managing different departments of the municipality, with resulting clash of authority and responsibility. Over them all, the Board of Audit and Finance held control of the purse strings.

The inconvenience of transacting business with so many departments managing the affairs of the city without coördination, and naturally therefore with lack of economy, became so apparent that at an election, when the question was submitted, the people almost unanimously adopted the commission form of government. In 1911, a council of five members superseded all of the boards previously existing, and for nearly five years the city has been under this form of government. Although some good has been accomplished by simplifying governmental methods, much more might be done, it is believed, by the employment of a municipal manager, as is being done in some other cities, and by following more closely the methods adopted by business corporations.

The commission form of municipal government has not proved a success, except in cases where notorious graft prevailed, and the tendency of municipal reform seems to be upon the lines adopted successfully by the Germans of having trained managers and concentrated control. As Price Collier says: "No State can make men. No State can produce wealth and worth. These three—men, and wealth, and worth—are produced, and produced only, where men measure themselves against men for the mastery over the fruits of the earth, without adventitious aids of any kind and under the protection of laws that all make and all obey. Our mistakes and our political troubles have mostly arisen from a wrong interpretation of 'government by the people.' It has never meant, and can never be successful when it is interpreted as meaning, that each individual shall take an active part in government. This is the catch-penny doctrine preached from the platform by the demagogue. The real spirit of 'government by the people' is merely that they should at all times have control, and keep control, of their governors."

Arthur J. Brinton, in the *Dispatch,* says: "When James Bryce, late British Ambassador to the United States, a keen, acute, brilliant observer of American affairs, wrote a quarter of a century ago that the Americans knew how to do some things well, but did not know how to run their city governments, the observation hurt. Here is Mr. Bryce's exact language: 'There

is no denying that the government of cities is the one conspicuous failure of the United States. The deficiencies of the National Government tell but little for evil on the welfare of the people. The faults of the State governments are insignificant compared with the extravagance, corruption, and mismanagement which mark the administration of most of the great cities. There is not a city with a population exceeding two hundred thousand where the poison germs have not sprung into a vigorous life. In some of the smaller ones, down to seventy thousand, it needs no microscope to note the results of their growth.'

"Such criticism stung. American cities, feeling the wound, have sought a soothing salve for their hurt feelings in revolutionizing the form of their city governments. Mayors have served them ill; municipal officials have been corrupt. Away with them! Let us get our city governments on a business basis; let us run them as we run our private business."

The present mayor of Wilmington, Parker Quince Moore, is a worthy descendant of the leading spirits of the colonial Cape Fear described by the British Governor Burrington in his official dispatches to the Home Government as the "pestiferous Moore family," who vexed the Royal Government at Brunswick by their revolutionary tendencies, and later, on the 19th of February, 1766, advocated the first armed resistance on the American continent to the authority of their Sovereign Lord, King George.

Mayor Moore is not only to the manner born, but his business training, his patriotic spirit, and the charm of his pleasing personality have established him in the respect and confidence of all classes of our people. To my request for an expression of his observations of municipal government he has kindly responded as follows:

"For some years there has been an increasing demand in this country for better municipal government, and, if the views attributed to an eminent statesman—that we had the worst-governed municipalities in the world—is even approximately correct, there is need for change. While we may not be quite prepared to accede to so severe an arraignment, many of us are fully convinced that the ordinary government of our cities and towns is very far from being noticeable for the effective and economic management usually prevailing in other corporations.

"The first move made in the direction of advantageous change was in Galveston, where what has been popularly called the com-