

material was first printed as two articles in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, with an introductory note on the valuation provisions of the Act of 1920 and an appendix giving the text of the valuation section of the Act of 1913. The author presents a clarifying analysis of the issues raised and directs his keen critical faculties at the weak spots in the reproduction-cost procedure, and especially at the carriers' claims on intangible values. He ends with a note of conjecture as to whether the Commission will make final valuations in figures, and of skepticism as to the "conclusiveness or ultimate usefulness of the figures so expensively secured and so elaborately presented."

It is good to have logical pitfalls hung with red lanterns, but it would be better to have a practicable course pointed out. After all, the past of railroad investment is such a welter of conflicting claims and interests that all that can come out of it is a very patchy compromise. It is only for the future, if at all, that a policy at once logical and equitable can be formulated.

Professor Vanderblue will soon be in a position to present a more definitive analysis of the finished work of valuation. If he can give his work a constructive turn, he may render a service of great importance.

J. M. CLARK

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*The Evolution of Parliament.* By A. F. POLLARD, M.A., LITT.D., F.B.A. London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1920. Pp. xii+378.

In 1908 Professor Pollard was elected to a fellowship at All Souls' College, Oxford, on condition of pursuing researches suggested by the late F. W. Maitland. The foregoing volume is the outcome of such studies, and, in a way, may be regarded as a popular setting forth of the result of Maitland's studies as represented in his Introduction to the *Memoranda de Parlamento*, which he edited for the "Rolls Series" in 1893. This work, "the most original and suggestive essay that has ever been written on the mediaeval English Parliament," has unfortunately remained buried in the "Rolls Series" since, and has been, if not unknown, at least ignored by writers of textbooks and teachers of English history generally, now for a generation.

Mr. Pollard does not pretend, therefore, to present an exhaustive Parliament, but rather to suggest lines upon which such a

history should be written; to indicate the research that is still necessary, rather than to give a résumé of what has already been done.

The student whose mind has been saturated with the *dicta ex cathedra* of Stubbs will get many a surprise, even a jolt now and then, as he reads this book. If perchance he be a teacher who has tried to reconcile for the inquiring student the accepted classical theories with the now well-established facts of English constitutional history, such a chapter as "The Myth of the Three Estates" will be read with positive delight. He will discover that "there ain't no such tract," nor ever was.

Another such enlightening chapter is "The Fiction of the Peerage." For here too is another darkened corner in which legal theorists have contrived to develop much fog and little light. Whether we accept Mr. Pollard's results or not, they do credit to his boldness in challenging some fundamental teaching of orthodox constitutionalism. But why stop here? Why did not the author add to his "Myth" and his "Fiction" still a third chapter, for which he would also get much support from Maitland's studies, on "The Legend of the Knights of the Shire"? Here certainly is another corner, becobwebbed by later fiction, that for the clearing of it needs not so much a flash light as a broom and a dust cloth.

Still another prime service of this volume lies in the emphasis which Mr. Pollard places upon the judicial function of the early parliaments. A thirteenth-century parliament was hardly a legislative body, certainly not in the modern sense. Not only was parliament the high court of the realm, but its business was largely and actually concerned with judicial matters. When it acted in a legislative way, its function was that of a court which declares, or defines, law rather than that of a legislative body which makes law. But even here, except in time of revolution, a parliament will not command; it may only petition. The king may grant or withhold. That is, both in theory and in fact, in the last instance, the king, and not parliament, will declare the law. The function of the early parliaments then, even as a high court of justice, was advisory. It was their duty to give good counsel. Their authority rested upon the fact that their advice represented a consensus of opinion of a group of communities of the realm, seigniorial or other. Hence the term "Colloquium," which first seems to have come into use to distinguish the larger gathering, as the older "Concillium" was reserved for the more official and select body of king's councilors, far more accurately expresses the real function of a thirteenth-century parliament than the

later and more pretentious foreign "Parliamentum." In fact the king might summon almost any group of subjects, political or economic, lay or ecclesiastical, or both, to a conference ("Colloquium") with his council, and such a joint gathering would be called a "parliament"—"Parliamentum." The well-known "parliament of Merchants" is an illustration directly to the point.

BENJAMIN TERRY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*Employment Methods.* By NATHAN W. SHEFFERMAN. The Ronald Press, 1920.

This book is essentially a manual of practice on the selection, placement, and individual follow-up of the worker, although it recognizes and to a limited degree discusses certain of the broader phases of personnel management. It appears to be largely a detailed interpretation of observation and experience, and as such brings together many suggestive facts.

In its general conception the book is at times somewhat perplexing. Compare, for example, these quotations: "selecting the right man for the right job is the principal function of the employment manager, and the success with which he performs that function is almost the measure of his success in general" (page 139); "it is as an interviewer that the employment manager can best demonstrate his special ability . . ." (page 19); "the ideal employment manager, trained by assiduous practice in the duties of interviewing, finds himself prepared to take up his most delicate and difficult task of properly hiring, placing, and constructively holding workers; of restoring to industry the humanizing influence; of being a successful 'trouble agent' and 'pacificator'" (page 20); and "standing on neutral ground, the employment manager is the greatest force in industry today for the fusing of interests that in the past have caused management and worker to travel different roads" (page 357). While such excerpts taken from their general setting do not fully set forth the position of the author in each case, yet they are essentially fair to the author. It is also somewhat perplexing to have stated that the employment manager for the "business house" must hold the position similar to that indicated in the charts exhibited, and these charts place his position as ranging in rank from a vice-president to a subordinate of the office manager. Varied or at least unharmonized points of view like these leave one in considerable doubt concerning