

When Steam Goes On in Minneapolis this Month

Steam goes on this month under Webster Moderator Control in the new Home Office Building of North American Life and Casualty Co.

Growth through service, which for 52 years has been the basis for North American's expansion and progress, was also the basis for the selection of the mechanical equipment in this modern building.



New Home Office Building, North American Life and Casualty Company, Minneapolis, Minn. Architects—Lang and Raugland; Associate Architects—Johnson and Backstrom; General Contractors—Pearson Brothers; Heating Contractor—F. S. Lamson Company.

The Webster Electronic Moderator System was chosen to achieve this objective because of (1) demonstrated ability to provide comfortable, even temperatures in all sections of a building, (2) instant response to every change in outdoor weather conditions and (3) effective coordination with air conditioning.

Cooperation of the Webster Minneapolis Representative with the architect and heating contractor was an important factor in this outstanding heating installation.

The equipment and service that produced these results for North American Life and Casualty Company are available now to help you to obtain similar results in your modern building.

Address Dept. NW-10

WARREN WEBSTER & CO.
Camden, N. J. : Representatives in Principal Cities
In Canada, Darling Brothers, Limited, Montreal

WEBSTER
MODERATOR
SYSTEM
OF STEAM HEATING
"Controlled by the weather"

Perspective

Registered U. S. Patent Office

The Issue Is Administration

by RAYMOND MOLEY

IT is one of the curiosities of our history that among our notable Presidents only Washington and probably T. R. could be rated as outstanding executives. Washington's papers show the meticulous care with which he managed the routine of his offices, from his own estate to the nation's government. T. R. knew how to pick able assistants and to hold their loyalty. It cannot be said that Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln, Wilson, and F. D. R. rated high as executives. Their Cabinets were mediocre; they fumbled many administrative tasks; and they were not notably successful in their judgment of individuals. They were, however, great leaders of people in the mass.

This suggests the paradox that those who can best judge men cannot so well judge a man, and vice versa.

On the other hand, several Presidents—notably R. B. Hayes and W. H. Taft, who do not rank with the great—were able administrators.

ADMINISTRATION as an art or science is not a flashy subject. It makes few headlines. It cannot be dramatized. It is a matter of intellect, rather than of emotion. It excites few moral sentiments, unless it is exceedingly bad. It is appreciated very little by people in the mass. It is seldom rewarded in politics or government.

Perhaps this is why the current Presidential campaign does not promise to be exciting. Despite the feeble efforts of President Truman to make people believe a great social cleavage exists, the real issue is how the Federal government is to be run. It is the simple, homespun question whether the people who are getting paid for toiling for Uncle Sam are equal to their jobs and are being properly directed from the top, and whether a new President, Dewey by name, can get better people, direct them better, and provide more service for less money.

There are no great legislative problems involved except those, like taxation and finance, which lead back to administration. There is no dispute about retaining the basic reforms of the last fifteen years. Agriculture will be supported; labor will be protected;

banks and brokers will be regulated; housing will be promoted; national resources will be developed; the armed services will be maintained; and Russia will be resisted. Congress will have routine business in the next session, no matter who is elected.

The course of our voyage has been set. Over the last sixteen years we have made a basic decision at the polls about what government should do. Now we shall decide at the polls the question of method, of personnel, and of organization.

Perhaps the great importance of administration is best illustrated in foreign affairs. Policy is determined by the President—the Secretary of State acting with both parties in the Senate.

Then, through thousands of officials in Washington and all over the world, that policy is carried out at countless points of contact with other nations. Some officials have a good deal of discretion; some have less; some have none.

But the extent to which the top-side policy is to be effective depends on the general caliber, judgment, energy, and loyalty of thousands of lesser officials. To see that the right people fill those posts and to see that they are doing what they should is a problem of administration. A nervous colonel in Berlin or a dumb major in Korea might conceivably set off the fuse of war. Pearl Harbor was an administrative blunder. There may be differences in opinion about which administrators failed there. But some administrators did fail, and a great fleet was destroyed.

DEMOCRATS are saying, once more, that those who want a change really mean: "We agree with what has been done. But we can do it better." This is supposed to be an argument against change. The answer, however, is implicit in the argument. The Republican answer is better, more efficient government: "Yes, we appreciate much of what the New Deal started, but we want it managed better. We want to keep those reforms without bankrupting the government and the taxpayer." The most helpful and humane government is the one that gives the most service for a dollar.

