I am bound to say, against the protest of the Canadian arbitrator, and upon this point also I prefer, for my part, the opinion of the Canadian arbitrator to the opinion of the Prime Minister. Then it was agreed on both sides that there should be a zone around the Islands, which served as rookeries to the seals. The Canadian commissioner suggested that the zone should be twenty miles around the Islands, but the court of arbitration made it three times twenty, or sixty miles around the Island. Then it was agreed also on both sides that there should be a close season within which sealing should be prohibited. The Canadian commissioner suggested that the close season should be from September 15th to May 1st, but the Court of Arbitration decided that the close season should be from May 1st to July 31st, the very reverse of what was proposed by our own commissioner. Upon this regulation also the Canadian commissioner dissented, and I am disposed to back his judgment against the opinion set forth by the Prime Minister. But, we may be told, the American commissioners also dissented from this regulation. It is true the American commissioners dissented from this regulation, and when they came back they did not brag, the American commissioners never pretended they had made a great success, on the contrary they protested against the regulation, and there was a very obvious reason why they should protest. From the very first their pretension was that they had a monopoly of those seals, that they had the right of ownership, the right of protection, and consistently with their pretension, they would not be participants in the regulation which knocked the bottom out of their pretension. But if you want to know why we should rejoice, as the member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant) said a moment ago, over that award, let us look at what took place on the other side of the continent, let us look at what took place on the British Columbia coast. Sir, I call the attention of my hon. friend from the city of Ottawa to this fact, that the effect of that award has been to kill the Canadian sealing industry completely. Canadian sealing is a thing of the past. I see that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries takes some exception to that; has he not seen, as we have all seen, a report that all these schooners and tackle which were employed in the seal fisheries in Britisn Columbia have been offered for sale at auction? I do not know whether the sale took place, but I know that they were offered for sale, and the hon. gentleman will not contradict me on that point, although I do not know that they were sold. I know that the British Columbia sealers have offered all their schooners and tackle for sale at auction, saying that their industry was forever a thing of the past, and unless I am greatly mistaken—we shall see by and by—I understand that there is in the hands of the Government a petition from the owners of schooners and tackle employed in the fisheries, asking the Government to compensate them for the great loss they have sustained by the award. Sir, I agree that on one ground we have reason to be satisfied—we have reason to be satisfied with the reference of the question to a court of arbitration, we have reason to rejoice that a dispute between Great Britain and the United States was referred to a court, instead of those two nations appealing to the supreme arbitrament of war. This is the second time within thirty years that the two great Anglo-Saxon nations have given this example to the world of settling their disputes, not as in the past, by the barbarous plan of war, but by a judicial arbitration. So, however unsatisfactory the award may be, still there is reason to be satisfied that the dispute was peacefully settled in the same manner as previous disputes had been settled. Now, there is another paragraph in the Speech from the Throne of which we have heard a good deal, a fast Atlantic service. Sir, how long ago is it since the Prime Minister told us, with a great flourish of trumpets, that Canada was to provide a fast Atlantic service on the northern route between Europe and Canada, equal to the fastest and best then plying the ocean? It must be six years ago at least, and in the following session, in consequence of that grandiloquent promise, the Parliament of Canada was induced to vote $500,000 to whoever would establish such a service equal to the fastest and best then plying the ocean. Now, half a million is a large pile of money, but although that offer has been on the statute-book for four years, nobody has yet come forward to take possession of that sum of money. Our great Canadian lines, the Allan line, the Dominion line, and the Torrance line, who, as the hon. member for Ottawa City said a moment ago, have been the pioneers of steam navigation in the St. Lawrence, have not come forward, enterprising men as they are, to take the money, and why? Because it is well known that the conditions set forth by the Government are impossible of fulfilment; it is impossible to have on the northern route a service equal to the fastest and the best, it is impossible to have a service as fast as the services now plying between New York and Europe. Why, Sir, it is a well-known fact that the difficulties of navigation are so great in the Gulf of St. Lawrence that it would be madness to expect any company to maintain a rate of speed such as is maintained between New York and the European ports. I remember that this question was discussed a few years ago, and two gentlemen of authority in this House gave their opinion to that effect. Mr. Jones, then one of the members for Halifax, and who is an authority upon this subject, said it was madness to expect that we should maintain a rate of speed of seven-