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In his preface, the author says: "This volume is offered as a companion and complement to Professor Howard Lee McBain's The Law and Practice of Municipal Home Rule, published by this press in 1916. It is designed to be read with that now standard work, rather than to take its place." The author is entirely too modest. Without in any way disparaging the excellent work of Professor McBain, it may be said that Dr. McGoldrick's contribution to the literature of municipal home rule is entitled to an equal standing with, rather than rank as merely a sequel to, the work of Professor McBain. It is true that only three states have adopted constitutional home-rule provisions since Professor McBain wrote his book in 1915, but a very large volume of judicial interpretation of these provisions has been added in the intervening period. For one familiar with Professor McBain's work, Dr. McGoldrick's book brings the story of home rule for cities to date; while those not familiar with the original treatise will find that the book here reviewed gives a fairly complete picture of the home rule charter movement.

The author of the review of Professor McBain's volume published in this journal in 1916 predicted that within a decade municipal home rule provisions would be inserted in nearly all of the state constitutions. The prophesy has failed to materialize, and Dr. McGoldrick points out that two important changes of situation have retarded the movement: (1) the extreme urbanization witnessed in the past two decades has made the state more than ever concerned in city affairs, and (2) the growth of administrative supervision of municipal affairs has perhaps reduced the demand for home rule.

Much of the battle for the exercise of the rights granted by home rule provisions has been fought over the meaning of such phrases as "municipal affairs" and "local concerns." The arbiter in these controversies has naturally been the courts, and in deciding what are state affairs and what are local affairs the courts have usually thrown the weight of their influence on the side of the state. This fact prompts the author to declare that "our judges are no better qualified to establish the rules of the relationship of municipalities to the state than are our legislators, unless we deem them men of greater sense and experience." In fact, he says, "the judicial process has rather less to commend it for the solution of municipal problems than the legislative process," because of the judiciary's devotion to precedent and over-interest in analysis. Judicial errors are difficult to overcome, while legislative errors are more easily corrected.

The author points out that it is not an easy matter to draw a definite line between local affairs and state affairs. Judicial opinion has largely
assumed that there are only the two categories. The author suggests that there are really three spheres instead of two, namely, those in which local interest may be said to be dominant; those in which state interest is paramount; and those in which joint control is probably the best solution.

The closing chapter, on “The Scope of Municipal Affairs,” is largely a summary of the problems raised and decided in the home rule charter states. An appendix giving the texts of the constitutional home rule charter provisions in sixteen states is included.
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The Office of Sheriff in the Rural Counties of Ohio. By R. E. Heiges. (Findlay, Ohio: Published by the Author. 1933. Pp. ix, 124.)

Constitutional amendments and legislative enactments in recent years indicate that increased interest in rural local government is beginning to bear fruit. It is to be hoped that the two studies here reviewed may assist in narrowing still further the gap in county government between the reformer and existing practice.

Professor Bromage writes of county government in general. After briefly outlining the historical background of rural local government, he turns to the present practices and the question of reform. Detailed constitutional provisions, especially those prescribing the direct election by the people of administrative officers of the county, have been serious barriers to reform. Home rule and optional systems of county government are suggested as possible solutions of the difficulty.

A satisfactory solution of the county-state relationship should lead to correction of some of the existing evils. Reconstitution of areas and reorganization of internal structure are the things Professor Bromage feels are most needed. County consolidation (either general or functional), the short ballot, and the county manager plan are suggested as means of revitalizing the county. Here the author is at his best. No more convincing study of, or thoroughgoing condemnation of, existing practices in county government has been made. Professor Bromage has not only marshalled the evidence, but presented it in unusually interesting style.

The study by Professor Heiges, based on a field investigation in eighteen counties, attempts to evaluate the office of sheriff in the rural counties of Ohio, viewing the official as a conservator of the peace, as an officer of the courts and keeper of records, and as custodian of the jail. In each case, the office is found wanting in effectiveness. The author does not suggest