connection with British industry. In proportion to population, the Australasian colonies take from Great Britain more than any other countries in the world; they are able to do so because they sell to her more than any other countries.

An able Australian writer lately said in The Times, "Australia is one of the least self-contained countries in the world. It is a wonderful producer of raw material, but it must trade off this raw material. A dozen big 'stations' Man for man, the people of the colonies, leaving out India, consume British products out of all proportion to foreigners. In Germany and the United States the ordinary annual consumption per head of British manufactures is about 8s. per head, in France, 9s., in Canada, $\pounds I$ 15s., in the West Indies, $\pounds 2$ 5s., in South Africa, $\pounds 3$, in Australasia, nearly $\pounds 8$. Thus three or four millions of people in Australasia take more of British goods than about fifty millions of people in Germany,



COOK'S MONUMENT, BOTANY BAY.

would supply wool enough to clothe every man, woman, and How is the child in Australia. big remainder, almost the whole, to be disposed of? We must sell it in the other hemisphere." He goes on to sav: "England could do without Australia better than Australia could do without Eng-The one imaginable event land. would mean something like ruin; the other, only disaster. England's prosperity is rooted in many countries, in so many that she is always able to turn a brave face in any single direction."

and nearly as much as sixty millions of people in the United States. Only an artificial boundary separates Canada from the United States, yet an emigrant who goes north of that boundary immediately begins to purchase more than three times as much of British goods as one who goes south of it. As a customer to the British artisan, one Australian is worth sixteen Americans; one South African is worth seven or eight Germans. Figures such as these have suggested the remark that "trade follows the flag."