Twice as many will vote every four years
in the election for president as will usually vote in their election for local
government and in many of our states we deliberately put the election
of local officials in a different year from the election of the president to
avoid the dominance of national politics over local issues. On the other
hand, I remind you that both Councilman Bromage and another one of
the speakers pointed out that while the electors may not vote in large
numbers, they will make very clear to their councilman their pleasure or displeasure over his acts.

The last point I would like to emphasize, growing out of the discussion on the structure and organization of local government, was that from every part of the world we have heard the need to re-think the role of the executive because of the emergence of the metropolitan problem. I take this occasion to show that even when we were talking about local government structure and organization we drifted into talking about the need to have larger areas. Mr. Sarpong of Ghana said that before the Local Government Act of 1956 there were 286 local government units in Ghana; now they have been reduced to about 10 urban areas and 56 rural areas. Here we have in the evolving society of Ghana the need already to deal with larger areas in common services and government. Mayor Wagner stressed this as a problem in his opening statement, Mayor Grady of Baltimore stressed it and I end my summary on the note that this one subject that we talked about for four or five sessions could not avoid dealing with this other problem of the conurbations, which also appears as a problem even in a country like Ghana which, in my ignorance, I would not have thought would already be faced by the metropolitan problem.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY

by

GEORGE S. MOONEY
Executive Director,
Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities

During these recent days we have been conducting what amounts to a laboratory examination of local government in the western world. We have examined the trends that are developing and the changes that are taking place in its structure and the methods and practices employed in administering the functions and responsibilities assigned to it.

Our inquiry has taken us to many places. We have learned about the developments which are transpiring in Greater London, New York, Tokyo and other major urban conurbations in Europe, Asia and North and South America. We have been informed about the patterns and methods of local government administration in the village settlements of the newer self-governing nations of Africa and Southeast Asia where local self-government is of comparatively recent origin. We have been told that while there is much universal similarity in the structure and methods of administration there is also much diversity, not only as between one country and another, but also within individual countries.

The over-all impression that we have gleaned is that local government in its forms and administrative organization and methods of management is in a state of flux; that even where it has been long established, a transition of sorts is in process; that everywhere adaptation and adjustment to new sets of conditions and circumstances is taking place. Change is the universal phenomenon of our age and nowhere is this more manifest than with respect to urban government and its administration.

Our inquiry has been salutary. It has revealed to us that what has proven to be successful in one particular situation will not necessarily be equally successful in another situation and, in some situations, perhaps not successful at all. There are many factors which influence and determine the wisdom of this or that particular form or structure of local government or of this or that method of municipal administration or management. The many variations which exist in the many systems of local government throughout the world are in large measure a reflection of the history and tradition and of the habits and customs of different people who have developed their forms of local government.
out of different backgrounds, different circumstances and at different times.

In their search for better ways to operate their administrative machinery a number of cities have undertaken comprehensive surveys or reviews of their organizational and administrative structure and of their management practices, procedures and methods. Each separate survey has revealed particular and sometimes peculiar management and organizational deficiencies and inefficiencies. They clearly indicate that some sort of a house-cleaning was long overdue. And this, not because of wilful maladministration, but merely because over the years insufficient attention had been paid to the departmental and inter-departmental administrative functions and responsibilities.

Some of the facts revealed by these surveys, but not necessarily by all of them, indicated the following:

1. Parkinson’s Law tends to be affirmed insofar as large city governments are concerned.

2. Some departments overlapped and some duplicated some of the other departments and within departments overlapping functions were frequently found.

3. Unnecessary paper work characterized many administrative operations.

4. Some departments were over-staffed and a few were under-staffed.

5. Some municipal employees carried an excessive work load and some, apparently, carried no load at all.

6. There was insufficient inter-departmental clearance and cooperation on matters involving two or more departments.

7. There was a tendency for department heads and their subordinates to set up what amounted to insular independent bureaucratic kingdoms.

8. Multiple manpower was being employed in operations that could be performed more efficiently and more economically by office machines.

9. The purchasing practices of some of the cities surveyed was time-consuming, cumbersome and costly to the municipal government. There was no centralized purchasing, no competitive bidding, no centralized stores and no inventory control.

10. Personnel recruitment, in-training, merit promotions and those other practices of good employer-employee relations left much to be desired. Team work was the exception rather than the rule.
These and other findings, some major, some minor, brought out into the open what many people had been saying about the inefficiencies of large city government. And what goes for the larger cities probably goes for the smaller ones as well. It will not be an easy task to bring order out of the confusion that frequently typifies the municipal administrative machine, or to smooth out and rationalize the complicated procedures that too often have developed within the administrative operations, or to restore to a logical balance the relative staff needs of this or that municipal function. The reorganization of the municipal administration will take time and it will require patient effort and much wisdom.

Without it being stated, there was a strong indication in the many statements made by various speakers during the conference that the management function of municipal administration needs strengthening. One sensed, too, that there is a growing awareness that management as such is not the proper responsibility of the elected council or of its members. If the idea of the municipal manager is not wholly acceptable everywhere it is nonetheless something of the sort that is needed even in the smaller village communities. And even where tradition is sacrosanct the concept of the professional municipal manager appears to have gained some measure of acceptance.

This is not the place to enter into a discussion of the comparative merits of administration through council committees as against administration by a trained professional municipal manager, but certainly the trend appears to be developing and, as it develops, there will develop alongside of it a need for a very clear demarcation between the role and responsibility of the manager and the role and responsibility of the municipal council. Even in those countries where the manager system has taken firm hold the line between the legislative function and the manager-administrative function is sometimes blurred and uncertain. Government by a locally appointed bureaucrat in the form of a municipal manager can be just as disastrous without the checks and balances of a responsible locally elected council as government administered through the authority of a central government appointee in whom is vested the overriding bureaucracy of the government which appointed him.

Turning for a moment to another aspect of the administrative machinery, concerning which not too much was mentioned during the conference, let us examine briefly some of the general and large-scale measures which have been taken in recent years in the field of standardizing municipal practices and the centralization of municipal service. The following examples are based on either United States or Canadian experience although other examples can be found elsewhere.

In the field of standardizing municipal practices perhaps the best examples have been in the finance, accounting, assessment and related
fields. Much of this has come about from the need to develop uniform finance reporting methods for federal and state (or provincial) government purposes. And related to this requirement was the need for comparative reporting on a uniform basis for the purpose of providing common information requested by other municipal governments and such other bodies as research and investment organizations.

Partly as a by-product of the need for standardized and uniform municipal finance reporting, but not solely for this reason, there has developed a wide range of standardized practices in the municipal finance and related fields. Perhaps the most significant development has been with respect to municipal budgets and budget control. With regard to budget control, a recent requirement has produced what has come to be known as a performance budget. It is a technique of budgetary cost analysis and control that allows a municipal administration to know precisely how much money is available for spending, where and when, in every department or division or section or sub-section of the municipal over-all annual financial operation. The adoption of a performance budget would go a long way in solving the annual financial headaches that most municipal administrations suffer from.

Standardized practices have also come to be accepted in the engineering and municipal construction field, in the organization and internal administration of police and fire departments, in the operations of municipal civil service commissions and, in fact, in most areas of municipal endeavor. Standardization implies what, in fact, it most frequently is, namely a better, more efficient and more economical way of conducting the business of running a municipality.

With respect to the centralization of municipal services, this can and does take two forms. There is the centralization of municipal services in fewer municipal buildings and the centralizing through combining two or more departments or services under a single administrative head or in consolidation of a decentralized municipal function into one function and responsibility. Examples that may be cited are the combining, for purposes of administration, of the police and fire departments into a single Department of Public Safety, and the centralizing of all municipal purchasing into a single department under a single department head. The latter is a practice which undoubtedly has improved the efficiency of municipal purchasing and has saved municipal governments large sums of money.

A final matter which rightly deserves mention in any discussion of the administrative machinery is that of the human function, without which the administrative machinery, no matter how much it is mechanized or automated, could not operate.

Perhaps no group of people anywhere suffer more from the universal and endemic disease of "brief-take-home-itis" than do senior municipal
officials and their supporting staff. It may be that it’s in the nature of the job and that it will always be that way. But if this is so, it is a costly burden to bear not only to the individuals concerned but to the municipal governments which employ them.

If our cities and towns are to be administered efficiently, then we have to do far more than we are presently doing to reduce the work load of our senior officials and enable them to exercise a more effective control of the manifold duties for which we hold them responsible.

Any improvement in the administrative machinery must provide for clearer lines of administrative control, for simpler and more direct inter-departmental relations and coordination, for the elimination of all unnecessary paper work, for the standardization wherever possible of municipal practices, for more effective budgetary control, for the intelligent use of machines and automation, and for the maximum preservation of the mental and physical health of those engaged in the administrative management of local government.
Mr. Emil Sady of the United Nations speaks at the Closing Session of the Congress.

Mr. A. Konan Kanga, Mayor of Abidjan, presents the key to his city to Mr. Robert E. McLaughlin, Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the Washington Congress.
PROBLEMS OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

In this section are included four major speeches concerning various aspects of today's phenomena, the conurbation, and a summary of the subsequent general discussion. The chairman of this seminar was Dr. Luther Gulick, President of the Institute of Public Administration, New York City, and the reporter was George H. Deming, Director of the Conference on Metropolitan Area Problems, New York City. Mr. Deming's final summary contained the major points stressed by each of the speakers as well as those which arose during the discussion period.

THE PROJECTION OF URBAN GROWTH

by

EDWARD CONNOR

City Councilman of Detroit, Michigan

I am not a population expert, but I do want to quote a few figures which I find very impressive. First, every 60 seconds 180 births take place in the world. The result is that at the end of the year there are 90 million people born throughout the world. As the death rate is only about half of the birth rate, this means that at the end of each year there are 47 million more people on earth than there were 12 months earlier — a number which is more than the entire population of France. This is something new in the history of the world, for from 1850 to 1950 the world birth rate was less than 1 %, but from 1950 until now the rate has increased to almost 2 %. This means that by the year 2000, just 39 years away, the world population will be 6 billion, 300 million people, or more than 2½ times today's world population.

As we go down a listing of the cities throughout the world we find that most of them have grown tremendously in the last 10 to 20 years; a few have lost population. In my own city of Detroit, for example, there has been a population loss of 150,000 within the city limits during the past 10 years; within the entire metropolitan area of Detroit, however, the population increased by more than 800,000 people. This indicates another population trend which is worth noting: it is estimated that 4/5 of the
population growth in the United States is taking place in metropolitan areas and of that growth, 4/5 is taking place in the suburbs or communities surrounding the core or central city. It is stated by responsible observers that by 1957, 80% or more of the population in the United States will reside in 19 great metropolitan areas.

This great population explosion which affects everyone directly will result in tremendous strains being placed on government, and particularly on local government, as demands arise for new homes and jobs and more educational, hospital, water and sewer facilities. This brings into sharp perspective the importance of local government and the work it is doing, for it is the local government which affects people daily, in every phase of their living. Moreover, it is local government that operates under the direct observation and supervision of the people it serves.

We must then ask ourselves if the structures of local government are adapted to the needs of the changing world. Are we at the local level utilizing the modern inventions of communications and of transportation to facilitate the exchange of information within the community and to permit the type of participation by the people of the community that will enable us to mobilize the total strength and brain power of all our citizens in creating the kind of community in which we would like to live and to work? Has local government the financial ability to meet the cost of providing these facilities and others that I have mentioned?

Let me speak for a minute in terms of Detroit, for many of the problems we face there are the same ones confronting local government officials in towns and cities throughout the world. Our greatest concern is that of urban blight, which already affects 1/3 of the residential area of the city; another third of the city consists of conservation areas, or residential areas which are still good but are rapidly deteriorating. The last third of the city area contains very fine residential sections. On the outskirts of the city new communities are being built at a very rapid rate, with the result that within the next ten years 300 square miles of what is now farm land will be converted into urbanized areas or, in other words, within the coming decade two cities the size of Detroit will be added to the metropolitan area. Unfortunately, in these developing areas every mistake that's ever been made in the building of cities and communities is being repeated all over again. Some ceiling has got to be placed immediately on the creation of future slums or in the building of areas that carry within themselves the seeds of their destruction within a few years.

Another problem Detroit is facing is that of transportation needs, especially expressways and main thoroughfares. The difference in cost between building such roads on land that has already been built up or on building them on vacant land which has been set aside by advance
planning involves savings of billions of dollars. The same savings apply
to the provision from the beginning of adequate sewer facilities for the
projected population figure.

Among the positive actions that have taken place in Detroit are the
building of a modern convention center and the development of a civic
center that includes, among other things, a city-county government build-
ing. There have also been established "three tools of democracy," the first
of which is a regional planning agency whose work is to plan the physical
structure of the southeastern portion of Michigan, an area that covers
more than 4,000 square miles and involves six counties. Established in
1945, the Regional Planning Commission is supported by the local govern-
ments of the area. It is composed of 48 members, half of whom are such
representatives of the constituent governmental units as mayors, council-
men, city and township assessors, engineers, etc. The other 24 members
represent various social and economic interests in the community, such
as education, labor, industry and business.

Another "tool of democracy" in the Detroit area is the Supervisors'
Inter-County Committee. For seven years now the members of this group,
who represent six different counties, have been meeting to discuss inter-
governmental problems and relations. The thesis behind this arrangement
is that before we develop new tools of government we should attempt
to use to the fullest the tools of agencies of government that already
exist. It is supposed that each unit working together according to a com-
mon plan can arrive at regional solutions to regional problems, using
already existing levels of units of government.

The Southeastern Michigan Metropolitan Community Research Coun-
cil is the third "tool of democracy." This is a group of 40 people, half
of whom represent governmental interests and half business interests.
On the council serve such people as Walter Reuther, Henry Ford, the
presidents of the four major motor companies, the presidents of the four
large universities in Michigan and representatives of local government.
Funds for the work of the Council include a Ford Foundation grant, in
addition to contributions from governmental and private sources. The
purpose of this organization is to study the social, economic and govern-
mental structure, the taxing arrangements, etc. of the entire area in an
effort to develop programs, techniques, ideas and recommendations which
can be put into effect in the local community.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize that there is a need not only
for local, state and world-wide organizations to provide a better exchange
of information on local government problems and solutions, but for better
mechanics as well to facilitate this exchange. Moreover, an impetus
should be given to research in terms of problems of local government and
how government and the people it represents can do a better job. As a beginning, each community might become a laboratory for developing better ways of serving people as well as a demonstration center in which others can learn how it is possible to develop a kind of living situation that would provide a better life for every individual in the community.
Modern city life has proved so successful that it is in danger of destroy­ing itself, if only through strangulation by the traffic it creates. This has forced into public prominence the question of how the city can survive and, as a first step to an answer, how its local government should be organised.

The large urban aggregations have developed in two ways. The simpler, which may be called the metropolitan area, is by concentric growth from a single centre; the second, which is a true conurbation, is the running together of several expanding centres to form one urban mass. As a result, the conurbation is too often administered by a complex group of local authorities, frequently of differing status and powers, whose areas inter­lock untidily.

How to organise a satisfactory system of local government for these major urban areas is a question to which much thought has been given everywhere. Various bold solutions have been proposed; but in few places have more than partial remedies been attempted, usually by more or less formalised federation of existing local authorities, which themselves are otherwise left unchanged.

London is an illustration of most of the problems the conurbation faces and many of the possible solutions that have been tried to meet them. For purposes of definition, three concentric areas may be distinguished: the City of London, one square mile in area, with a night population of 5,000 and a workday one of half a million: the Administrative County of London, 117 square miles in extent with a resident population of 3 1/3 million, increased daily by a further million coming in from the suburbs to work; and Greater London, the built-up area within the green belt, which ex­tends to some 825 square miles with a population of approximately 8 1/2 million people.

Because the original settlement, the City, did not extend its local government as the town expanded beyond its boundaries, the outlying areas were inadequately administered by the rural local authorities, sup­plemented by ad hoc authorities. For example, to provide protection over
an extensive area. Parliament established in 1829 the Metropolitan Police which were placed under a Commissioner appointed by and responsible to the central government. Moreover, the authority to provide for sanitary needs and the lighting and maintenance of roads was conferred on local boards. These in turn elected members of the Metropolitan Board of Works which had over-all responsibility for such services. Later the Metropolitan Board of Works was superseded by the London County Council and the local boards were replaced by the present 28 metropolitan borough councils.

Other ad hoc authorities that were established are the Metropolitan Water Board, set up in 1902 and consisting of members appointed by the local authorities within its supply area, and the Port of London Authority, which was created in 1908 and which consists of members who are partly appointed by the central and local governments and partly elected by traders using the port. In addition, in 1924 the London and Home Counties Traffic Advisory Committee was appointed to represent the local authorities and other interests concerned with traffic and transport. On the other hand, a number of services formerly provided by local authorities, such as public transport, gas and electricity, and hospitals, have been nationalised and so taken out of the field of local government.

Local government commissions have begun to review the areas of the major local authorities. Only recently a report was received from a Royal Commission which was established in 1957 to study Greater London, with the exception of the administration of the police, water supply, public transport and hospitals. The Commission recommended that the existing local authorities, which include three county boroughs, or one-tier areas in which the council administers all local government services, plus the two-tier system, whereby administration is shared by five county councils and some 70 borough and district councils, be replaced. In its stead, the Commission proposed a two-tier system consisting of 52 borough councils with populations of 100,000 to 250,000 and a directly elected Greater London Council of some 100 members. There would be a redistribution of powers, with only those essentially metropolitan in nature being vested in the Greater London Council. Publicly these proposals have received a mixed reception and a number of alternative schemes have been proposed. The Government, however, has not yet announced its attitude on the proposals.

Outside London the Local Government Commission has considered the West Midlands conurbation and has tentatively recommended its division among a small number of one-tier, all-purpose authorities that would deal with common problems through joint committees. But here the urban area is a true conurbation and lacks the feeling of a common local patriotism which characterises the concentrically developed Greater London.
These examples from England illustrate the main forms of local government organisation so far adopted for metropolitan areas. The simplest is informal consultation among the local authorities. The result may be that one authority then extends its services to cover the areas of others, or joint bodies composed of representatives of the local authorities may be established which possess either consultative functions or have joint executive responsibility for particular services. More frequently an *ad hoc* authority is created with a directly elected or appointed membership, this often being an easier way of meeting the need for a particular service for the whole area than the radical reorganisation of the general local authorities.

The main types of organisation which local government may follow in major urban areas are as follows: first, a one-tier system may be adopted in which a single general authority provides all local services in the area. A variation of this may be the division of the area into sections in each of which an all-purpose authority is established, with the common interests of the whole being looked after through joint committees. Secondly, a two-tier system can be established; under this plan a metropolitan authority provides services appropriate to the whole area and a number of local authorities administer more local services. The metropolitan authority members may be directly elected by the electorate or indirectly elected by the second-tier authorities.

Which type of organisation is suitable for a given area depends on several factors, among which are: What services are nationally recognised as falling within the scope of local government as opposed to central government or private enterprise? What are the national traditions in relation to the system of local government? As for the latter point, in the British tradition local government must reconcile technical efficiency with democratic control. The result is that committees composed of the elected council members personally direct the administration of local government services. Moreover, constituencies are relatively small and membership of councils is relatively large. Another factor to be considered is the area in which a metropolitan organisation should be established. For regional planning the whole area is one, but need other metropolitan services be extended over the same area under the direction of one metropolitan authority?

Perhaps we must re-examine the familiar arguments about responsiveness and remoteness in government. Modern means of communication and other technical developments destroy some of the assumptions on which the structure of local self-government has everywhere been based as well as create novel problems and opportunities for their solution. Nowhere is our faith in local government and our ingenuity in organisation
challenged more directly than in the conurbations and metropolitan areas. We shall be judged by how we tackle them, since the alternative to efficient and democratic means of providing them with the local services they need will be the supersession of local government by other forms of organisation able to ensure the efficiency which the present patchwork of authorities must too often fail to give.
We administrators are often so deeply involved in putting policies into action that we sometimes lose sight of the goals of our activity. This is particularly true in the field of urban affairs. For administrators in this field are not — as perhaps we sometimes imagine ourselves — architects of national destiny. We do not shape the future. Rather we ride the crest of movements so vast we don’t begin to understand them. And the best we can hope to do is to try to make life tolerable in the midst of them.

Vast population movements toward the urban areas are taking place everywhere in the world today. The reasons for this movement are very complex and indicate that our civilization has entered a new stage of development whose final form is as yet unknown. Moreover, this development has taken place under a variety of national government systems, from the communist forced collectivization and industrialization, to the capitalist laissez faire, and all degrees inbetween.

The indication seems to be that urban development, as we witness it throughout the world, does not depend in any fundamental way upon national policy. But that national policy in any country — communist, socialist or capitalist; democracy, monarchy or dictatorship — must reflect the impact of this vast, world-wide shifting of peoples.

This topic which was assigned to me seems somehow to imply that urban affairs are just now becoming issues of national policy; this is not quite true. Throughout history there were cities long before there were nations; many nations are, in fact, but creations of the cities. The Soviet Union is but the vast extension over centuries and continents of Moscow, the British Empire had its center in London and the United States has emerged from the federation of a handful of colonial cities scattered along the Atlantic shore.

In the case of America, the national government concerned itself with those things which the scattered cities had in common — national defense, foreign relations and commerce between the states. In 1916 the farm
population of the country first began to decline; even before then, in 1892, the national Congress began looking into the problem of urban slums. It was during the depression of the 1930's, however, that the national government became involved on a large scale in urban affairs with the primary purpose of stimulating the economy. Thus, a large-scale public works program was launched, slums began to be demolished, public housing was built and experimentation was begun on the building of model towns. In addition, a system of government insurance on home mortgages was created and an agency established to provide a secondary market for mortgages.

After World War II America was faced with a huge housing shortage. The national government, through a series of measures liberalizing mortgage credit, acted to induce the private housing industry to meet that shortage. Moreover, under a new system of slum clearance, private redevelopment rather than public housing was undertaken. This was a program almost identical to that undertaken in Denmark in 1939 and both countries encountered the same difficulties.

In both countries the cities were encouraged to use their power of eminent domain to condemn slum areas, clear them and sell them to private redevelopers. In both countries the national government paid a share of the loss resulting from the resale. In both the new owners had government assistance in obtaining mortgages at low rates of interest for rebuilding. Despite all this, however, the areas were redeveloped in luxury apartments or commercial structures. In both countries the program was severely condemned for displacing the poor to provide facilities for the rich.

In recent years the United States Congress has gradually broadened the activities of the national government in urban renewal. The national government also assists cities, through loans and grants, in such fields as urban planning, highways, hospitals, airports and sewage treatment plants. Loans are made, in fact, for nearly every kind of public facility if private financing is not available.

Most of the activities of the United States government in urban affairs are carried out by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Demand has grown, however, for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing to coordinate and consolidate those activities. It can thus be pointed out that in the United States urban development is only emerging as an issue of national policy. The reason for this late emergence, however, is due to the country's peculiar pattern of urban development, for the United States was largely settled by rural people who had a real distrust of the city. Not only the national capital of Washington, but many state capitals as well, were built up far from any city and its influence.
In the older areas of the world urban development has ebbed and flowed as great tides of population moved inward toward the cities, then dispersed again in the wake of great disasters — invasions, earthquakes, plagues, famines or fire. The city of Amman, now the capital of Jordan, is an interesting example of this point. Thus, the national governments in the older areas of the world are a far more recent development than cities and were, in fact, created in cities, by cities and for cities.

Urban renewal, with which the American government has been experimenting for the past few years, is an old story for many other governments, as witness London after the fire of 1666, the rebuilding of Paris by Baron Hausmann at the time of Napoleon II and the rebuilding of cities ravaged by the past World War. Whereas the emergence of urban development as an issue of national policy is therefore not new, what is new is the great momentum which has developed behind this movement of urbanization — a momentum which has been building up for centuries and shows every sign of continuing to build and build and build in the decades ahead.

The implications for the future are frightening at times. What will it be like when urbanization is complete? Will our worlds be nothing but island cities where men live in an environment entirely of their own creation? And between those islands will there be nothing but highways and mechanical outposts... and the world that was there before men? Fortunately the history of our civilization has been that it never really reaches the extremes towards which it seems headed.

To those who, like myself, do not pretend to know what hidden forces in the future may bring us back toward some more comfortable middle ground, there is hope and encouragement in history’s lesson that such forces have operated in the past. I’m sure they will bring us to a happier and more balanced future than the one foreseen by the Cassandras of our time.
Professor Schaeffer concluded his background paper on Metropolitan Areas with these words: "Apart from the issues of war and peace, no greater challenge faces the leaders of the world today than that of resolving how additional billions of people are going to reside happily and productively on this planet in the decades ahead."

Despite this warning we, as local communities, and we, as communities of nations, seem to move at an agonizingly slow pace in our efforts to relate our political institutions to the economic and social realities of our current and projected patterns of human settlement. Particularly is this true in North America today, and especially in Canada.

This attitude is not unexpected. In our short history the dominant outlook has been one of community objectives consisting of the sum total of independent personal initiative and accomplishment. The compelling need for identifying the individual's desires and needs with those of his society is only now beginning to have practical meaning for our (schizophrenic) society. That the object of economic activity is the provision of a satisfactory environment for an urban population is looked upon as only incidental to the primary purpose of accomplishing the entrepreneurial act.

This strong separation between the concept of a private person and a "public" person pervades every field. Thus, in metropolitan planning the dominant objective is one of trying to describe what is likely to happen as a result of undirected private action and then plan the public works required to serve the resulting development, hoping that the public can afford the results, in terms of dollars mainly, since we do not attempt, as yet, to seriously define community objectives and to design measures for reaching those objectives.

However unprepared we may be to face the urban age, we must nevertheless try to not persist in attitudes and methods proven to be inadequate.
for today and certainly for tomorrow. Moreover, a basic review is needed of the role of the various levels of government. In Canada and the United States, for example, prestige, status and leadership are associated with the national government, and in several instances with state or provincial governments. In both countries, where approximately two-thirds of the people live and work in metropolitan areas, a more adequate concept of national government might well be a federation of large metropolitan governments. The present state or provincial governments would then have residual powers only for the non-urban territory. Thus, each metropolitan corporation, as well as each rural province, would be responsible for coordination within its own territory, while the national government would assume responsibility for and deal directly with these corporations and provinces.

The bulk of our gross national product is produced in cities. However, the share of this product which is available for public purposes is collected and distributed, in the main, by the national and provincial governments, and is therefore allocated only to such purposes which are common to rural and urban areas. The planned use of social capital at the urban or local level can only be effectively accomplished when related to allocation policies at the national level that are increasingly geared to the needs of an urban society.

Within the metropolitan area the most rational approach to coordination of the use of available resources is to be found in a system which recognizes that there are numerous facilities required that are common to the urban area as a whole. Among examples which may be cited where such coordination within an urban area does not exist or is partially provided by single-purpose agencies are air pollution control, the provision of transportation facilities, parks, conservation, flood control, sanitary sewers and waste disposal.

Coordination between different functions can only be brought about when all agencies operating in a metropolitan area are responsible to one metropolitan government, as is being attempted in Metropolitan Toronto. In that urban area two principles are adhered to: functions that can be performed by the local units of government are left with those governments, and the new metropolitan government is not separated from local leadership because the governing body consists of the heads of the local governments. In this way conflicts between the local and metropolitan governments are reduced.

Along with this organizational structure went assertive leadership of the new federation. The boundary problem was temporarily solved and the planning of much needed facilities was immediately begun. In addition a ten year capital construction program was adopted and has been consis-
ently extended each year for the ensuing ten years. Under this program the local municipalities may borrow funds to undertake capital expenditures only when the Metropolitan Corporation gives its approval for the issuance of debentures or bonds for local purposes. On the other hand, the local municipalities are aware of the annual and ten year programs of the Metropolitan Corporation and can then relate programs in terms of function and time.

The planning authority of the Metropolitan Toronto Corporation covers an area about three times as large as the area of governmental jurisdiction. However, one difficulty that has been encountered is that adjoining territories do not have similar planning units nor is there effective provincial control. This fact thus reduces the effectiveness of the Metropolitan Authority’s program.

The question is frequently raised whether the same level of coordination could have been achieved by other forms of organization. There are strong reasons for maintaining local units of government beyond the traditional reason of bringing government “close to the people.” The first is that a federal metropolitan government gives political recognition to the genuine differences which exist within a metropolitan area. Individual municipalities can adopt standards and methods which, while not doing violence to a minimal standard for the area as a whole, allow variety and the right to be different.

More important is the difference in the functions performed. One set of elected representatives could hardly deal, on the one hand, with every detail of administration of a large metropolitan area and, on the other hand, with the highly complex questions of developing and implementing a twenty year master plan for the whole area. Related to this division of political labor is the fact that more people participate in government with the result that political power is diffused and not concentrated in a unitary government with all its inherent shortcomings.

Other forms of organization which deal effectively with urban problems include the urban county, which is favored in the United States and which is not unlike the federated Toronto organization; and the borough system, which has been adopted in New York City and several big European cities. In the latter, as in the federated system, elected representatives and local administrations take care of local matters. However, the local units generally do not levy their own taxes, but receive allocations from the funds of the larger units. This eliminates one of the most serious problems in metropolitan areas, the competition for industrial and commercial assessment and its reverse, the attempt to keep out low-income families.
The specific form of metropolitan government suitable for each area will vary with local conditions and traditions. But I am convinced that in all large metropolitan areas some form of two-level government is required, with strong legal and financial powers vested in the over-all government of the metropolitan area. The alternatives to such governmental organization for metropolitan areas are continued confusion, disorder and political chaos. The urban age requires strong urban leadership and political mechanisms within which this leadership can effectively cope with the tasks ahead.
DISCUSSION

Participants in the question and answer and discussion period on Metropolitan Areas were: E. G. Tindale, Union of South Africa; Prof. Robert G. Dixon, United States; Prof. Leslie Green, Union of South Africa; John O. Hall, United States; O. Cunha Bueno, Brazil; Norman Prichard, Great Britain; O. Weerasinghe, United Nations; Ruy Ramos, Brazil.

In answer to a request for further information on the Regional Planning Commission for Southeastern Michigan Councilman Connor stated that when a plan is devolved by the Commission it does not at that point have the force of law; this occurs only when the plan has been adopted by the concerned governing bodies. In the case of some planning commissions in the United States a plan automatically is law, but Mr. Connor thinks it is better to have the planners concentrate on planning and the governing body on adopting the plan and enforcing it through such means as zoning and building codes and controls over the use of land and the type and form of construction. In this way the planner is free to be as far seeing and as imaginative as possible without having to constantly modify his plans by considerations of financing and the like. Once a master plan is adopted, it is constantly under revision, although specifically the Metropolitan Detroit area is trying to plan in terms of the next 15 to 20 years.

As to whether developers are required to contribute anything towards the cost of services by the local authority, Mr. Connor explained that in the Detroit area there is no uniform pattern of law or legal arrangement. There are situations where the developers themselves put in the local roads of the sub-division or build and then turn over to the public authority sewer plants for their development. Some developers will also set aside park areas which, in turn, are dedicated or deeded to the city.

One of the major obstacles in the development of metropolitan activities is the liability for pre-existing debt. The question was asked whether the central government, as a matter of policy, should encourage centralization of certain local services by offering help regarding the assumption and allocation of pre-existing debt and help in the management of debt. Mr. Murray Jones answered that it should. If we are to undertake any form of reorganization of government within the metropolitan area resulting in some form of centralism, the purpose being to coordinate the assets of the area, then by the same token, the liabilities must be taken into account as well. In the Toronto experiment the Metropolitan government simply assumed all existing local debt. The payment of that debt was still
charged back to the local municipality on its own local tax rate but it was assumed as a joint and several burden of the area as a whole.

This has also been the case in a series of small-scale reorganizations in England and Wales, where a regular pattern of dealing with problems of the transfer of debt, assets, staff, etc. has been established.

The panelists were asked to give their opinion on a national policy that, after due allowance of time for study and action, would withhold mortgage loan, urban renewal and other similar federal assistance from urban areas that failed to annex surrounding urban territories or merge multiple contiguous local governments. Dr. Weaver said he thought such a policy would defeat itself. The net result would not be any more metropolitan form of government than we have now and it would probably be the death knell of all the existing governmental housing programs. Investigations have shown that the interests, either real or imaginary, of the central city and of the suburban satellites are very often at variance with one another; there are instances where the interests coincide, but as long as the voters don’t think so, they do not vote for some form of metropolitan organization. The net result of the national policy mentioned would be that the central city would be deprived of urban renewal on the one hand, and the outlying areas would be deprived of mortgage insurance on the other, a situation which would not tend to get the two areas together. There are, however, certain services which can demonstrate a unity of interests between the central city and the outlying districts, one of which is mass transportation. Perhaps one way of accelerating metropolitan organization for this particular function would be to have the federal policy that an urban area can get loans for mass transportation only when such an organization exists.

Mr. Connor said that it seemed to him that by the very asking of the question there is an assumption that merger for consolidation is, per se, good, an assumption that should be very seriously questioned. There are certain values to uniformity, but there are also great advantages to diversity. Merely getting bigger and bigger is not necessarily an answer to anything. The problem of transportation, for example, can be approached in several different ways, one of which is that the central city could be responsible for the operation of transportation on a metropolitan basis and have contracts with the suburban communities. The trend toward centralization needs to be resisted and only approved when shown that there are practical results to be obtained.

Mr. Jones emphasized that in the metropolitan areas the jobs to be done are either being performed in a haphazard way or are not being performed at all, so the great issue of centralization doesn’t really crop up. Why must we assume that we are taking away something that people
couldn't do anyway? Another point is that, as Dr. Weaver said, what is really required is a series of incentives. First, an attempt should be made to set up some model of organization and then a series of incentives should be created which will lead people in metropolitan areas to gradually adopt a rational form of local government, by the back door, if you will, but at least you attain this goal.

Sir William Hart, when asked if the Royal Commission studying London did not have too limited an area of review, replied that this had been a criticism levelled at that body. However, the review area was prescribed by the government and was not left to the choice of the Commission. Sir William said he would not agree or disagree with the actual size of an area which from a planning point of view quite obviously ought to be looked at as a whole. But to look at the area as a whole, does not necessarily mean that there must be a single authority dealing with that area for planning purposes, much less dealing with the whole of the area for all other purposes that have a conceivable metropolitan influence. Rather, it might be necessary to think in terms of a smaller metropolitan authority and a wider system of inter-locking committees, or whatever it may be, to deal with planning. Mention was made in this context of an existing Joint Committee of the London Boroughs, whose activities are aimed at inter-borough cooperation in a variety of matters, as well as cooperative effort between the boroughs and the London County Council.

It is generally agreed that one of the main handicaps faced by local governments throughout the world is the lack of adequate financial resources. Even where the local units have the authority to levy and collect local rates, such rates are nevertheless subject to limitations by the central or state or provincial government. In those countries where all taxes are centrally collected and then quotas are assigned to the local governments, as is the case in Brazil, the financial crisis of the municipalities is even more prominent. In Brazil the situation is further complicated by the fact that out of 60 million inhabitants, only 20 million live in urban areas; the remaining 2/3 are found scattered throughout the vast interior of the country. Under these conditions it is not a case of improving what is already good in the local communities, but of establishing a minimum standard of living.

One aid that is now under study in Brazil to accomplish this goal is the establishment of a bank whose main function would be to give impetus to desperately needed local development. Through its resources such a bank could help finance, on a regional basis, such necessities as low cost public works and housing, schools, health and sanitary facilities and other basic services. Another suggestion that has been proposed is a program whereby technicians from throughout the world could help plan and
construct local communities that would have the basic facilities to ensure a decent living standard. Such a program, moreover, would aim at maintaining Brazil's rural population where it is, rather than scattering it to the urban areas which already face insurmountable problems in regard to providing necessary services and facilities for their present inhabitants.

Not only local and national governments, but the United Nations as well has a deep concern with the problems of rapidly growing areas. The UN has drawn up a proposed program of concerted action to be undertaken by its specialized agencies of ILO, WHO and UNESCO during the coming two years. Consisting of several projects whose objectives are to assist governments to deal with problems of urbanization in a comprehensive manner and using the team approach, the proposed program includes: a meeting of experts on metropolitan planning and development to be held in Stockholm in September 1961, with the object of making suitable recommendations for comprehensive approaches to such problems as slums, squatters settlements on the outskirts of large cities, traffic congestion, overlapping of municipal administrations and the location of industries; and a seminar confined to African countries and proposed to be held in Addis Ababa in April 1962. This seminar would deal with the problem of urbanization with a view to indicating lines of action that African countries might take. A third project is a seminar on development policies and programs for European countries to be held in Poland in August 1962 and to be organized by the Economic Commission of Europe of the United Nations and the European countries.