

gredients are not well proportioned. A number of quite inaccurate statements call for correction in a possible second edition.

A. G. ROBINSON.

*The Single Tax Movement in the United States.* By ARTHUR NICHOLS YOUNG, Ph.D., Instructor in Economics and Social Institutions, Princeton University. (Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1916. Pp. x, 340.)

It is just thirty years since Henry George as a candidate for mayor of New York received 68,110 votes as against 60,435 for Theodore Roosevelt and 90,552 for Abram S. Hewitt. George had come to New York, only six years earlier, from California, whither he had gone at eighteen years of age, and had followed the occupations of printer, newspaper editor, and inspector of gas meters. His death in 1897 when he was again a candidate for mayor was the occasion of a demonstration of popular veneration which marked him, beyond question, as a leader of men.

George was a man without political ambitions. The sole reason for his nomination in 1886 was that he had written a book which had attracted world-wide attention, setting forth an explanation of the causes of poverty, and proposing a simple remedy by which it might be abolished, and that he had shown extraordinary ability, both as writer and speaker, in sustaining his thesis in a manner that appealed to the popular mind. In the space of a few years he had risen from obscurity and become the leader in a new crusade for human liberty and the welfare of the masses. It was certainly a remarkable occurrence, and it is not strange that George and his followers should have believed that their cause was bound to triumph in the near future.

A generation has passed, however, with few positive results achieved, least of all in the United States. While there can be no doubt that *Progress and Poverty* has gained its place among the books which have exercised a real influence on the course of thought concerning economic and social problems, particularly financial problems, the single-tax movement, instead of assuming a dominating rôle, has become one of the minor movements for economic reform. But whatever the outcome, whether it revives as a strong, independent movement or is absorbed in the general current of economic thought, it has historical importance not only for economics, but in the life of the people of the United States.

Dr. Young has performed a service of real value by showing the influence of the peculiar economic conditions in California, particularly the conditions of land tenure, on the development of George's ideas; the circumstances which explain his rapid rise to prominence in New York and throughout the world; the subsequent course of the single-tax

agitation, kept alive, largely, by a few men actuated by the same sense of devotion, to what they conceive to be a great moral cause, which was characteristic of Henry George himself; and the paucity of measurable results achieved in the United States.

The author seems to have conscientiously consulted all the sources which might throw light either on the development of George's ideas or the course of the single-tax movement, and has treated his subject both sympathetically and sanely. He has apparently done his work so thoroughly that it will not be necessary to go over the ground again. Full references to the sources of information and a bibliography add greatly to the value of the work for students.

HENRY B. GARDNER.

*The History of New France.* By MARC LESCARBOT. With an English Translation, Notes, and Appendices by W. L. GRANT, M.A., Professor of Colonial History, Queens University, Kingston, Canada; and an Introduction by H. P. BIGGAR, B.Litt. Volumes II. and III. [The Publications of the Champlain Society, VII., XI.] (Toronto: The Champlain Society. 1912, 1914. Pp. 584; xviii, 555.)

THE Champlain Society's Lescarbot is an unusually successful demonstration of the possibility, and the advantages, of co-operation in historical editing. Everyone who has been concerned in the production, except the editor, would be likely to insist that Professor Grant was the responsible person, while he in turn has acknowledged in preface and foot-notes how important a share of the work was done by others. The results, which are what really matters, amply justify the large amount of time and effort that have been so unselfishly contributed by all concerned. It may some time seem desirable to reissue Lescarbot, but it will be a very long time before a more readable translation into English is made, or more satisfactory elucidations supplied.

Professor Grant's translation combines fluency with a respectful regard for the critical opinions of those who will compare it with the French text which is reprinted within the same covers. His method, which is easier to recommend than to practise, was to render the text into English rapidly, much as would have been done, and for a portion was done, for the London readers who were contemporary with the original publication. After careful revision this version was submitted to Mr. Biggar, and then to other members of the Champlain Society whose studies had made them familiar with Lescarbot's work. How carefully and freely the doubtful points were discussed is witnessed by scores of notes to the translation. There is nothing to show how often differences of opinion became agreements, but whenever the question, sometimes a difference of actual meaning but more frequently a shading of phrase, was still not wholly solved, a foot-note gives the reader an