

## PERSONALIA

**Joseph L. Hudson**, a member of the council of the National Municipal League since 1906, died at Worthing, near London, England, on July 5. Mr. Hudson was Detroit's leading merchant and a most versatile business man. He was easily the first philanthropist of the city and one of the most active civic workers. He was for years the president of the Municipal League, resigning only last spring. He was identified with all sorts and conditions of movements and was a liberal contributor to every forward effort in his city, state and nation. He was a quiet and modest attendant at the recent meetings of the League and at the meetings of the council. His death is a loss we shall long feel.



**Frederick L. Ford**, formerly city engineer of Hartford, Conn., has been elected city engineer of New Haven.



**Dr. William Bennett Munro** has been made professor of municipal government in Harvard University.



**Howard Strong**, by a slip of the pen, was spoken of in our July issue as being secretary of the Cleveland Civic and Commerce Association, whereas he is the secretary of the Minneapolis body of that name. He was assistant secretary of the Cleveland chamber of which Munson Havens continues as secretary.

**Chicago to Honor Burnham.**—The suggestion to have all Chicago pay tribute of honor to Daniel H. Burnham, the distinguished municipal architect, by giving his name to the proposed lake front park, which was offered by Chairman Charles H. Wacker of the Chicago plan commission has been received with widespread enthusiasm.



**Carlton E. Davis**, department engineer of the New York board of water supply, was appointed July 24 by Director Cooke of the Philadelphia department of public works as chief of the bureau of water at a salary of \$7500. His experience and responsibilities in connection with the building of the great reservoir on Orange Mountain as an addition to the Newark water works, his municipal engineering work on the Isthmus, which included the complete installation of two water works supplying over 100,000 people, and the building of the Ashokan Dam in the Catskill Mountains, have given him an unusually broad engineering training for a man of but forty-two years of age.



**Dr. Werner Hegemann** of Berlin, the well known German city planning expert, is coming to America in the spring of 1913 under the auspices of the People's Institute, 50 Madison Avenue, New York.

## BOOK REVIEWS

**PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION: A STUDY IN METHODS OF ELECTION.** By John H. Humphrey. London: Methuen and Company, 1911, pp. xxi. \$4.00.

This volume is an opportune and authoritative contribution to the literature of a fundamental and democratic electoral reform, now attracting the

earnest and favorable consideration of progressive legislators, especially in Europe. It is the first English or American work to present a general survey of the remarkable progress of proportional representation in recent years, and a comprehensive and concrete discussion of the reform in the light of its actual workings in the various countries that have adopted it. The entire book

clearly reflects Mr. Humphrey's thorough mastery of his subject, his familiarity with the latest developments in his field the world over, and his exceptional qualifications to speak with authority, particularly with regard to the practical detailed operation of the new electoral machinery. He has been secretary of the Proportional Representation Society for some years, has organized and conducted a highly successful series of "enlarged illustrative elections," and has personally observed elections under the new system in Belgium, Sweden, and the Transvaal.

The work embraces a discussion of both the direct and indirect results of elections by majority or plurality vote whether by district or general ticket; of earlier forms of non-proportional representation of minorities by means of the limited, the cumulative, or the single vote; of the second ballot on the continent and the alternative, or preferential, vote in Australia as solutions of minority elections in three-cornered contests; of the different systems of proportional representation now in use in comparison with one another. The value of the volume is enhanced by the addition of a series of eleven appendices, aggregating 112 pages, on such topics, among others, as the single non-transferable vote in Japan, the proportional systems of Sweden and Finland, the second ballot in Germany, statistics of the general elections in the United Kingdom, 1885-1910.

The operation of the single-district system is critically analyzed and its direct results summarized as follows: (1) Often a gross exaggeration of the strength of the victorious party; (2) sometimes a complete disfranchisement of the minority; and (3) at other times a failure of the majority of citizens to obtain their due share of representation. Indirectly the system gives rise to false impressions of public opinion and consequent unstable legislation, unduly exalts party organization, and is largely responsible for the increasing degrada-

tion of party strife by making the result of the whole election hinge on a "final rally" of a handful of nondescript voters. The limited, the cumulative, and the single vote are shown to have accomplished their purpose of securing large minorities a share of representation, but to be non-proportional and lacking in the elasticity and adaptability characteristic of a true system of representation. While recognizing "that the preferential vote "possesses many and valuable advantages as compared with the second ballot," the author holds that both are designed to "maintain the exclusive representation of the majority in each constituency" regardless of inequalities, and that "neither . . . can solve the problem of three parties seeking representation."

Proportional representation is urged by Mr. Humphreys as the only just and adequate solution of England's electoral problems, as the key not only to electoral but also constitutional and social reform. While preferring the single transferable vote system to the various list systems, he declares that results demonstrate the immeasurable superiority of the latter over ordinary electoral methods. The reasons given for his preference are that the single transferable vote is more elastic, adapts itself more freely to new political conditions, appeals with greater force to English-speaking peoples because based upon the direct representation of the electors, and has the stronger likelihood of becoming the common electoral method for the British Empire.

This work should prove very effective in advancing the proportional representation propaganda in Great Britain, for which it was primarily written. But its interest and value are by no means confined to Englishmen, nor to students of English politics, but extend to the United States with its similar electoral problems, and to all students of present-day political methods.

LEON E. AYLESWORTH.