THE OFFICE OF MAYOR IN THE UNITED STATES: A STUDY IN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649346448

The Office of Mayor in the United States: A Study in Administrative Law by George J. Bayles

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd. Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

GEORGE J. BAYLES

THE OFFICE OF MAYOR IN THE UNITED STATES: A STUDY IN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

Trieste

11

۰.

0 8 **_**0 8

10

×, 1.00

.

 \mathbf{v}^{\star}

1

						573			PAGE
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	AN	D	HIS	тог	Y	4	4	3	9
CHAPTER II. THE PRESENT	C	ON	STIT	rua	ION	01	T 1	HE	
OFFICE.									
r. Legal Qualifications		20	8 2				•	÷.	19
2. Election			00 80 0 0	000 (#0			÷.		31
3. Term of office			 +-1	ж. ЭК	•3		50 •5		23
4. Oath of office		201 18		89 28			•		25
s. Amotion					50 50		*		26
6. Vacancy, how filled	19						•		27
7. Compensation .		a X				28 28			29
8. The acting Mayor	ы. е		- €3 • €		30 16		*		30
CHAPTER III. THE MAYOR	AN)	D C							•
1. As a member of the	Co	un	cil	35	$\overline{\mathbf{r}}$	÷2	88		33
2. The Mayor's message	es	2	20	82	23	6	25		35
3. As the presiding offic	er		•	2	1		•		36
4. Power to call special	m	eet	ing	S	•		•		38
5. Right to vote .			ili.	•		÷ ;			39
6. Power of approval						÷.			40
7. The Mayor's veto por	we	r			•		•		45
CHAPTER IV. EXECUTIVE I DUTIES.							FEF	IAL	in an
1. Power to appoint to	offi	ce	22	ж.	•		ŧ٤,		48
2. Power of suspension					8.	χ.	•		56
는 사람에는 도가 한 것이라. 가지 않는 것이라는 것이 가지 않는 것이 한 가지 않는 것이 가지 않다.	2		•		50		•12	12	58
4. Duties as to licenses			340	÷					62
5. The Mayor's signatu	re		1.121		2.0	2	15	25	64

	PAGE
6. Miscellaneous powers and duties	66
7. Judicial control by writ of mandamus	71
CHAPTER V. JUDICIAL POWERS	73
CASES CITED.	
Achley's case, 4 Abb. Pr. 35	41
Alexander v McKenzie, 28 C, 81	25
Allentown v Grim, 109 Pa. St., 113	64
Andrews v King, 77 Me 224	59
Bain v Mitchell, 87 Ala. 304	-73
Becker v Washington, 7 S. W. Rep. 291	64
Blanchard v Bissell, 11 Ohio St. 96	63
Buady a City of Rochester, 54 Hun. 140	60
Carroll # Wall, 35 Kan. 36	-52
Chandler v Brandish, 23 Vt. 410	24
Charles v Hoboken, 27 N. J. L. 213	58
City of Chariton v Holliday, 60 Iowa 391	41
City Council v Church, 4 Strobh 306	35
City of Louisville v Murphy, 86 Ky. 53	68
Cochran v McCleary, 22 Iowa 75	-38
Cohen v Marchant, 1 Cin. Ohio 113	41
Cammonwealth v Allen, 128 Mass. 308	52
Commonwealth v Fitler, 136 Pa. St. 129	41
Commonwealth v Jones, 12 Pa. St. 305	20
Commonwealth v Stokeley, 12 Phila. 316	61
Coaboy v Iowa City, 2 Iowa 90	63
Crook v People, 106 Ill. 237	25
DeFoe v Harshaw, 60 Mich. 200	23
Duncan v Louisville, 8 Bush. 98	69
Bimendorf v Mayo, 25 Wend 693	63
Brie R. R. Co. v Dunkirk, 65 Hun 494	39
Flotcher v Lowell, 15 Gray, Mass. 103	67

3

łv

.

6

	PAGE
French v Marvin, 40 Iowa. 384	73
Garside v City of Cohoes, 58 Hun 605	23
Gregory v City of New York, 113 N. Y. 416	55
Hatch v Cincinnati, 17 Ohio St. 48	30
Horr v Bemis, Mun. Police Ord. § 49	63
Howard v Shoemaker, 35 Ind. 111	21
Howeth v Jersey City, 30 N. J. L. 93	41
110weth 2 Jersey City, 30 N. J. D. 93	4-
In Re Cleveland, 55 N. J. L. 188	31
Irvin v Devors, 65 Mo. 625	41
Jaquith v Royce, 42 Iowa 406	73
Johnson v Wilson, 2 N. H. 202	25
,	-3
Keeler v Milledge, 24 N. J. L. 142	74
Kempner v Commonwealth, 40 Pa. St. 124	43
Keogh v Board Ald., Holyoke, 31 N. E. Rep. 387	37
King v City of Chicago, 11 Ill. 66	35
Knell v City of Buffalo, 54 Hun. 80	2-44
Knight v Kansas City R. R. Co., 70 Mo. 2314	2-64
Lafon v Dufrocq, 9 La. An. 350	70
Langdon v City of New York, 63 How. Pr. 134	26
Launtz v People, 113 Ill. 137	40
Louisiana State Bank v New Orleans Navigation	- -
Co., 3 La., An. 305	37
Lyth v City of Buffalo, 48 Hun. 125	43
Mantindala - Dalman as Ind	
Martindale v Palmer, 52 Ind. 411	63
Melsker v Mally, 40 Kan. 122	58
Milliken v Weatherford, 54 Texas 388	27
Murphy v State, 68 Ala. 31	73
N. Y., N. H. & H. R. R. Co. v Waterbury 55 Conn. 19.	44
North v Cary, 4 Thomp. & C. 352	2-44

v

		raon
	People v Council of Buffalo, 47 St. Rep. 149	47
	People v Bardin, 7 N. Y. Sup. 123	52
	People v Cooper, 57 How. Pr. 416	58
	People v Fairbury, 51 Ill. 149	24
	People v Fitche, 76 Hun. 80	46
	People v Fitzsimmons, 68 N. Y. 514	54
	People v Hill, 104 N. Y. 170,	54
	People ex. rel. Hoffman v B'd of Edc'n, 143 N. Y. 62	56
	People v Knapp, 4 N. Y. Sup. 825	52
	People v Mapes, 141 N. Y. 330	69
	People v McLean, 57 How Pr. 587	58
	People # Mayor, etc., 82 N. Y. 491	60
	People v Murry, 70 N. Y. 521	54
	People v Schroeder, 76 N. Y. 160	43
	People v Stowell. 7 Abb. Pr 456	54
	People v Weber, 89 Ill. 347	52
	Piard v Jersey City, 30 N. Y. L. 148	63
	Porter v Thompson, 22 Iowa 391	38
	Preble <i>v</i> Portland, 45 Me. 241	44
	Railroad Co v Lash, 103 Ind. 80	74
12	Raleigh v Sorrell, 1 Jones N. C. L. 49	34
	Reeves v Allen, 42 Ind. 359	74
	Rex v Richardson, 1 Burr 517	26
	Robinson v Benton Co. 49 Ark. 49	74
	Russell v Wellington, 21 N. E. Rep. 630	39
	Sank v Philadelphia, 8 Phila. 117	47
	Saxton v Beach, 50 Mo. 488	34
	Schwerchow v Chicago, 68 Ill. 444	
	Small v Orne, 99 Me. 78	40
	Speed v Council of Detroit, 56 N. W. Rep. 570	54
	State v Ames, 31 Minn 440	69
	State v Bryson, 44 Ohio St. 457 51-52	-53
	State v Carr, 1 Mo. App. 490 43-43	

vi

PAGE

.

228

.

	PAGE
State v City of Newark, 25 N. J. L. 399	. 41
State v City of Newark, i Dutcher 399	. 41
State v Davis, 111 N. C. 729	. 74
State v De Grees, 53 Texas 387	. 21
State v Funck, 17 Iowa 365	. 23
State v Hein Miller, 38 Ohio St. 101	
State v Henderson, 38 Ohio St. 644	. 46
State v Hoag, 46 Iowa 337	
State v Hudson, 44 Ohio St. 137	
State v Jersey City, 30 N. J. L. 93	
State v Lingo, 26 Mo. 496	
State v Maynard, 14 Ill. 419	. 71
State v Perkins, 24 N. J. L. 409	. 70
State v Pinkerton, 63 Conn. 110	
State v St. Louis, 90 Mo. 19	. 58
State v Wallbridge, 24 S. W. Rep. 457	- 58
State v Walters, 64 Ill. 226	
State v Wolner, 127 Ind. 706	
Stevenson v Bay City, 26 Mich. 44	. 63
Stryker v Kelly, 7 Hill, N. Y. 9	. 63
Swarth v People, 109 Ill. 621	. 61
Tillman v Otter, 20 S. W. Rep. 1036	. 39
Townes v Tailahassee, 11 Fla. 150	
Trenton v Clayton, 50 Mo. App. 535	
Truesdale v City of Rochester, 33 Hun. 574	- 47
Upton v County of Clinton, 52 Iowa 311	- 73
Waln's Heirs v Philadelphia, 99 Pa. St. 330	. 63
Whitney v City of Port Huron, 88 Mich. 268	
Wiggins # Chicago, 68 Ill. 373	
Williams v Gloucester, 148 Mass. 256	
Woodruff v Stewart, 63 Ala. 206	

vii

1

THE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

IN THE UNITED STATES.

CHAPTER I.

. Introduction.

From the statistics of the federal census I gather the following facts :

At the beginning of this century only six cities of the United States had populations exceeding 8,000. The largest city had not 75,000 inhabitants.

In 1850 the number of cities with more than 8,000 inhabitants had increased to 141, in 1860 to 286 and in 1890 to 437.

In the year 1800 only 4 per cent. of the population of the United States resided in cities with 8,000 or more inhabitants. In 1860 16 per cent. lived in cities of this size; in 1870 20 per cent., and in 1880 223/2 per cent.

During the last fourteen years the increase in urban population has been marked, and now not far from 25 per cent. of the people of the United States reside in cities.

Everywhere it is acknowledged that the development of municipal administration has not kept pace with the increase of urban population. City government has been the weak point in our political organization.

The people of this country thus far in their history as a nation have neglected their municipal affairs because of their intense interest in the development of their comTHE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

mercial resources, and the absorbing attention demanded by grave questions of national politics.

But outrageous abuses of power by municipal authorities have at last drawn the attention of all citizens to matters nearest home, and the study of municipal organization and administration has become popular.

The organic laws of our municipalities as a rule appear to be satisfactory and the law made by municipal legislatures though often originating in corrupt sources has never been so bad as to arouse the people as a whole for reform.

It has been the execution, or, more accurately, the non-execution of the law by vicious and incompetent men that has caused the scandal, and now when the spirit of reform is moving over the land it is the executive departments of city governments that are undergoing closest examination.

At the head of the administration in every city of the country is an officer, "an executive magistrate," usually styled the Mayor, who, in theory at least, is responsible for the execution of law and the maintenance of order within the municipality.

A brief study, therefore, of the powers and dutics pertaining to the office of Mayor is opportune.

In order to study with appreciation the present constitution of the office and the power and duties now belonging to it, it is necessary to understand what the office has been in this country.

The first American city governments were established by special charters incorporating the political inhabitants of <u>New York</u>, Philadelphia and <u>New Orleans</u>.

Each of these charters provided for an executive officer styled the Mayor.

For the city of New York a Mayor was appointed by the Governor of the province, in Philadelphia the Mayor was selected from the Aldermen, by the Aldermen and Councilmen, and accepted by the Governor and for the

10