

delighted with what he had seen, and hopeful as to the future. Twelve years later he went over the same ground. The little villages had grown into towns, and the towns into cities. Stub lines of railway had been extended hundreds of miles, transportation companies had been organized, and railway tracks gridironed the country. Everything was booming. Even the Rocky mountains seemed brighter the second time he crossed the continent. I congratulate him on the pleasant tale he told—the story of an hon. gentleman who appreciated what prosperity was. And I do most sincerely trust that the prosperity which prevailed for those twelve years under the late Administration will be taken as an evidence of what that Administration has done in promoting transportation, immigration, and the settlement of the country, and that there will be no decline in the high standard achieved by the late Government.

Passing on to the first paragraph, I concur very heartily in the expressions of sympathy to which these two hon. gentlemen gave deliverance with regard to the recovery of Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Connaught. Their Royal Highnesses, during their short stay in Canada have endeared themselves to the people of the Dominion by their kindly manner, by their interest in everything pertaining to the social and public life of the country, and by the assiduity with which they put themselves at the disposal of corporations, organizations and educational institutions in endeavouring to add to their interest and usefulness. I do not know anything occurring in many years that has pleased Canadians more than when they learned that their Royal Highnesses had returned to Canada to resume the duties of their high offices, and that Her Royal Highness would be well enough and strong enough to take her full share in the duties she has so far discharged so acceptably to the people of Canada.

I must proceed to notice one or two things in the Address which I think deserve our attention. As a whole I do not think the Address contains matter of such interest and importance as some addresses I have heard from the Throne, and I have heard quite a number since I first entered Parliament about forty years ago. The bill of fare, to use a common expression, is not very large. I do not know whether it is very nutritious or not. We will know better by the time it is consumed, and I hope we will not spend an unreasonable time around the

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS.

table in disposing of the materials placed before us.

I notice the Address reports progress on the National Transcontinental railway. I must say I am a little disappointed that the progress has not been as great as we expected a few years ago. I am a little disappointed at hearing a report, whether true or not, that the character of that road is not to be maintained to the standard prescribed originally. I do not think a greater mistake could be made with that vast scheme than to lower the standard originally intended. Such lowering of the standard means an addition to the cost of transportation which might be very serious. It means depriving us of the honour which I saw in sight, of having one of the greatest railway systems in the world, constructed on the most approved basis, and calculated to open up a very large extent of country, already waiting for settlement. I hope my fear is groundless. The hon. gentleman when he speaks can tell us whether it is so or not. I am also disappointed somewhat in the progress made on the Hudson Bay railway. We have, I understand, about ninety miles of it completed. The road will exceed four hundred miles in length. There are very ominous rumours as to the adequacy of the terminal on the Hudson Bay, as to it being by no means the best terminal that could be found. I think it is not too late, if proper inquiry were made, to change from Port Nelson to Port Churchill, if the latter is found to be the proper terminal. It would entirely destroy the purpose of building that road; if it were found, as is represented, that ships could not enter the harbour. If these ships have to stand out four or five miles, and be loaded and unloaded, the means of transportation which the road was intended to provide, for western grain, would be hampered by conditions such as these. My hon. friend can tell us whether there is any truth in the stories we have heard, and whether it is the intention of the government to place beyond all possible doubt, the adequacy of the terminal at Port Nelson, for the purpose for which such terminal was acquired.

I am glad to notice one or two things in the Address, of which I think we can all appreciate. First is the construction of the large elevator at Fort William. That has greatly facilitated in the transfer of the products of the West to the sea, and to the