

instance, when he states that "free trade was a catch electioneering expression, invented by certain agitators in 1846." In places, also, he is severe on some of the men who were his colleagues in the House of Commons, but who were not, like himself, members of the Conservative party. From the point of view of those who are compelled to watch the progress of reconstruction in England at long range, one obvious value of Mr. Webster's book is that it manifests the spirit in which the fiscal question, as it affects reconstruction, is being discussed by some of the thorough-going protectionists.

Mr. Christopher Turnor's *The Land and the Empire* (London, John Murray, 1917; 144 pp.) is a distinctly valuable addition to the library of reconstruction literature. It is of more than passing usefulness because of its clear and well-ordered exposition of the agricultural economy of England on the eve of the war, and because of the comparison which the author makes of the agriculture of England with that of Belgium, Germany and Denmark and the statistical and other detail on which this comparison is based. Mr. Turnor, like Mr. Webster, is not an admirer of the old school of economists, the school that so greatly influenced England's fiscal policy during the hundred years preceding the outbreak of war in 1914. But only a few pages of Mr. Turnor's book are concerned with the old-school economists and the fiscal system. In the main it is a plea for a better organization of agriculture in England, for a new and more social attitude of owners of land toward land as a peculiar form of property, for a large extension of small holdings under national as distinct from county systems of inception, finance and oversight and for better wages for agricultural laborers in counties where wages are notoriously low and inadequate. In urging better organization of agricultural economy, Mr. Turnor repeatedly emphasizes the importance of cooperation in purchasing farm supplies in some departments of farm work and in particular in marketing farm products. Like the late Earl Grey, he attaches great importance to the ethical and social value of cooperation; and above all, he pleads for a national land policy. His book is of special interest to students of farm economy in the United States, for Mr. Turnor treats of farm problems in England, some of which are quite similar to problems which have engaged, or are now engaging, the attention of the Department of Agriculture at Washington.

The preparation of *The Government of England—National, Local, and Imperial* (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1917, xi, 384 pp.) must have been a congenial undertaking for Professor D. D. Wallace. From

the first page to the last this is obvious, for, as the book manifests, he is an admirer of the political civilization of Great Britain and the British Empire and is disposed to endorse the statement of Admiral Dewey when he declared that after many years of wandering he had come to the conclusion that the mightiest factor in the civilization of the world was the imperial policy of Great Britain. Professor Wallace's aim in writing his book was to describe "the English government as it is, without distracting the reader with a long account of how it came to be what it is." To this end he has grouped his subjects into the following divisions—the legislature, the executive, local government, empire and colonies, and social and political characteristics. The field into which he has thus moved is a large one to be covered in a book of eighty thousand words. To some degree Professor Wallace has succeeded. He gives an easy, flowing description of the framework of the British government. He is eminently successful in describing the attitude of the people of England toward their governmental institutions and in conveying the spirit in which these institutions are worked. But the book lacks compactness; and in some places, even when the limitations of space are kept in mind, there is obvious skimpiness. One instance of this is in the chapter describing political parties at Westminster. A reader previously ignorant of the subject would end his perusal of the chapter with the impression that in 1916, the year in which the book was written, as in the first half of the nineteenth century, there were only two parties in Parliament. There is not a word about the Nationalist party, nor about the Labor party as it has existed and developed since the general election of 1906. There is nothing in the book, in fact, to indicate the development of the group system that was the outstanding feature in the House of Commons from the third extension of the franchise in 1884 to the beginning of the Great War. Professor Wallace's statements, moreover, are in some places inaccurate. Parts of the book are now out of date by reason of the revolutionary changes in the electoral system made by the Reform Act of 1918. To be out of date, is, however, the lot of writers on the English constitution, for of no country is political progress more characteristic than of Great Britain.

Treatises and monographs of worth on various subjects in British imperial history are not wanting, but a tolerably satisfactory brief history of the British Empire remains to be written. The most recent attempt to supply this desideratum has been made by two professors of history in Grinnell College, Cecil Fairfield Lavell and Charles Edward Payne. In *Imperial England* (New York, The Macmillan