

tion which has not received such a request send its name and address to the Council at 45 East 65th Street, New York City, and a questionnaire will be forwarded promptly.

The annual summer conference of the British Institute of Public Administration was held in New College, Oxford, July 11 to 14. In attendance were officials from half a dozen government departments, town clerks and other officials, visitors from Canada, Ceylon, and South Australia, and four from the United States—Mr. Louis Brownlow, former president of the City Managers' Association, Clinton Rogers Woodruff of Philadelphia, Professor John A. Fairlie of the University of Illinois, and Mr. Roland Egger of Princeton University. The subjects discussed included personality in public administration, relations between the official and his council, how to fill higher posts, relation of government to organized industries, and rationalizing the processes of administration. As usual, the principal papers were printed in advance, and the sessions were devoted to discussion. Mr. I. G. Gibbon, of the Ministry of Health, presided.

New Hampshire Constitutional Convention of 1930. In pursuance of a popular vote at the election of 1928, New Hampshire held one of her not infrequent constitutional conventions (there have been four since 1902) in June, 1930. It convened on June 4 and adjourned on June 13, having been actually in session six days. The president was Frank N. Parsons, a retired chief justice of the supreme court. The number of delegates was 459; the largest number who voted was 416 (in the election of a secretary on the opening day); the largest number recorded as voting on any measure was 347.

Twenty-three proposals for amendment were introduced. Five of these were adopted by the convention, and appeared on the ballots in November, as follows: (1) provision for item veto on appropriation bills; (2) empowering of the legislature to enact a law providing for absent voting in state elections, the supreme court having given an advisory opinion against such a law under the existing constitution; (3) also as a result of an advisory opinion, an amendment empowering the legislature to fix the exemptions in any income tax law that may be enacted, and also limiting the rate of such taxation to the average general property tax rate; (4) "an estate tax may be imposed equal to such credit as may be allowed by federal estate legis-

lation on account of similar taxes to the several states;" and (5) reduction of the House of Representatives from about 425 to about 350 members.

The last-mentioned proposal is the only one of the five that seems to require comment. Under the present arrangement, any town or city ward which has a population of 600 has one representative (smaller places having a curious "part time" representation); and the number of additional population which entitles the town or ward to an additional representative is 1,200. Thus a town with a population of 5,000 is now entitled to four representatives. The proposed amendment would change the number 1,200 to 1,500, so that the town of 5,000 would have three representatives. It is, of course, obvious that all the reduction will be gained at the expense of the larger towns and cities; but the small towns had the votes in the convention to put the new plan through. It is very unlikely that it will be adopted by the voters, as a two-thirds vote is required.

Various proposals which were rejected would have provided, in one form or another, for legislative submission of constitutional amendments to the people, New Hampshire now being the only state in which the legislature is powerless in this matter. After considerable debate, however, and a final close vote (165-182), all were defeated. The reason for this action deserves a word of explanation, for it would never be apparent to one reading the journal of the convention. The proposals were of two kinds. The first was to turn the legislature into a joint convention for the consideration of amendments, as in Massachusetts. Those who favored this were obviously and frankly actuated by their distrust of the Senate, a body numbering only 24, and well-known for its extreme conservatism, to put it mildly. The second proposal was of the more usual type, requiring a two-thirds vote of the total membership of the House, plus a majority of the total membership of the Senate. Proposal one being defeated, on a voice vote, enough of its friends, probably about twenty-five, turned against proposal two to bring about its defeat also, by the close vote already stated. Hence a proposal for the moderate liberalization of the amending process met defeat at the hands of a group which insisted on the whole loaf or no bread. None of the other rejected proposals was of major importance.

Although delegates were elected on partisan ballots, the only occasion in the convention when party lines could be said to have been

drawn was in the election of a secretary; and here precedent was followed in the choice of a Democrat, though the convention was overwhelmingly Republican.

The convention was perhaps remarkable in one other respect: there was not a single reference, direct or indirect, to the prohibition controversy.

JAMES P. RICHARDSON.

Dartmouth College.

Social Science Abstracts—an Institution in the Making.¹ “This article describes a sequence of the factors that led up to the establishment of an international coöperative effort in which more than 1,700 scholars participate. It analyzes the process of organizing a scientific journal which publishes 15,000 abstracts a year, based upon the systematic examination of about 400,000 articles contained in 4,000 serials which are printed in 26 languages. As a voluntary effort, *Social Science Abstracts* is of sufficient magnitude and stability to be regarded as an institution in the making.”

The origin of *Social Science Abstracts* was recognition of the need of keeping informed on the important contributions to the social sciences contained in the ever-increasing volume of periodicals and serials in the literature of many countries. Successful patterns of coöperative research to solve this urgent problem existed in the great abstracting services established in the physical sciences. *Social Science Abstracts* is indebted to these services for the many transfers of essential technique.

Contacts with European scholars were made in the summer of 1928. Meanwhile the collaboration of hundreds of American scholars was secured for the preparation of abstracts. The first issue of the journal was distributed in March, 1929. By December, a complete volume containing 11,093 abstracts had been published. Volume II for the year 1930 will contain over 15,000 abstracts.

In handling 400,000 articles a year, accuracy and system are essential. The office editors select the articles to be abstracted. In order to prevent duplication, the title of each article is cleared against a great central file before mailing to an abstractor. About 18,000 titles were mailed out during 1929. In a few cases (600), responsibility

¹ Abstract of an article by the editor-in-chief of *Social Science Abstracts* published in the *American Journal of Sociology*, November, 1930.