

- (c.) Through a committee of the Privy Council corresponding to the existing Judicial Committee.
- (d.) Advisory only.
- (e.) Or advisory and partly administrative.
- (f.) By an elective Imperial Senate.
- (g.) By a council partly elected and partly nominated, ex officio, and co-opted.*
- (h.) By an Inter-Parliamentary Committee appointed from all the Parliaments within the Empire (as a tentative measure) to formulate the scheme.
- 2.—(a.) Free trade throughout the Empire.
- (b.) Free trade within the Empire.
- (c.) Discrimination on foreign goods and Preferential tariffs for British goods.
- (d.) A Preferential tariff in Great Britain on Colonial produce, and
- (e.) As to what the Colonies should offer in return.
- 3.—(a.) How the fund or contributions should be raised for the purpose of Defence.
- (b.) How it should be used.
- (c.) Where it should be used.
- (d.) By whom it should be administered.
- (e.) Whether it should be *per capita*.
- (f.) A percentage on the Exports.
- (g.) Or on the Revenue.
- (h.) Or a direct tax levied on Imports for the special purpose.

The term bristling with points, seems very applicable to the discussion. The above divisions do not include all, and yet over 440 variations of the scheme can be made from combining in different ways those given under the above headings.

The two principal essays on which THE WEEK invites an opinion are very well analysed in the issue of the 29th May, p. 634, and to which we refer our readers, and so do not repeat them here further than to say that Mr. J.G. Colmer's suggestions were:

1. That an import duty of 3% *ad valorem* should be placed on certain articles (specified), received from foreign countries in the ports of Great Britain, thus giving a preference to similar articles from the Colonies.
2. A contribution by the Colonies of 2% from their revenues to an Imperial Defence Fund.
3. The creation of a Colonial Council appointed by the Crown and the Governor Generals of the Colonies for consultative purposes and to administer the Defence Fund.

Mr. Ralph S. Ashton's suggestions were:

1. Free Trade to be adopted by the Empire.
2. Direct contributions of \$10,000,000 towards the Imperial fleet, from direct taxation which he outlines.
3. An Imperial Fiscal Union Council elected from such parts of the Empire as they represent to administer the Defence Fund and advise on Imperial and Commercial affairs.

These essays can be obtained from The Statist, 51 Cannon St., London, May 2nd and 9th, and synopses of other essays are continued in the following weeks.

In answering the questions, then, asked by THE WEEK, I would advise their readers to take the question of Defence first as being comparatively simple. Then to consider the best trade policy, remembering this, that England does not feel much inclined to give a preference to Colonial produce without receiving a corresponding advantage in return, that England has deprived herself by treaty of the right of receiving a preferential rate in the Colonial ports not accorded

to Germany and Belgium, but that by maintaining those treaties she maintains the right to receive equal treatment with them and other nations with 750,000,000 people with whom treaties exist for that purpose. The consent of each Colonial Parliament will be required to the adoption of any plan. The most interesting point, however, in the controversy, I think, will be on the manner of Colonial representation in England. History can be ransacked for arguments and examples for or against an appointive council or an elective Assembly. Surely every British subject whose interest may be aroused in the development of this problem which may bring him as a factor into the full stream of the political thought of our Empire, influencing the history of the world in his day and generation, instead of, as at present, being, as it were, protected in and limited to an eddy or a side stream in the great river of time.*

In this great question of closer political and commercial union we should claim our right to have a direct vote on our representation to an Imperial Assembly, and not allow the right to be filched away by some appointive method, which has always produced mischief and discontent in ancient and modern history alike.

My final advice in forming an opinion on these essays is—read them. You may find they are something like the description an old farmer gave of Shakespeare when he said: "It contained lots of things he would never have thought of himself." They are also very good examples of the practical literature of the day, correct in figures and statistics, clear and forcible in expression. There are several copies in Toronto. The writer would be glad to lend the ones he has long enough to be read over to any of THE WEEK's subscribers.

J. VAN SOMMER.

* * *

Phases of Athenian Politics.

BY PROFESSOR HUTTON, M.A., UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO.

"AS Greece is to us the mother of almost everything that makes life worthy to be lived, so is Aristotle . . . the founder of political science." So writes Sir Frederick Pollock by way of introduction to his recent lectures. But, after all, the credit of founding our political science clearly belongs, in a much deeper sense, to those Greek communities which excited Aristotle's interest and riveted his attention. If his political writings have been to Sir Frederick Pollock and to Dr. Arnold and to other students of modern politics the starting point from which the philosophy of modern politics begins, it must be because those Greek communities and in particular Aristotle's adopted home—Athens—were the authors of political systems, the heroes and victims of political successes and failures, which have a very close affinity with the systems and the successes and the failures of the political world to-day.

However this may be, that the politics of Athens come home very closely to ourselves and affect our own views of politics, will probably be disputed by no one. Indeed we often hear it made a ground of complaint, that Athenian politics and the politics of ancient Rome, in so far as classical education brings them within the reach of the modern world, come home too closely, influence too effectually, those whose education has been of this kind.

Accordingly, the critic who resents the influence of musty antiquity upon the live modern world, the critic who finds it easier to let his contempt for the classics breed familiarity towards them, than to wait till familiarity may breed contempt, and who, therefore, speaks with excessive familiarity and with entire contempt of the great names of Greece and Rome, this critic tells us that a column of The Times is better than all Thucydides; but he forgets—this critic—

* See Seward Brice's Essay.

* Mr. Ashton makes a strong point of this in his essay, p. 46.