Hon Chief Commissioner—The interests we want to protect would be considered under confederation.

Hon Dr Helmcken—I say what we want now is what we want under confederation. Now, sir, what have we been trying for. What has been our policy? why, to protect industry. I am told that the Dominion Government will not admit any such provision in our tariff and the example of the United States is cited. It has been said that California wanted to alter her tariff and was not allowed to do so. I say, I really think California was one and a part of the United States. But the Union—and we are confederates, so we are still in a union to some extent—Californ would have made terms if she could, but could not, and it was for a mere question whether she should or not she did. It was only three months and even communication in that land California in the Union. There is this difference in the Organic Act—section ninety five enables Canada to make different laws as to agriculture in each different province.

Hon Chief Commissioner—I don't think that section applies to the tariff; it does not seem like it.

Hon Dr Helmcken—Perhaps it does not, but I say that anything advantageous to the colony may be enacted by the Local Government. We can ask for a separate tariff and we do use powers to make different laws as to agriculture in each province.

Hon Attorney General—No, that is a mistake. The 95th section weakens this hon member's argument.

Hon Dr Helmcken—I say I stir nothing my argument. It does not mean merely that people may create laws out of their land. The question is issue is, shall agricultural interests be protected or no? It is quite possible that those who realize the treaty, when brought into contact with Canadian statesmen, may devise some arrangement by this result may be effected. I could wish to give up to Canadian statesmen that they know more than our selves about our local affairs, but I think we may utilize their experience. I do not think that people, when they know that Confederation will not be forced upon them, will accept Confederation. The question for the farmers will be, shall agriculture be protected or not? I ask again, is agriculture protected by the resolution or not?

Hon Attorney General—It is not a sine qua non.

Hon Chief Commissioner—I think the idea to take a vote on protection to agriculture is good one, and I would rather that the resolution stopped there. Then I would propose a further resolution, pointing out the difficulties and leave other under.

Hon Dr Helmcken—I accept that alteration. We shall by it secure an expression of the opinion of the Council upon the point.

Hon Mr McCombe—I go further than that resolution. I stand here as a protectionist and I want to see the manufacturing interests protected as well as the agricultural interests. Protection will be a sine qua non with my constituents. If the hon senior member for Victoria will drop the question into agricultural interests, to manufacturing interests and trade, I will withdraw my resolution. I say that we want this question settled before Confederation. As for a reciprocity treaty, it has, in my opinion, to be based on existing industry. The most important treaty of reciprocity was between Canada and Portugal. I may add in English goods were admitted into Portugal free of duty and Canada. Reciprocity to be some extent must be based on existing industries. If we enter into a treaty of reciprocity with the United States, we must build up our industries, such as coal. I take it that with our coal has to be subsidized so as to foreign and native coal in the San Francisco and Portland markets. Unless there is an extended market I fear it is impossible to increase the trade in coal. Reciprocity would destroy the most permanent interests; that, for instance, of agriculture, and we would gain no thing by it. I say if Canada thinks proper to be negotiated a treaty of reciprocity with the United States we should be not liberty to negotiate a separate treaty, or I am very especially afraid in the treaty.

Hon Mr Robson—I rise to cover the ground by getting the Chairman to put the resolution as an abstract proposition.

The Chairman then read the resolution as an abstract proposition for the vote of the Council.

"That in the opinion of this Council it is necessary that the agricultural, horticultural, and dairy interests of British Columbia be protected."

Hon Chief Commissioner—Mr Chairman, I am prepared to vote for that proposition, but I do not go quite to the extent of being so liberal as necessary. Although I think it very desirable. I don't think it of such importance as the hon members for Victoria City and District, and to make it a sine qua non or a sine qua sine non condition. I think it is desirable to continue protection under Confederation, and I voted so while we deliberate. I think that the Dominion government may, perhaps, be better able to provide the means to meet the object in view. We may not be able to provide a remedy, but we may advise. Our protection that we ask is only partially affects the agricultural. It is important that it will affect Vancouver Island and the Lower Fraser at this time. (No, no, from Mr McCombe.) I say that the farmers of the Lower Fraser are not agricultural properties, the land is of a nature which acts in dual manner can compete in the upper parts of British Columbia or when the produce of the upper country can come into competition with the produce of the island and of the Lower Fraser in these markets, it must be cheaper to cost transport as equivalent to a protective duty, that before that time arrives the tariff may be amended again and again. With regard to what has been said about the closer union with a foreign country I said and I repeat that if the interests of the farmers would be prejudiced under confederation, they would be very anti-related under the Union Act. I believe that if we were brought under the Dominion tariff they would be injured. I do not say that the Dominion would not give us separate tariff regulations. I think they will do so but I say we have placed ourselves out of a position to press it. We have put it here then a sine qua, and we have left the tariff out of the scheme. We can now put out that we want protection and leave it for the Dominion Government to put in but the means. We have virtually put it out of our hands to dictate the means approved by the Council. I cannot agree in thinking that cause 91 leaves us free to impose our own tariff. I say we have made the British North America Act apply under the scheme which we have adopted under clause 10.

Hon Mr Robson—I differ from that.

Hon Chief Commissioner—That is the whole strength of my argument. We have virtually given up the power over the tariff to Canada, but it seems to me as the Council are invited to state what is wanted. It must be remembered that those terms are only memoranda for confederation. Different terms may be sent back, and it will be left for the new Council to decide upon them; and I, for one, am ready to suggest to the Canadian Government that we should have protection, although there are objections, for it you protect one interest another must suffer. We pay for the protection of produce in the increased price of the articles we consume. I got to the length of thinking it desirable to recommend the Canadian Government to protect our agricultural interests.

Hon Attorney General—I will ask the honorable mover of this recommendation whether he insists on the word 'necessary?'

Hon Dr Helmcken—I say this is one of those things that under Confederation will be necessary.

Hon Chief Commissioner—Will the hon member alter the word 'necessary' to very desirable?

Hon Attorney General—If you retain that word I must vote against it.

Hon Dr Helmcken—I retain the word.

Hon Mr Robson—'Highly desirable' would suit my views better.

Hon Mr Dewdney—I think the word ought to be retained.

Hon Mr Alston—I believe all restrictions are false in principle, and governments have no right to travel out of their path to dictate principles. It is rightly been said that protection to agriculture is at the expense of other things, and it is simply ridiculous to say that agricultural interests are the only interests in the colony. Vancouver Island cannot be looked upon as an agricultural country. I would vote for protection temporarily, but no sooner gold rushes are over the farmer needs no protection, and although free trade may be injurious to one interest, I believe it to be the correct principle. It seems to me that the Organic Act is a treaty or partnership between four countries, and where the terms are so sent we can alter the Organic Act. If it be that we may make the laws, I think a tariff takes the revenue; and unless the resolution is altered I cannot vote for it.

Hon Chief Commissioner—I may clear the ground if I make a suggestion. Think it would be better to take the subjects separately, and then I would embody the whole matter in one resolution to His Excellency.

Hon Mr Wood—It would be desirable to have as unanimous a vote as possible. The hon Chief Commissioner and the Hon Mr Alston have said that a tax on produce would be likely to prove injurious. I say that protection is only to be extended until our agriculturists can compete with the farmers on the opposite shore. If reciprocity should eventually arise, I do not pledge myself to simple protection. It would be necessary that we make some compensation to farmers, but I cannot say I would support it.

Hon Dr Helmcken—We want a positive guarantee for protection.

Hon Chief Commissioner moved an amendment to change the word 'necessary' to 'highly desirable.'

The recommendation, as amended, was carried.

Hon Mr Dewdney moved a resolution, 'That it is highly desirable that manufactured articles should be protected.'

Hon Chief Commissioner—I would ask the hon member to define manufactured articles.

Hon Mr Dewdney—I would name boots and shoes. Now in event of a reciprocity treaty, I should like to see our interests protected. A reciprocity treaty may exert a stimulating influence for a time or it may be detrimental. We have confectionary and many other things, for instance, there is a proposition to erect a woolen manufactory. Furniture at present comes from the United States. Our shops make as good manufacture if there if they could import the raw material free. The same could be said of wheel wrights. If we are to have large public works we must look to these interests protected. Harness may be brought in cheap under reciprocity, leather and soap like these. I start out on this principle, if we can keep our manufactures at home we are doing our duty.

Hon Mr Barnard—The Canadian tariff applies to all the articles mentioned by the hon gentleman; I am satisfied in regard to this protection. He says he wants protection for leather, and boots, and harness. Twenty per cent is our tariff on wagons, and yet no class of wagons, such as is wanted, can be made here.

Hon Mr Robson—I shall never have protecting manufactures if we do not protect them. With regard to wagon building, parties now engaged in the business were about to leave until the tariff was introduced. Competition lowers the price of home manufactured articles.

Hon Dr Helmcken—I shall support this resolution; the Canadian tariff meets measure meets it.

Hon Attorney General—I shall ask to have the words altered.

Hon Dr Helmcken—Precisely we shall have to protect British Columbian interests against Canadian interests, if the farmer and boot maker are protected, other local manufactures must be protected also. Where you do not protect those and out them free, it is our duty to protect our own interests.

Hon Mr Barnard—And train people out of the country.

Hon Dr Helmcken—You keep them in. You send out $100,000 a quarter for goods, which could have spent here. Nine hundred thousand to be spent in mines and in building up the country. Now you want this country to be a garden and a manufactory. The people must do it, and it is the only way in which they can do it. Put your productions into competition with the world and you will run the producers throughout the whole country.

Hon Chief Commissioner—Another question is, up to what point are you to protect? What is the use of protecting produce if you protect coloniz out of the country? I put this as an abstract proposition. There is no more moot point than the difference between free trade and protection. I see the Canadian tariff protects these things and I think I feel inclined to ask for more. Under the Canadian tariff agricultural products are admitted free, but manufactures are protected. I don't intend to assume that the tariff will be taken off—that protection is to be taken away from manufactures, but if so, it will be against the arguments of the members from British Columbia.

Hon Mr Robson—Some members are growing protection mad. They want to build a wall around the colony and keep out the native world. You must come down to first principles. When honorable members talk about protection, I suppose we intend to protect that which we can produce. Are we to protect one to force people into branches of industry against their will? Some honorable member have run to the extent of protecting population out of the colony; another favors protection in order to keep prices low, and thus to secure our population. I maintain that protection has run too far, and the agriculturists have not benefitted by it. [No, no! Mr. Dewdney.] They tell me the demand is so small that prices are low. I am not in favor of withdrawing protection from farmers, but let us see that it does not go too far.

Hon Mr Wood—Right I put turn the tables by judging some hon members are free trade mad, no one ever dreamt of such high