

tude, and my hon. friend, the member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay would not have impaired the power of his eloquence, would not have lost his reputation as a thorough and through partisan of the system of political dependence, if he had bridled a little the expression of his admiration and enthusiasm for the National Policy. Truly, in witnessing such solemn gestures, in hearing such a magnificent voice as his, in listening to the pompous eulogy of the National Policy, and recollecting the animated phases of his election, I was expecting that the member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay, in his great admiration for the National Policy, was going to tell us that it was that policy that had invented the telegraph which enabled Mgr. Bosse, during his election, to fortify the weak points of his electoral organization. I was also expecting that the hon. member would attribute to the merits of the National Policy the invention of the match boxes, which sometimes also replaced the official tin boxes in which are to be deposited the voters' ballots. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has stopped short of that. Besides his eulogium of the advantages of the National Policy was pompous enough to allow him to stop short of these absurdities which I was prepared to hear. He could also have checked himself from many other things which he, however, had the audacity to say, as, for example, to repeat to satiety how prosperous this country is, and how this prosperity is due to the National Policy. It is true that the Minister of Finance has said the same thing, but the Minister of Finance is obliged by his position to do all he can to make us believe what is not true, and he acquitted himself fully. But with us members our duty is to believe only what we know to be true, and especially not to believe what we know to be false. Truly, when we consider the misery in which a great part of the people, especially the rural population, suffer to-day; when we realize that they are obliged to emigrate to the United States because of the prevailing distress, and when, on another hand, we witness the emphasis with which we are told that the country is prosperous, can the members who say these things expect to be taken seriously; should they not rather be taken as strangers to the country in which they live? I am astonished that the Tory party, which lectures us at every turn, which constantly accuses us of treason because we do not mimic closely enough the English nation—the mother land—I am astonished, I say, that they should allow to enter into their own customs, precedents so contrary to what is practised in the Imperial Parliament. One would truly think, Mr. Speaker, that speaking the truth is to be avoided, while the contrary holds elsewhere. I was reading lately in the Speech from the Throne pronounced at the opening of the Imperial Parliament now in session in London, a whole paragraph devoted to regret over the misery suffered by the population in certain parts of Eng-

land. Here, on the contrary, truth must be hidden. Is that the proper way to remedy the evils pressing upon the people? Is it by hiding the ills that they can best be remedied? In making this statement which I have just mentioned, in the Speech delivered from the Throne in the Imperial Parliament, has Mr. Gladstone belittled himself, has he lowered himself as a statesman, and will he be considered as a man inferior to—say the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Belley), who, in the wake of the hon. Minister of Finance, declared that this country is prosperous? It is not disloyalty, Mr. Speaker, to speak simply the truth. It is to show one's sincerity. It is to show one self patriotic, to face the situation of the country in order to study and remedy it. The hon. member made another error in his speech, when he accused us of being disloyal, of decrying the country when we say it is not prosperous. These charges have already many times been refuted by a great number of members on this side of the House. However, it seems that these refutations are of no avail with members who know how to flourish their arms in a show of eloquence, but upon whom arguments seem to be powerless. We have seen them launch into comparisons. I am willing to follow them on that ground. Here is a comparison that I am going to make. Let us suppose that the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Belley) be for the country, or rather—this would be too much honour—let us suppose that the hon. Minister of Finance be for the country. The physician of the hon. Minister of Finance finds that he is afflicted with a serious disease, but this physician thinks that he must not discourage the patient, and, with that object in view, he thinks proper to hide the truth from him. He must not tell him he is sick, but on the contrary, he must make him believe that his health is perfect. On the complaint of the hon. Minister of Finance, saying to his physician: I am suffering from a general depression of the whole system; what is the matter with me? The physician answers: Oh, it is nothing but a moment of weakness; it will be over in a moment; your health is really unimpaired; have no fear. You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, what fate would await the hon. Minister of Finance at the hand of such a physician, if he did not seek the services of another doctor who would apply another regime and would tell him the truth as to the state of his health. Who is our best friend, I pray, if not the one who tells us the truth? And is not the best physician also the one who recognizes the gravity of the case and sets about to treat it seriously? Surely, the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Belley) cannot deserve to be called the best friend of the Government. I said, Mr. Speaker, that we should face the situation. It is useless to deny it, there prevails in the country a general depression. The Conservative press, as well as the Lib-