

action: (1) an alliance with England (ignoring his earlier assertion that such an alliance had existed since 1897), (2) the abandonment of the Pacific to Japan, (3) the renunciation of the Monroe Doctrine so far as South America is concerned, and (4) the immediate policing and ultimate annexation of Mexico, Central America, and portions of the West Indies. This, we are solemnly informed on the cover, is "the first attempt to formulate an American foreign policy that will meet new conditions and save us the burden of huge armaments!"

JOHN H. LATANÉ.

*A History of England and the British Empire.* In four volumes. Vol. IV, 1802-1914. By ARTHUR D. INNES. (New York: The Macmillan Company. Pp. xxxv, 604. With maps.

Among general histories Mr. Innes's book is likely to be of singular usefulness because he has so fully implemented his title *A History of England and the British Empire*. The period comprised is from the peace of Amiens to the beginning of the war. The new era in British colonial history—the era that began with the American Revolution—falls in the main within this period; and there can scarcely be a development of importance in the history of the oversea dominions, or of India that has not adequate treatment in Mr. Innes's pages. There are aspects of colonial development where a little more detail might seem desirable. It might have been well, for instance, if there had been some amplification of what responsible government has meant for Canada; of what Canada has gained in constitutional power and liberty in the three-quarters of a century since the united provinces of Ontario and Quebec secured responsible government through the liberality with which Sydenham and Elgin, as governor-generals, interpreted the act of union of 1840. But when a reader feels a desire for a little amplification here and there, he also realizes that Mr. Innes is writing the history of England as well as of the oversea dominions, the crown colonies and India since 1802. He appreciates that while no distinction of style characterizes Mr. Innes's work, and while occasional errors in dates and statements have crept into the book, the history is well-planned and well-balanced. Going through it from cover to cover, if the volume were kept within its present limits—562 pages—the only chapters that could be eliminated without loss to make room for any amplifications, are those assigned to literature. The attention that literature receives in any general history is seldom satisfactory. Literary surveys even in the best of general histories are scrappy and incom-

plete. Mr. Innes's survey certainly comes under this description; for it consists of little more than an enumeration of the principal writers and books of the century under review.

Mr. Innes is obviously at his best when he is writing of politics and of industry; and as has been indicated his book stands out among general histories by reason of the comprehensiveness of his treatment of the oversea dominions and India. In his handling of colonial policy, he brings out with much clearness the old conception of British statesmen with regard to what have since developed into the oversea dominions. "At that time," he writes, in describing the formation of the Disraeli administration of 1874, "the British public in general, and the great majority of politicians, took it for granted that colonial policy meant educating the colonies or allowing them to educate themselves up to such a standard of political organization that they could set up for themselves as independent states whenever they might elect to do so, and that they were rather to be encouraged to take such a step, so as to reduce the world-wide responsibilities of the British Empire." Carnarvon, who was secretary for the colonies in the Disraeli administration of 1874-1880 was the first statesman to develop the new imperial idea. He looked forward to the day when the colonies should form a group of sister states, all self-governing, but united in one imperial family. Carnarvon, with the help of Froude, worked towards this ideal in South Africa. He was anxious for a union like that which came in 1908. But in 1877 there was no active interest in England concerning the oversea dominions. England was indifferent to Carnarvon's scheme for a South African federation. It was not acceptable, moreover, to Cape Colony and Natal. Consequently the scheme failed; and until Chamberlain was installed at the colonial office in 1895 England had no other colonial secretary who was animated by Carnarvon's conception of colonial policy or fired with zeal for carrying such a policy into effect.

Except as regards municipal life England of the period immediately preceding the great European war was largely the creation of the years between the second reform act and 1914. Mr. Innes realizes this, and devotes nearly two-fifths of his book to these forty-seven years. His survey of politics and legislation is particularly good, especially after the third extension of the franchise in 1884-1885, and the division in 1886 in the Liberal party on Gladstone's first home rule bill. Even before the Liberals were returned to power in 1906 there was some noteworthy legislation on liberal—almost democratic—lines; and Mr.

Innes shows how much of this was due to the liberalizing influence which Chamberlain exercised on the Unionist governments of 1895-1905. In describing the legislation and the attempts at legislation of the Liberal governments of 1880-1885 and 1892-1895, Mr. Innes also emphasizes the new conception, developed by Salisbury, of the functions and powers of the house of lords.

His narrative of the abortive Bayard-Chamberlain treaty of 1888 is one of the places where a little more detail is desirable—enough to establish his statements that “left to themselves the United States threatened a commercial war with Canada which would have damaged them more than the Canadians;” and that a treaty was negotiated that “virtually ignored the Canadian claims, and conceded everything to the United States, although there was a general conviction that the case for Canada was very much the stronger of the two.” Mr. Innes inferentially attributes the alleged ignoring of the claims of Canada to Chamberlain, who “had not yet come to be regarded as the creator and foremost champion of the imperial idea.” Whatever basis there may be for the suggestion that Chamberlain was not vigilant for the interests of Canada, Mr. Innes overlooks the fact that the late Sir Charles Tupper was Chamberlain’s associate at Washington in negotiating the abortive fisheries treaty of 1888; and there certainly was no statesman in any of the oversea dominions who was more possessed of the imperial idea than Tupper, nor with the exception of Galt, was there any Canadian statesman more everlastingly vigilant for Canadian interests, or more aggressive in asserting them, whether the case concerned Great Britain or the United States. Tupper was satisfied with the treaty; for on February 28, 1888, while the treaty was still pending in the senate at Washington, he assured Chamberlain that “we have much reason to congratulate ourselves and those we represent upon the result of our efforts.” “The time is not far distant,” added Tupper, “when the great services you have rendered to Canada and to the empire will be freely recognized and freely expressed.”

Ireland’s many agitations from the days of O’Connell to the government of Ireland Act of 1912-1914 are all well described by Mr. Innes. But all there is about Scotland in these 562 pages could be brought within a single page. In the 114 years from the beginning of the nineteenth century to the outbreak of the great war, Scotland was freed of the serfdom at its coal mines and salt pans that dated back to the seventeenth century. It emerged from a parliamentary system to which the word representation could not properly be applied. Its era of rule by a boss came to an end. Its municipal corporations were reformed.

Its ancient convention of royal burghs took on new life and usefulness. It developed a school of municipal administrators not second even to those of England since 1835. It developed the greatest centers of steel shipbuilding in the world. It often gave the Whigs and Liberals their majorities from 1832 to 1886. It provided the house of commons at least with one speaker. It developed one of the best newspaper presses in the English-speaking world; and not to lengthen the catalogue of achievements, Scotland between 1886 and 1914 gave Great Britain three premiers. The writer of this note is not a Scotsman; but he looks forward to the time when Scotland will be fairly regarded by English historians as of the British Empire.

E. P.

*Law and Order in Industry.* By JULIUS HENRY COHEN. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1916. Pp. xviii, 292.)

The agreement or "protocol" made in 1910 between the New York local unions of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union and the Cloak, Suit and Skirt Manufacturers' Protective Association has received a large amount of attention. Exhaustive studies of the working of the agreement and of the peculiar problems of the industry have been published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and numerous magazine articles have discussed the merits of the plan. Mr. Cohen's book adds to the literature of the subject a connected history of the agreement interspersed with many interesting digressions on the larger questions involved in the relations between organized labor and capital.

Mr. Cohen has been counsel for the manufacturers during the entire life of the agreement, and is intimately acquainted with the events of which he writes. He has not, however, added much to the available information concerning the protocol. The chief interest of the book to students of trade agreements will be found, therefore, in Mr. Cohen's argument in favor of judicial determination as a means of settling trade questions. As is well known, the protocol differs from nearly all other important trade agreements in providing for a standing arbitration board. Most students of the subject have regarded the board as a temporary device, necessary, perhaps, in view of the extraordinary conditions in the trade, but to be dispensed with at the earliest possible moment. Mr. Cohen on the contrary, believes that the standing board represents an important advance in the means of settling trade disputes. He argues that it is only by such a device that "moral issues" such as the right of discharge can be permanently disposed of.

GEORGE E. BARNETT.