

been sold and millions of dollars paid by the purchasers, every dollar of that capital has been put into revenue so as to swell the surplus. Can the hon. minister find anything in economics which would justify a man in selling his capital and treating the proceeds as current revenue for the year? It is just as if a man had two large mills out of which he made a profit every year. One of these mills he sells at \$50,000. Would any rule of business justify him in adding that \$50,000 to the revenue account of the current year? What dividends could be paid and what terrible confusion could be created if business were carried on in that way. Yet we have a sample of it in the present administration. In the surplus of last year, there is over \$1,600,000, the proceeds of the sale of lands, the year before that the same amount, and this year probably two or three million dollars more. All these capital sums got from the sale of Canada's possessions are treated as revenue, while at the same time the cost of administering those lands is charged to capital. Now I hope to see the Minister of Finance go a step further and bring forth works meek for repentance by putting the sales of that land into a fund out of which the Hudson Bay railway shall be built, and treating it as capital and not as revenue. What has the Finance Minister to say in defence of conduct of this kind? With his authorization, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) declared that the Hudson Bay railway was to be built at an estimated cost of some \$25,000,000, and to be paid for out of the proceeds from the sales of Dominion lands. And the whole country applauded and none more than hon. gentlemen on that side. The Minister of the Interior got his Bill through, and has been selling these lands, and to-day there is not one cent left of all the money he got from these sales. It all went into current account, and was spent on different services in the country. I leave the Minister of the Interior and his colleagues to settle that matter among themselves. But I ask whether it is an honest method of conducting business. You get parliamentary authority to sell our lands in sufficient quantities to net some \$25,000,000 under pledge that the proceeds shall be used to build the railway, and then you put all that money into current account and spend it on dredging and every other kind of current services. When we come to pay the bills for the Hudson Bay railway we must go to the money markets of the world and borrow it. It is simply a brazen breach of faith.

The Finance Minister was rather troubled about that surplus. He thought that \$30,000,000 of surplus was so large that the taxpayers might make a demand for the lessening of their taxes, especially that large portion of them who were brought up un-

der the teachings of the Finance Minister himself. All the time the Finance Minister was going about and telling the people what was right to do, he was a sturdy opponent of surpluses. And so was Hon. David Mills, so was Sir Richard Cartwright, so was the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself and all the members of his cabinet. The moment you get a surplus that amounts to anything, these teachers told us, it is warrant positive that you ought to reduce taxation and give relief to the taxpayer. To-day my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has a different doctrine, but, then, what is there in this wide world of business and politics in Canada on which he has not a different doctrine from that which he had twenty years ago. Why, he has even changed his faith in the national point of view. That is, I suppose he has. I heard him say but a little while ago that he was overjoyed at the stability and prospective permanence of this Dominion, this great confederation. I must believe him. And yet I could not but remember that it was not many years ago that he led a determined campaign to break up this Dominion, to smash confederation into atoms. Not content with attempting to take his own province of Nova Scotia out, he tried to inveigle Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick into the same evil path, and was quite angry when he could not succeed. However, he vowed: Let them go, let them sacrifice to their idols, let them walk in their own paths; but as for me, I will take Nova Scotia out, come what may. Is it that my hon. friend, as he grows older, grows wiser. Or would he yet say, if I asked the question: I still believe Nova Scotia would have been better off if she had been taken out of the union? But after all, has he changed his view? After all, is not the policy he has to-day before this House the same in essence as that which he advocated in 1886? I read, not three months ago, in the Halifax 'Chronicle,' which, I suppose, gives the views of my hon. friend now as it did in those times, the old geographical argument. You cannot fight against geography runs this argument; why not let British Columbia deal with the States to the south of her?—why not let the northwest deal with the adjacent States and the maritime provinces deal with the New England States? That was the argument before confederation. That was the argument in reference to Nova Scotia in 1886, if my hon. friend had been strong enough or straightforward enough to carry out the policy he declared he was convinced was the proper policy for Nova Scotia. So, it is possible that to-day, by another and devious way he is operating to bring about the same condition for all sections of this Dominion that he tried to bring about in 1886 for his