

to them. Now, what commodities does Australia produce? Australia does not produce as large a variety of exportable goods as Canada. We get the best indication of her surplus by looking over her list of exports to Great Britain, for nearly everything that Australia produces in greater quantity than she requires for home consumption she sends to the English market. The British consumption of Australian goods amounts to \$150,000,000 a year. Certain articles which Australia sends to Great Britain come into direct competition with our exports. We could hardly expect to send wheat or flour to Australia, nor could we send cattle, for our cattle meet their chilled beef in the British market. They compete also in sending large quantities of minerals—gold, silver, copper and lead.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What is Australia's export of wheat?

Mr. AMES. About \$25,000,000 a year. There are a number of articles that we already admit free from Australia—we could hardly do better than that.

We allow all skins, hides, rabbit skins, sheep skins and other skins to come in free. We allow wool in free, we allow tin in free and we allow their unmanufactured timber, many beautiful hardwoods that can be used in the manufacture of furniture, and special timber that will resist the torredo, and can be used in wharf construction, and also paving block timber. All of that timber is of most excellent quality and it is all admitted free. But, on the other hand, there are certain lines which Australia would be extremely glad to put on the Canadian market more extensively, lines on which we have a distinct maximum, intermediate and minimum tariff. Some of these articles are:

Article.	Maximum.	Minimum.
Butter.. . . . .	4c	3c.
Apples.. . . . .	40c. bbl.	25c. bbl.
Leather.. . . . .	15%	12½%
Chilled mutton.. . . .	3c.	2c.
Meat in tins . . . . .	27½%	17½%
Tallow.. . . . .	20%	15%

If we should give to Australia our minimum tariff on these items we would undoubtedly considerably increase our importations of them from that country. We might even do better than our minimum tariff, inasmuch as the number of articles Australia can send us is so limited compared with the very large variety we can send them. Then, as I said, a list-for-list arrangement can only be dealt with when commissioners sit beside each other and concession is given for concession. The New Zealand principle that the computed loss of revenue on each article should be balanced might be applied and in that way the concessions made to measure up by some rule mutually agreed upon.

Australia produces a great deal of very excellent light wine. I can speak from knowledge for I have been there, I have seen the actual making of the wine, and have tasted it as well, Hocks and Chablis and wines of that character. The Australians would be very glad if they could get from us the same preferential treatment as we give to France on light wines and I think our Pacific coast people would find that the Australian wine would supplant the Californian if such an arrangement was made. There are other items which we include under the French treaty such as lime-juice, prunes, raisins, currants, &c. If we could give to Australia the preference we give under the French treaty it would help them very much in these lines.

Mr. DEVLIN. Apart from natural products, are there any manufactured goods in which we might give them a preference?

Mr. AMES. I have pointed out that there are a number of manufactured goods we can send to Australia, but that there are very few manufactured goods that Australia could send to us.

Mr. DEVLIN. And in these manufactured goods that we might send them according to the list enumerated by the hon. member could we compete with the Americans in Australia?

Mr. AMES. My contention is that at present the Americans get the advantage of Canada because we are both treated as strangers, but if we were given a slight preference in Australia of even 5 per cent or 10 per cent on the selling price over the American manufacturer we could, in many items displace the American manufacturer. In fact the point I mainly have in mind and am endeavouring to persuade the House to consider, is that it is of primal importance that these two great parts of the British Empire should be linked together as closely as can be and there are a great many advantages that would accrue if we had a mutually satisfactory preferential trade arrangement.

I believe that the trade now carried on between the two countries is a mere bagatelle compared with what might be effected if there were proper facilities for transportation and mutual concessions made under the tariffs of the two countries. That would be of great advantage. It would help us to build up our shipping on the Pacific and to build up the empire generally, it would strengthen us in dealing with the great problem that we must some day face, the defence of British interests on the Pacific ocean. But, I feel that the proposal of minimum for minimum, a rough-and-ready system of giving 400 items that neither country could possibly send and