

the particular application of that principle, followed in England, may not be advisable under our very different conditions. During the first forty or fifty years of this century, England rested almost wholly on one of the twin pillars mentioned; now she rests almost wholly on the other. Rightly to comprehend the development of her industry, which has been witnessed, we must look upon it as based in effect on both.

It is the manufactures of the United States, rather than those of England, against which Protection is required in Canada. The reason of this may be given in few words. The material circumstances—and, it may be added, the *social* circumstances, (however much political circumstances may differ)—of these Provinces, resemble very much those of the neighbouring States, while differing greatly from those of England. These circumstances, all of which determine the particular varieties of industrial pursuits that the people “take to,” so to speak, furnish the explanation of the broad general fact before us, namely, that the industrial aptitudes of the Provinces are like those of the States, but unlike those of England. Now it is plain that while manufacturers of similar articles are competitors with each other, manufacturers of different lines of articles are *not* competitors. Canadian manufacturers can look with perfect complacency upon importations of Sheffield cutlery, most articles of “Brummagem” ware, Spitalfields silks, West of England broadcloths, “Hoyle’s” and “Ashton’s” prints, Glasgow fine muslin, and Paisley sewing thread. But they cannot so regard the importation, either free or at too low rates of duty, of American mill machinery, leather, boots and shoes, cotton yarn and coarse cottons, “Lawrence” (Massachusetts,) woollen shawls and woollen goods generally, flax and hempen fabrics, starch, corn-spirit, reaping and mowing machines, axes, saws, and other mechanics’ and farmers’ tools, cigars and manufactured tobacco, brooms, pails, tubs, &c., and the rest of the list of articles in which we are running the race of competition—not with England, by any means, but with the United States. The moral of the distinction here pointed out is so obvious, that it needs not to be enforced at any great length. It may be profitably studied in connection with the paragraph from the *New York World*, quoted in the *Leader’s* article.