

# 行政法





# 行政法

## 原理与案例

史蒂文·J·卡恩 著

Steven · J · Cann

张梦中 曾二秀 蔡立辉等 译



中山大学出版社

Copyright © 2002 by Sage Publications, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

本书中文字体专有出版权由 Sage Publications, Inc. 授予中山大学出版社,版权为中山大学出版社所有。未经书面允许,不得以任何方式复制或抄袭本书内容。

### 版权所有 翻印必究

#### 图书在版编目 CIP 数据

行政法:原理与案例/史蒂文·J. 卡恩 (Steven J. Cann) 著; 张梦中, 曾二秀, 蔡立辉 等译, 一广州: 中山大学出版社, 2004.9

(公共管理经典教材系列)

ISBN 7 - 306 - 02366 - 7

I. 行… II. ①史… ②张… ③曾… ④蔡… Ⅲ. 行政法 - 美国 - 教材 IV. D971.221

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2004) 第 092705 号

责任编辑:葛 洪

封面设计:流 野

责任校对:宗 隐

责任技编: 黄少伟

出版发行:中山大学出版社

编辑部电话: 020 - 84111996、84113349

发行部电话: 020 - 84111998、84111160

地 址:广州市新港西路 135 号

邮 编:510275

印刷者:广州市番禺区市桥印刷厂

经 销 者:广东新华发行集团

规 格: 787mm×1092mm 16 开本 49.25 印张 776 千字

版次印次: 2004年9月第1版 2004年9月第1次印刷

定 价: 98,00元

如发现因印装质量问题影响阅读、请与承印厂联系调换

#### 案例一览表

黑体页码表示案例在本教材中有全文 (Boldface page numbers indicate cases that appear in full in the text),案例后面页码为原书页码。

Abbott Laboratoies v. Gardner, 131

Adarand v. Pena. 343

Air Pollution Variance Board v. Western Alfalfa Corporation, 193

Alden v. Maine, 432, 461

Allen v. United States, 440, 476, 483

Allen v. Wright et al., 120, 127, 173, 481

Ambach v. Norwick, 371

American Airlines v. Civil Aeronautics Board, 290

American manufactures Mutual Insurance Company v. Sullivan, 380, 387-392

American Power and Light Company v. Securities and Exchange Commission, 112

Association of Data Processing Service Organizations v. Camp, 120, 173

Aumiller v. University of Delaware, 327

Barr v. Matteo, 441-476

Bell v. Burson, 425

Bennett v. Spear, 126

Berkovitz v. United States, 440, 483

Bernal v. Fainter, 371

Bernasconi v. Tempe Elementary School District, 327

Bibles, Director, Oregon Bureau of Land management v. Oregon Natural Desert Association, 225, 235-236

Bi-Metallic Investment Company v. State Board of Equalization, 266, 267

Bishop v. Wood, 352-354, 482

Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 441, 443-444, 452,458

Blum v. Yaretsky, 379,387

BMW of North American, Inc. v. Gore, 420-425

Board of Commissioners of Bryan County v. Brown, 453

Board of County Commissioners, Wabaunsee County v. Umbehr, 329, 363-366

Board of Curators of the University of Missouri v. Horowitz, 402-404, 482

Board of Education of Oklahoma City Public Schools v. Dowell, 372

Board of Regents v. Roth, 320-322,335

Bogan v. Scott-Harris, 477

Brown v. Board of Education, 343, 372

Burlington Industries v. Ellerth, 349

Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority, 426

Bush v. Lucas, 336, 462, 464-467

Butz v. Economou, 445-448, 462, 483

Cafeteria and Restaurant Workers Union v. McElroy, 425

California dental Association v. Federal Trade Commission, 158, 168-172, 173

Camara v. Municipal Court, 179

Carlson v. Green, 445, 462, 463-464

Caulker v. Durham, 425

Cedar Rapids Community School District v. Garret, 276, 311

Chamber of Commerce v. Occupational Safety and Health Administration, 272

Chandler v. Miller, 199

Chervon U.S.A., Incorporated v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 269-272, 488

Chrysler v. Brown, 208-213, 273, 280

Chrysler v. Department of Transportation (DOT), 4

Citizens to Preserve Overton Park v. Volpe, 140-141, 156-157

City of Los Angeles v. Lyons, 160-162, 481

The Civil Rights Cases, 263, 340

Cleveland v. Policy management Systems, Inc., 248, 460

Cleveland Board of Education v. Loudermill, 361-363

Clinton v. City of New York, 53-59, 115

Clinton v. Goldsmith, 173

Collins v. City of Harker Heights, 482

Colonnade Catering Corporation v. United States, 179

Common Cause v. National Regulatory Commission, 204

Connick v. Meyers, 482

Craig v. Borne, 371

Dalehite v. Unites States, 427, 476, 483, 489

2 行政法

Dalton v. Specter, 142

Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education, 347

Decatur v. Paulding, 173

DeFunis v. Odegaard, 132

Department of Commerce v. United States House of Representatives, 242, 255-260, 261

Department of Defense v. Federal labor Relations Authority, 224

Department of the Air Force v. Rose, 225

Department of the Army v. Blue Fox, Inc., 432

Deshaney v. Winnebago County Department of Social Services, 469-471

Dickenson v. Zurko, 285

Dolan v. City of Tigard, 93

Dole v. United Steelworkers of America, 22, 44, 45-47, 480, 485

Donovan v. Dewey, 197

Dow Chemical Company v. United States, 193, 228-229

Duke v. North Texas State University, 327

Dunn v. Commodity Futures Exchange Commission, 311

Edmonson v. Leesville Concrete Company, 380

Eldridge v. Weinberger, 426

Environmental Defense Fund v. Thomas, 37

Erie Railroad Company v. Tompkins, 476

Ewing v. Mytinger and Casselberry, Incorporated, 425

Ex Parte McCardle, 132

Faragher v. City of Boca Raton, 349, 366-371

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation v. Merrill, 246-247, 248, 261

Federal Election Commission v. Akins, 129, 162-165

Federal Power Commission v. Hope Natural Gas Company, 112

Federal Trade Commission v. American Tobacco Company, 184-185, 188

Federation of Federal Employees, Local 1309 v. Department of the Interior et al., 292-296

Ferguson v. City of Charleston, 199, 229-235

Field v. Clark, 112

Food and Drug Administration v. Brown and Williamson Corp., 100-105, 111

Forrestor v. White, 476

Foucha v. Louisiana, 416

Franklin v. Gwinett County Public Schools, 347

Frantinero v. Richardson, 371

Fuentes v. Shevin, 425

Fullilove v. Klutznick, 371

Gagnon v. Scarpelli, 425

Gebser v. Lago Vista Independent School District, 347

Gibson v. Berryhill, 426

Gilbert v. Homar, 336-339, 482

Givhan v. Western Line Consolidated School District, 327

Goldberg v. Kelly, 373, 392-395

Gonzalez v. Freeman, 425

Goss v. Lopez, 399-401, 425

Griffith v. Wisconsin, 236

Griggs v. Duke Power Company, 372

Grijalva v. Shalala, 379, 410-413

Hale v. Walsh, 318, 322, 334,433

Halperin v. Kissinger, 484

Hampton v. United States, 82-84, 487

Harris v. Forklift Systems, 348

Heckler v. Campbell, 288, 290, 302-304, 482

Heckler v. Chaney, 141, 147-149, 165

Heckler v. Community health Services, 249, 252-255, 481

Heckler v. Lopez, 488

Hicks v. Miranda, 372

Hornsby v. Allen, 426

Humphrey's Executor v. United States, 32

Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Aguirre-Aguirre, 311

Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Chadha, 64-67, 70, 96-100, 481, 484

Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Delgado, 193

Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Lopez-Mendoza, 193

Industrial Union Department AFL-CIO v. American Petroleum Institute

(The Benzene Case), 86-90, 110, 486, 488, 489 Ingraham v. Wright, 405-407, 482

In Re Federal Trade Commission Line of Business Report, 183

International Longshoremmen's and Warehousemen's Union v. Boyd, 173

Jablonski by Pahls vs. United States, 489

Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Company, 426

Johnson v. Robinson, 133, 141

Kahn v. Shevin, 371

Kalina v. Fletcher, 477

Kalstadt v. American Dental Association, 477

Kansas v. Hendricks, 416-420, 482

Katz v. United States, 194

Kimble v. Machintosh Hemphill Company, 476

Kimel v. Florida Board of Regents, 461

Lane v. Pena, 430

Legal Services Corporation v. Velazquez, 94

Levitt v. Board of Trustees, 333

Lichter v. United States, 112

Lincoln v. Vigil, 137-139

Linda R.S. v. Richard D., 173

Lindsley v. Natural Carbonic Gas Company, 371

Local 28 Sheet Metal Workers Union v. Equal Employment Opportunity commission, 372

Londoner v. City of Denver, 265, 311

Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Commission, 93

Lugar v. Defenders of Wildlife, 120, 122-126

Marquez v. Screen Actors Guild, 145

Marshall v. Barlow's, Incorporated, 177, 189-192, 236

Massachusetts Board of Retirement v. Murgia, 371

Mathews v. Eldridge, 336, 373, 395-399

McMillian v. Monroe County, Alabama, 453

Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson, 348

Michigan v. Tyler, 193

Miller v. Johnson, 372

Miller v. Schoene, 425

Mistretta v. United States, 105-119, 489

Monell v. New York City Department of Social Services, 449, 452

Moose Lodge # 107 v. Irvis, 426

Morrison v. Olson, 36,44, 47-53, 485

Morrissey v. Brewer, 425

Morton v. Ruiz, 277-280

Motor Vehicle Manufactures Association of the United States v. State Farm Automobile Insurance Company, 3, 308-311

Myers v. United States, 32

Nader v. Allegheny Airlines, Incorporated, 143-145

National Broadcasting Company v. United States, 112

National Collegiate Athletic Association v. Tarkanian, 426

National Credit Union Administration v. First National bank & Trust Co., 296-299, 311

National Endowment for the Arts v. Finley, 311

National Federation of Federal Employees Local # 309 v. Department of the Interior, 311

National Labor Relations Board v. Bell Aerospace Company, 288, 299-302, 482

National Labor Relations Board v. Hearst Publications, Incorporated, 150-152

National Labor Relations Board v. Sears, Roebuck & Company, 214-218

National Labor Relations Board v. Wyman-Gordon Company, 287-288, 290

National Parks and Conservation Association v. Morton, 206-208

National Treasury Employees Union v. Von Raab, 198, 200-203, 236, 482

New Jersey v. T.L.O., 193

New Orleans v. Dukes, 371

New York v. Burger, 197

Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, 93

North American Cold Storage Company v. Walling, 185-187, 188

Oncale v. Sundowner Offshore Services, 348

Owen v. City of Independence, 449-452, 462, 483, 484

Pacific Gas and Electric v. Federal Power Commission, 274, 479

Pacific legal Foundation v. Department of Transportation, 4

Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company v. Haslip, 420, 482

Palmore v. Sidoti, 343

Panama Refining Company v. Ryan, 85

Paul v. Davis, 384-386, 481

Pembaur v. Cincinnati, 452, 467-469

Pennsylvania department of Corrections v. Yeskey, 275, 312

Pergram v. Herdrich, 477

Pickering v. Board of education, 323, 325-327, 335

Public lands Council v. Babbitt, 268, 311

Railway Express Agency v. New York, 371

Rankin v. McPherson, 330

Reed v. reed, 371

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 344

Regents of the University of Michigan v. Ewing, 404

Richardson v. McKnight, 459

Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company v. United States, 489

Rowlands v. Mudd River School District, 330

Rust v. Sullivan, 94

San Francisco Arts and Athletic Inc. v. U.S. Olympic Committee, 426

Schechter Poultry Corporation v. United States, 85, 283

Scheuer v. Rhodes, 454-455

Schweiker v. Hansen, 248

Securities and Exchange Commission v. Chenery Corporation, 286, 290

See v. Seattle, 179, 192

Shalala v. Illinois Council on Long Term Care, 173, 409

Shapiro v. United States, 181-182

Shaw v. Reno, 372

Shelley v. Kraemer, 426

Simard v. Board of Education, 327

Simon v. Eastern Kentucky Welfare Rights Organization, 173

Sims v. Apfel, 286

Skinner v. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 236

Sniadach v. Family Finance Corporation, 425

State Employees' Retirement System v. Industrial Accident Commission, 152-154

Steel Company, aka Chicago Steel and Pickling Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment, 116, 173

Superior Oil Company v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 183

Traynor v. Turnage, 133-135

TXO Production Corporation v. Alliance Resources Corporation, 420

United Public Workers v. Mitchell, 173

United States v. Belmont, 27

United States v. Biswell, 179

United States v. Brockamp, 312

United States v. Chadwick, 194

United States v. Curtis-Wright Export Corporation, 27

United States v. Florida East Coast Railway Company, 281, 312

United States v. Grimoud, 112

United States v. Haggar, 273, 312

United States v. Lanier, 459

United States v. Pennsylvania Industrial Chemical Corporation, 249

United States v. Storer Broadcasting Company, 288-290

United States v. Varig Airlines, 435-439

United States v. Western Pacific Railroad, 173

United States Department of Defense v. Federal labor Relations Authority, 224-225

United States Department of Justice v. Landano, 225

United States Department of Justice v. Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, 219-224

United States Department of State v. Ray, 225

United States Ex Rel. Exarchou v. Murff, 154-155

United Steelworkers of America v. Weber, 372

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 158, 267, 305–308

Vernonia School District 47 J v. Acton, 193, 236

Vlandis v. Kline, 425

8 行政法

Walters v. Metropolitan Educational Enterprises, 264, 311, 312

Walters v. National Association of Radiation Survivors, 399, 414-416

Wards Cove Packing v. Atonio, 372

Washington v. Davis, 372

Waters v. Churchill, 354-361, 482

Webster v. Doe, 173, 243

West v. Atkins, 426

West v. Gibson, 312, 431, 460, 472-476

Wiener v. United States, 34-35

Williamson v. Lee Optical Company, 371

Wisconsin v. City of New York, 173, 241, 261

Wisconsin v. Constantineau, 383-384, 425

Wolff v. McDonnell, 425

Wood v. Strictland, 455-457, 483

Wright v. Universal Maritime service Corp., 142

Wyman v. James, 194-197, 287

Yakus v. United States, 112, 425

Yeskey v. Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, 275, 312

Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. v. Sawyer (the Steel Seizure case), 28, 60

Your Home Visiting Nurse services, Inc. v. Shalala, 165-168

#### 第三版序言

最初,因为我所授课班级的学生对于时下市场上的教材不满意而写作这本教材。到现在,这本书已经面世6年并且两次修订。学生似乎欣赏民主与行政国家对照的理论背景。学生似乎同样喜欢每一章末尾原理小结和法律测试,他们喜欢这些案例。

《行政法》第三版保持了前面版本的优势,但第三版添加了起诉资格的探讨,包括起诉行政机构、无搜查令的行政搜查、政府行动(如政府私有化和外包、日益增加的私有公司和个人类似政府的决策)、性骚扰,以及在《信息自由法案》下对隐私的侵犯。

《行政法》第二版写于1997年下半年。从那时起,法院作出了很多有趣并且重要的行政法判例,其中的相当一部分已经包括在这本新版教材中。以下是一些样本注解:

克林顿诉纽约市 (Clinton v. City of New York) 宣布单项款项否决 (the line-item veto) 违背宪法,这个判决进一步削弱了总统控制行政机构的能力。

食品与药物管理局诉布朗和威廉森 (Food and Drug Administration v. Brown and Williamson, 2000)。 FDA曾经被禁止规制烟草,找出理由。

联邦选举委员会 (Federal Election Commission, FEC) 诉埃金斯 (Federal Election Commission v. Akins, 1998)。一个关注选民的集体能够获得资格以挑战联邦选举委员会决定美国以色列公共事务委员会 (Israel Public Affairs Committee, AIPAC) 在法令下不是一个政治委员会吗?

加州牙医协会诉联邦贸易委员会 (California Dental Association v. Federal Trade Commission, 1999)。加州牙医协会限制牙医折扣价格广告。联邦贸易委员会认为加州牙医协会这个举动构成了对贸易的限制,但是由于加州牙医协会是一个非盈利协会,联邦贸易委员会是否有规制加州牙医协会的司法管辖权尚不明了。

美国司法部诉新闻自由记者委员会 (United States Department of Justice v. Reporter's Committee fro Freedom of the Press, 1989)。找出媒体为什么不能获得一个报道的副本,这个报道是在《信息自由法案》下暴徒首领的谈话

记录。

弗格森诉查尔斯顿市 (Ferguson v. City of Charleston, 2001)。找出一家公立医院是否能够检查未预期的 (并且未经过许可) 怀孕妇女的尿液, 怀孕妇女是到医院作孕前护理。医院在寻找使用可卡因的证据,这种搜索是没有搜索许可的。

商务部诉美国众议院 (Department of Commerce v. United States House of Representatives, 2000)。找出为什么人口普查局不能使用将会改善统计所有美国人口的抽样调查技术。

吉尔伯特诉霍马 (Gilbert v. Homar, 1997)。一个有财产利益的公共部门雇员被错误地停发薪水。找出在停发薪水前他是否有权出席一个剥夺前听证会。

法戈尔诉博卡拉顿市 (佛罗里达州) (Fargher v. City of Boca Raton, 1998)。在什么情形下一个公共部门雇员为雇用机构带来性骚扰的责任?

格里加尔瓦诉沙拉拉 (Grijalva v. Shalala, 1998)。当他拒绝在与老年医疗保险方案签署的合同下提供治疗时,一个健康保持组织 (HMO) 是一个州的扮演者吗?如果是,受到负面影响的老年医疗保险方案接受者有权参与剥夺前听证会。如果HMO不是州扮演者,那么就没有权力举行这样的听证会(那么,他们就不能因为其决策而被起诉)。

韦斯特诉吉布森 (West v. Gibson, 1999)。平等就业机会委员会 (EEOC) 能够要求其他联邦机构支付违反1964年《民权法案》的损失补偿金吗? 这是一个主权豁免的问题。

### 第二版序言

当然、我教书、《行政法》是最有回报的。当学生学会很多人知之甚少 的一个主题——官僚机构和行政法的运行时、我们能够容易地看到我们劳动 的成果。然而, 学生对我授课的评估表明, 尽管学生对主题感兴趣, 他 (她) 们对教材却不恭维。我相信,那种不满源于这样一个事实,即许多教材是由 律师和实践者写作的、没有在大脑中把本科生作为读者对象。行政法是复杂 的、但却不必然是困难的。学生的反馈不仅显示教材对于提升理解没有多少 益处,而且在我看来没有为学生提供足够的案例。作为案例方法为教学手段 的信徒、我以为可以撰写出比市场上的教材更为对学生友善的一本案例教科 书。我相信这本教材、回应了这些要点、为学生和教员提供了一些显著的特 色。

#### 本教材的显著特色

善待学生的概念框架 (Student-Friendly Conceptual Framework)。本书的组织围绕一个概念框架去对照民主与行政国家,或:政府的"第四分支"(隔离的技术专家官员和官僚)。

解说性的案例 (Illustrative Cases)。每一章始于一种场景或例证,用一种争辩的方式展示,以激发学生的兴趣。每一案例显示该章的中心主题,并且经常建议学生回头参看该案例以阐明全章的概念。

案例的平衡 (Balance of Cases)。 因为是我的经验,即案例是优秀的教学工具——一方面学生喜欢阅读它们——本教材大量地使用案例,比起多数针对本科生和MPA学生的教材使用的案例还要多。我已经试图寻求在一方面太多的案例和另一方面太少的案例(我发现市场上的许多教材都有此共性)之间找到平衡。

更多案例内容 (More Case Content)。与其他使用案例的教材对照,本书的每一案例都包含了更多的内容,如此学生能够更好地掌握什么因素导致法律诉讼,并且法院是如何解决问题的。除了引言部分的例证外,本书贯穿每一章都呈现了多个案例,章尾有几个更多的与该章内容相关的案例。章节中部的案例倾向于"经典",章尾的案例代表了同样法律见解的更多新近判例。

原理小结 (Summary of Doctrines)。最后,我包含了行政法原理、法律原则和宪法测试的篇章小结,学生应该从每一章呈现的案例中收集整理出来,学生也应该能够将这些原理运用于章尾案例或假设的案例。

教学设计 (Pedagogical Design)。本书的设计是与解决问题的教学路径相匹配的。案例末尾的问题是查看学生对于原理、原则和宪法测试的理解,以及法院是否运用了、修改了或者忽略了这些原理、原则和测试。同样,每一章末尾的小结是与教学路径相匹配的。这一教学路径使用假定案例测试并且要求学生能够勾勒出纲要。法院的案例素材以每页双列(编辑注:中文版采用单列)的方式展现,使得参考具体案例更为便利。

#### 理论框架

本教材的理论框架是并列民主与政府的第四分支,即行政国家。民主 的展现仅仅通过这样的理念,即公民,无论直接还是间接,应当对政府政 策有一定影响。然而,每一章为学生提供了行政国家的实例——由不负责 任的机构作出的决策和政策,这些机构依赖非选举个人的专长制定决策和 政策。在教材的前半部分引入权力的授予,以便学生熟悉日益增加的国会 对机构的授权。本教材进一步认为、总统一方面拥有控制机构的意愿、但 缺乏原始的权力去履行这种意愿。另一方面, 国会拥有这种权力, 但却乏 施展这种权力以控制机构的意愿。因此,几乎是通过默认,控制政府第四 分支的任务落到法院的肩上。行政法是支配它们的工具。在本书的最后一 章,学生被要求分析法院是否很好地适合于这个任务,并且,从总体上 讲,法院是否做得成功。正如美国劳工部前部长罗伯特·赖克 (Robert Reich) 指出,关于司法审查和民主方面的不协调论著汗牛充栋,但关于行 政国家和民主方面的不协调几乎是一片处女地。

#### 读 老

本书是为学习行政法的三、四年级本科生而写。它适合于MPA课程学习, 因为即使在研究生层次、法学院的教材由干价格的缘故而使用其少。由于本 教材比起非法学院典型的案例教材包括更多的案例和每一案例更多的内容。 它也适用于法律预科的课程。

#### 内 容

教材的第一部分包含四章,建立理论背景。第一章将机构欲做之事的描 述与民主的讨论相连。第二章提供了总统试图控制官僚机构途径的讨论,始 于分析总统的宪法条款二的权力,并包含总统任命和免职权力的分析。这里、 讨论侧重于总统对于任命者和"俘虏"概念的失望。案例的呈现与讨论是与 总统的免职权相连的。该章同样分析执行控制的其他传统模式,包括对于 "行政总统"概念的讨论。

最后,1990年的案例,呈现并讨论多尔诉美国联合钢铁工人(Dole v. United Steelworkers of America)。该案例并没有很好地预示总统通过管理与预 算办公室 (the Office of Management and Budget, OMB) 对于机构规则制定的 控制。我认为宪法未能为总统提供控制官僚机构的原始权力,并且其他机制

本教材的显著特色 5