

duty to watch earnestly and exert every effort to advance the industries and development of the resources of our country—a country of which all of us may well be proud.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—I have no doubt the House will be highly pleased when I inform them that it is not my intention to go through the whole bill of fare, like the hon. gentleman who has just made his speech. My remarks will be confined to one or two paragraphs in the Speech from the Throne, but before referring to those paragraphs, I desire to call the attention of the House to the omission of a clause from the Address which appeared in the Speech from the Throne last year. It was considered worthy of a place in the Speech from the Throne in 1893, and I regret to see it has been omitted from the one under consideration. I refer to the ninth paragraph of the speech of last year, which promised that provision would be made by which voting by ballot should be extended to the North-west Territories. I always took strong grounds, from the time that the very first Act was introduced in this House to give the North-west Territories representation in the other branch of the Legislature and in this, that they should have the ballot the same as the provinces. I held that no exception should be made as to the manner in which elections for the Dominion House should be conducted in these territories. Depriving them of the ballot I looked on as a slight, and I might say an insult and a reflection on the intellect of the people of that portion of our great Dominion.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, there is a bill now before the other Chamber—it may have been read this afternoon for all I know—introducing a measure in compliance with the wishes of the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—I am very much pleased to hear it. I was not aware that the Government had brought down a bill of that nature. It having been named in the Speech of last year, I thought it was only reasonable to assume that if they intended to make the desirable change it would have been mentioned in the present speech. I am very much pleased to hear the announcement that the hon. gentleman has made.

The first paragraph in the speech which I desire to criticize for a short time is that which has reference to the Behring Sea Arbitration. I had the pleasure, a few nights ago, of listening to the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government of this country in his reply to the gifted leader of the Opposition, and when he came to deal with the criticisms of the leader of the Opposition with respect to the Behring Sea Arbitration, he stated emphatically, and I have his speech here as reported in the Commons Hansard, that the present regulations would not diminish or injure the sealing industry in the province of British Columbia. I can assure this House and the hon. the leader of the Government in this Chamber and the hon. the leader of the Government that they have been misinformed. In order to show how the award and regulations of the Behring Sea Arbitration are viewed in my province and by those engaged in the industry, perhaps I cannot do better than read a few articles and editorial comments from the leading Conservative organ in the province of British Columbia, namely the *Victoria Colonist*. I have no doubt the leader of the Government here and others will probably attach more importance to the statements made by that Conservative organ than they will to anything I may say here. The following is an editorial from the *Daily Colonist* of August 18th, 1893:

THE ARBITRATION.

It is not a little singular, but still, in a measure it is not surprising to notice the manner in which the award of the Behring Sea arbitrators is regarded by the people of Great Britain and the United States, who alike seem to have gained their point—the one in the maintenance of the principle for which they contended, the other in securing the object which they had in view. This is well expressed by the *New York Herald*, which says, “it gives the Government and to its lessee, the fur company, all that was, rightly asked.” Our neighbours have, it would appear, reason to congratulate themselves; for though they are beaten they, as it is said, have gained all and more than all, which the late Secretary of State Blaine demanded. Britain's victory is for Canada worse than a defeat, for though it is logically expected to have secured to the British Columbia sealers indemnification for the losses to which they have been subjected by undue United States interference, it has, it is claimed, destroyed a local industry in which a capital of over \$500,000 has been invested, and in which some 1,500 or more men earn their own living, and at a low estimate that of from four or five thousand women and children. “Schooners for Sale” will undoubtedly be the announcement on all hands, and the United States or the Alaska