ed under a tariff is almost wholly paid by the country which imposes the tariff, so that the money which is now being collected in the intercolonial trade would, under this scheme, remain in the pockets of the colonists.

The volume of intercolonial trade, large as it is, forms but a quarter of the total trade of the Colonies. The weight of the objection, therefore, depends upon the relative amount of trade carried on by each Colony with its sister Colonies.

(1) Out of the 42 British possessions whose trade is explained by Rawson (Table VIII), 9 of them, including Canada, import less than three per cent. of their goods from sister colonies. The trade of Hong Kong, Gibraltar and Malta is not explained in the above table, but I understand that these three colonies should be added to this group.

(2) Fourteen of them import over five but under twentyfive per cent.

(3) Eight of them import between twenty-five and fifty per cent.

(4) The remaining eight import more than fifty per cent of their goods from sister colonies.

It is obvious that groups (1) and (2) would suffer but little inconvenience in adopting free intercolonial trade. (Froup (3) includes New South Wales, Victoria, and South Autralia which are on the eve of uniting in the Australian confederacy, and Newfoundland, which will probably soon join the Dominion of Canada.

Of the eight Colonies comprised in group No. (4), three of them, Queensland, W. Australia and Tasmania, will doubtless be united in the Australian confederacy, and the remaining five, Labuan, Ceylon, Mauritius, Fiji and Montserrat, have neither a high rate of duty nor, relatively to the larger colonies of the Empire, a very extensive trade. But how will the scheme affect the Mother Country ?

The Colonies cannot as yet be said to compete with Great Britain or with foreigners in manufactures. Even if a Colony found itself unable to raise its necessary revenue otherwise than by imposing a slight additional duty upon British and foreign goods, the colonists, not the Britishers or foreigners, would have to pay the duty.

But Great Britain would, in another aspect of the case, be greatly benefitted by the scheme.

The activity of trade and the probable rise in Colonial securities which would accompany a removal of the intercolonial duties, would undoubtedly lead to heavier purchases of British and foreign goods, especially by the wealthier classes of colonists. Nor would the benefit be at all equally shared by foreigners.

Taking the percentage of total imports by the Colonies, Great Britain supplies 42.3 per cent., and foreigners 31.4.

This would indicate an advantage of over 10 per cent. in favour of the Mother Country. But the advantage would in fact be far greater.

Twenty-four of the Colonies mentioned in Rawson's Table include nearly all the large possessions of the Empire, South Africa, India, Australia and Canada, and as to these the percentage stands 54.9 in favour of Great Britain, and only 24.1 for foreigners.

If the time should ever arrive when either Great Britain or the Colonies find it advisable to modify their views as to customs duties, and when the treaties above mentioned are abrogated, we shall be in a position to adopt a more complete Customs Union than the one hereby Meanwhile, half a loaf is better than no bread. submitted. Under any scheme some portion of the Empire will benefit more than others, at least in the first instance; but with a body of experts, having the work of the scheme under their constant supervision, as I propose in the third provision of my scheme, no permanent hardship could exist, whereas a present inestimable benefit, in the matter of Imperial defence, might be at once taken in hand and placed upon a more satisfactory basis.

(To be continued.)

\*

Mr. Raymond C. Beazley's new work, "The Dawn of Modern Geography," may be expected at an early date. The author's idea has been to give a history of travel and geo. graphical science from the conversion of the Roman Empire, with an account of the achievements and writings of the early Christian, Arab and Viking students and explorers. Mr. John Murray is to publish it.

## Concerning Sponges.

LITTLE-READ author in our day is Philo Judeus, A although Bohn has long since provided an English translation of his works, by Yonge, in his Ecclesiastical Library Ho was an Although State of the He was an Alexandrian Jew, the contemporary Library. He was an Alexandrian Jew, the contemposi-of Jesus Christ and of the early years of Josephus. In him we find the first prominent specimen of that peculiar product, the philosophical Hebrew, paralleled with many an accentuated difference, in Maimonides of the twelfth, and Spinoza of the seventeenth century. Plato was his master equally with Moses, and he had many followers within the Christian Church and without it. Plato and he were Greek and Hebrew Hegels of antiquity, whose business it was to break all hard shells of fact for the sake of the kernel of idea which lay within them. By this means the sage of the Academy made the repulsively voluptuous and cruel mythology of the Greeks a vehicle of moral instruction. Philo applied the same allegorical process to the books of Moses, which he accepted implicitly without any higher critical doubts, furnishing a commentary, not indeed altogether void of rabbinical conceits but altogether void of rabbinical conceits, but philosophical along cosmical and moral lines. His line of philosophical succession, like that of the apostles, is broken beyond the probability of mending; but, towards the end of the second century, two celebrated men, both originally pagans and both supposed to have become converts to Christianity, although one apparently relapsed, took up his allegorical mantle. He who lapsed was Ammonius Laccas, once a common porter, who headed the Neo-Platonic school adverse to the Christian faith : the other was St. Clement, of Alexandria, the founder of the allegor-izing college of Biblical interpreters, which culminated in his pupil thright. his pupil, Origen. These allegorizers or idea-hunters exist to day, both out of the Church and in. They are wise in their own conceits to make it allows. their own conceits, to make it plural, but an ancient scholastic hit them hard when he said : "Real existence is greater than thought." Hegelians and the champions of deductive theology, Spencerian philosophers and Plymouth brethren, evolutionary higher-critics and verbal inspirationists, would do well to purder the set of the se do well to ponder the scholastic dictum. Real existence, otherwise fact, is greater than thought.

Here we go quarreling again ! Let us get back to Philo Judaus and the sponges. He is speaking of mixtures in general, and of the commingling of wine and water in par-ticular and save "With ticular, and says : "With a sponge saturated with oil it is possible for the water to be taken up and for the wine to be left behind, which may perhaps be because the origin of sponge is derived from water, and, therefore, it is natural that water being a kinded that water being a kindred substance is calculated by nature to be taken up by the sponge out of the combination, but that that substance which is of a different nature, namely the wine, is naturally left behind." Sponges and water the Sponges and water the writer has in abundance, but wine, that maketh glad the heart of man, and oil, that maketh his face to shine, he, for the present, lacks, so that he cannot corroborate the truth of Philo's experiment in unravelling mixtures. His combination recalls Charles Lamb's apology to his sister for leaving their whimpering dog out in the rain. "What more can the animal want?" he asked; "he has plenty of whine and water." If, however, Philo's idea is scientifically correct, it will be invaluable to formal and the When a will be invaluable to frugal and temperate hosts. guest drowns the miller, instead of urging him to resuscitate that imaginary being by the aid of the decanter, furnish him with a sponge dipped in oil to draw off the superfluous water. It is almost safe to say that he will not drown the miller a second time, even should he get the chance.

Ancient examination papers in philosophy contain the question, "What are mixed modes?" The author of the essay concerning Human Understanding replies : "Such are the complex ideas we mark by the names obligation, drunk enness, a lie, etc., which, consisting of several combinations of simple ideas of different kinds, I have called mixed modes, to distinguish them from the more simple modes, which consist only of simple ideas of the same kind." It is a neculiar coincidence that a peculiar coincidence that Locke should call his second illustrative term mixed, seeing that it indicates an extreme result of Philo's unmixing. The usages of modern speech seem to justify the English philosoper in calling intoxication a mixed mode, whether produced by American mixed drinks or by the native simplicity of home-made tangle-leg. Greeks and Romans would have regarded Philo's treatment