

tends that the publication should reach as wide an audience as possible. Only the committed though will do more than read the Introduction and the final chapter on the Green Paper which are, incidentally, written in a strident tone unlike the rest of the volume. The genesis of the book was a study Rankin did at Harvard Law School. Unfortunately, instead of completely rewriting the earlier study and adding the final chapter, he did only the latter. However, the reader's patience in wrestling with legal terminology is rewarded by a greater appreciation of the present barriers to access including the doctrine of standing, crown privilege, Section 41 of the Federal Court Act, civil service oaths of secrecy and the classification system—all of which permit the Government to decide who shall have access.

For those not already familiar with the American Freedom of Information Act, Rankin gives a useful description of its evolution and implications, which serves to introduce his thesis that the concept of judicial review is directly applicable to the Canadian situation. Those who do not agree will be hard pressed to refute Rankin's arguments that "the existence of an independent Judiciary has long been a fundamental principle in both England and Canada" and that "no constitutional, legal or practical impediment stands in the way of judicial involvement in the adjudication of freedom of information questions" (p. 128). Indeed, Rankin argues that there is no alternative social institution in Canada capable of scrutinizing sensitive Government documents.

Rankin effectively questions the motives of the Government, reasoning that were it really serious about passing effective access legislation, more thought would have gone into the preparation of the Green Paper. By stressing cabinet policy deliberation in talking about documents, the Government diverts attention from "the factual briefs, reports, background papers and other similar Governmental documents" which are the targets of those wishing access. While one may disagree with Rankin's attribution of questionable motives to the Government in presenting the Green Paper, his book has made a valuable contribution to the discussion of access legislation.

Both the Green Paper and Rankin's study should be required reading for archivists working with government records. Any legislation permitting freer access to federal, provincial, or municipal documents will undoubtedly result in more records being transferred to the appropriate archives. In addition, some records now in archives will certainly be the target of citizens utilizing the new legislation. Archivists therefore should anticipate the possible implications of such legislation, not only in terms of space, financial and staff requirements, but also in terms of their own ethical stance on this issue.

Ian McClymont
Public Archives of Canada

Comments on the Green Paper on Legislation on Public Access to Government Documents and Recommendations for a Model Bill on Freedom of Information in Canada. A submission by the CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION to the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments. Prepared by the Special Committee on Freedom of Information of the Canadian Bar Association. Ottawa: Canadian Bar Association, 1978. 31 p.

Of the two parts of this submission, the "Comments" and the "Recommendations," it is the latter which is the most useful. The comments are basically a reiteration of

arguments advanced in the Rankin report and, like that report, emphasize the need for independent judicial review where an appeal is made against a ministerial decision denying access. Although the idea of "an information commissioner with the power to order release of information" is introduced as one of "the only meaningful options," nothing more is said about it.

In its recommendations, the Bar Association outlines the principles upon which legislation should be drafted. Given a choice between American and Australian legislation on access, the Association would prefer the latter as being more specific in defining exemptions. The exempted categories presented are more closely defined than are those proposed by the Green Paper. "National defence" for example replaces the much broader category of "national security" proposed by the Green Paper.

It is to be hoped that the brief will get the attention it deserves, and that the Bar Association is able to make a further contribution to the discussion by preparing their intended model bill.

Ian McClymont
Public Archives of Canada

Access to the Papers of Recent Public Figures: The New Harmony Conference.

Edited by ALONZO L. HAMBY and EDWARD WELDON. Bloomington, Ind.: Organization of American Historians for the AHA-OAM-SAA Committee on Historians and Archivists, 1977. 107 p. \$4.00 (Available from the Executive Secretary, Organization of American Historians, 112 N. Bryan, Bloomington, Ind. 47401.)

A first glance at the contributors and topics represented in this volume raises great expectations. The issues are current and controversial, the contributors are associated with the writing of contemporary history, but the length of most pieces was limited for conference presentation to a maximum of five pages. The American Historical Association—Organization of American Historians—Society of American Archivists Committee on Historians and Archivists sponsored a short conference in October 1976 on research access to the papers of elected and appointed public figures. The final resolutions were submitted to the National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials. The coy title of the conference refers not to a consensus but to the geographical location of the meeting in New Harmony, Indiana.

The conference endorsed previous statements on access, including public control of the records of Presidents, and recommended that Presidential papers be opened ten years after the conclusion of the official's public life, that all historical records of federal executive agencies be transferred to the National Archives within a period of thirty years, and that all classified material more than twenty years old be systematically reviewed for declassification by the National Archives. One half of the participants were historians writing primarily on the post-World War II period; the remainder were archivists with only a few linked to federal institutions. The introduction to the resolutions refers to a conflict of interest "between students of recent or contemporary history and students of more remote periods. . . [with] the existing system. . . biased in favor of the latter. Restrictions are often justified on the grounds that they are required to guarantee that historians in later years will have papers of the quantity and quality that they will need."

Several articles are of particular interest. A.L. Hamby, in an overview of the historian's dilemma, identifies photoduplication limitations as a major deterrent to