

determination . . . to intercept all future unearned increment which may arise from the increase in the speculative value of land. There will be an even wider area of municipal enterprise. I go further; I should like to see the state embark on various novel and adventurous experiments. . . . I am of opinion that the state should increasingly assume the position of the reserve employer of labor. I am very sorry we have not got the railways of this country in our hands . . . and we are all agreed, every one in this hall who belongs to the progressive party, that the state must increasingly and earnestly concern itself with the care of the sick and the aged, and above all of the children. I look forward to the universal establishment of minimum standards of life and labor [page 80].

On these general principles, Mr. Churchill defends the policy and program of the Liberal government in that eloquent and incisive manner which has made him so formidable a campaigner.

These are, indeed, two remarkable and timely volumes, from which the student of English politics may gain both philosophic and practical insight into the forces which are sweeping England away from traditional Liberalism. One cannot help exclaiming, however: "Shades of Cobden and Bright! Are these your sons?"

C. A. BEARD.

The Union of South Africa. By R. H. BRAND. Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1909.—192 pp.

This is an admirable little book. Mr. Brand, having been a fellow at Oxford, for seven years an officer in the public service of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony and secretary to the Transvaal delegates at the National Convention, unites with his intimate knowledge of the subject a pleasing style and a useful familiarity with existing political systems. Students of comparative government will find the book very suggestive.

The South African colonies, like the North American, were impelled to union by economic necessity. There was the customs question, which divided the coast and inland colonies; there was the railroad question, which concerned the revenues of all the governments and the fortunes of Durban, Delagoa Bay and the Cape ports. Disputes culminated in deadlock; and the Pretoria conference, unable to settle anything, spoke unanimously for a national convention. It is not extravagant to find here an analogy with our Annapolis conference. Union was also dictated, though not so urgently, by the need of a uniform policy in the treatment of the Kaffirs. "No other nation," says Mr. Brand, "is faced with a future so perilous. . . There is no political question in

South Africa which does not bear upon the native question, and beside it all other problems sink into insignificance." The Kaffirs, numbering six millions and increasing faster than the whites, outnumber them five to one. They have already a monopoly of unskilled labor and are beginning to compete in the skilled. The appearance of a "poor white" class, too ignorant for skilled labor and too dignified for "Kaffir work," is an ominous sign. Englishmen will not immigrate for the mere wish to save South Africa, and the Dutch are not likely to encourage them to come. Mr. Brand does not attempt to say what the result will be. He sees only "impenetrable darkness." We may surmise that it will mean much in consolidating the two white races.

The Convention sat with closed doors. Thus the delegates "were emboldened to act calmly and with courage, and with a due sense, not only of the immediate present, but of their responsibility towards future generations. . . . The process of gradual solution, which was incessant throughout the Convention, would have been impossible in the glare of publicity." An account of the proceedings, which are still kept secret, would be of profound interest. It would explain, for instance, why, having decided upon a flexible constitution, a unitary government and an omnipotent Parliament, the Convention should have made that Parliament bi-cameral. The tendency in England has been in the other direction. It is well known that the Canadian Senate performs no useful function except to provide rewards for superannuated party workers; that while the bi-cameral legislature of Quebec is incompetent and expensive, seven of the nine Canadian provinces find single chambers efficient and economical; and that the Australians adopted an upper house as a concession to provincial feeling. No doubt a similar concession was made in this case, for Mr. Brand intimates that there was opposition. Elected indirectly and somewhat as in France, the Senate will offer no menace to that principle of cabinet government which requires accountability to one house only. It is more uncertain how the cabinet system will work with an executive capital in Pretoria and a legislative capital in Cape Town.

Mr. Brand supplements his description of the government with chapters on the future of parties, relations with the Empire *etc.* He believes that the administration of the school system, left to the provincial councils for ten years, will rouse serious animosities on account of the two rival languages. In the appendix appears the text of the constitution. It was not written by a Gouverneur Morris. Sir Percy Fitzpatrick calls it the finest in the world; it is certainly one of the longest.

E. M. SAIT.

Deutsches Reichsstaatsrecht. By PAUL LABAND. Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1909.—viii, 464 pp.

Das Verfassungsrecht der französischen Republik. By ANDRÉ LEBON. Same publishers, 1909.—vi, 205 pp.

Das österreichische Staatsrecht. By JOSEF ULBRICH. Same publishers, 1909.—viii, 378 pp.

Das Staatsrecht des Königreichs Belgien. By PAUL ERRERA. Same publishers, 1909.—xx, 460 pp.

Das Staatsrecht des Grossherzogtums Luxemburg. By PAUL EYSCHEN. Same publishers, 1910.—vi, 231 pp.

The scholars of England and the United States have been unable or unwilling to produce any really great handbooks of political economy and public law; and the student who would take a comparative survey of the constitutional systems of the world must still rely upon the monumental treatises of the prodigiously industrious German savants. Under the circumstances, a cordial welcome will undoubtedly be extended to the publication of a thorough revision of Marquardsen's *Handbuch des öffentlichen Rechts*, under the title, *Das öffentliche Recht der Gegenwart*. The stamp of authority is set upon it by the names of Professors Jellinek, Laband and Piloty, who have undertaken the editorial supervision of the work; and the original plan has been improved, at least to the extent of curtailing several lengthy historical disquisitions and confining the treatises to the concrete exposition of current public law. The scheme in general is, however, the same; and in some instances the authors who contributed to the original Marquardsen collection have merely brought their books up to date without extensive modification. For example, Laband's *Deutsches Reichsstaatsrecht* is simply the fifth edition of his little treatise published first in 1876, and Ulbrich's *Das österreichische Staatsrecht* is a revision of the third edition of his volume in the original *Handbuch*. In only a few instances are entirely new works promised. Nevertheless the new edition, taken in conjunction with the *Jahrbuch des öffentlichen Rechts* and the *Archiv*, will enable scholars everywhere to keep abreast of the constitutional developments of the civilized world with relatively little effort.

In turning over the pages of these new volumes, one cannot but be impressed with the fact that little of importance has occurred in the field of public law since the latest Marquardsen revisions. There is, of