

Britain to-day and they will find that the best opinion there upon this question is that by the action of this government there has been a recession from the position which they have taken upon preferential trade in the adoption of an intermediate tariff which has practically reduced preference to an amount not exceeding 10 per cent. Why is that? It is for the purpose of helping our exports. Why have we gone to France for the purpose of negotiating this treaty? Is it for the purpose of helping our imports? My hon. friend who seconded this motion touched the note which actuated and inspired in the adoption of this treaty. My hon. friend pointed out the volume of imports which we have been receiving from France at the expense of our exports. We have been importing eleven million and exporting about one million to France. What was the object of the government in negotiating the treaty with France? Was it not for the purpose of helping out the exports of the country, and for the purpose of reducing the imports of the country? What does that mean so far as its effect upon the preference with Great Britain is concerned? It means that we will buy from France where we can buy to greater advantage than in Great Britain, and, torture it as you may, I say it is a frank confession of the weakness of the policy adopted by the government some ten years ago in establishing a preference with Great Britain, and refusing to demand anything in return therefor. Now, this balance of trade which has been against us to the extent of about one hundred and eighteen million must necessarily represent something else. It represents the increased revenue which is to-day being enjoyed by the government. The government boasts of the revenue leaping ahead by bounds until we are now enjoying a revenue, fortunately or unfortunately, of about one hundred million dollars. The revenue for the coming fiscal year will doubtless reach the sum of one hundred million dollars. Hon. gentlemen congratulate the country upon the size of our revenue and upon its continuous increase. They point to the time when the Conservative government of 1896 had a revenue not exceeding \$27,000,000. I think in 1896 upon the accession of the present government to office,

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.

the revenue of the Dominion of Canada represented \$27,000,000.

Hon. Sir Richard CARTWRIGHT—\$37,000,000.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—\$37,000,000 including all sources. Hon. gentlemen have persuaded themselves that taxation has not been increased. It seems to me that I have never in my experience come in contact with a section of the community who have so happily deluded themselves as hon. gentlemen of the Liberal party who take the position that notwithstanding the increased revenue that taxation has not increased. There is such a thing as self-interest deluding one's self into almost any conception. This I take to be the case which the hon. gentlemen who are congratulating themselves and the country that though taxation has not increased, that while the population has not increased more than one-fifth, the revenue of the country has increased almost 200 per cent. If the people of Canada paid \$37,000,000 in 1896, and the people of Canada in 1907 are paying \$100,000,000, will any hon. gentleman in this Chamber tell me seriously from whence comes the increase of \$60,000,000? Does it not come from taxation? Of course, I am now speaking of the customs and excise revenue and the increase has been mainly in those directions. It is only the cant of phraseology, it is only a shibboleth to say that the taxation of this country has not increased from 1896 up to the present time, figured out as you may. There is the revenue. The revenue comes from the pockets of the people, and the increase has been up to the amount I have already indicated. Let me say in this connection, that it is immaterial what we call it, whether we say this increased revenue has been obtained from a protective tariff, or from a revenue tariff. I observe through the Liberal press that the Liberal party scouts the idea of this revenue being raised or derived from a tariff which is to be designated a protective tariff. Hon. gentlemen scout the very idea of their being protectionists, or in sympathy with the manufacturers, or of having adopted the tariff of their predecessors, and claim that they are only raising a revenue by means of the tariff. Every hon. gentleman knows full well that the people of this country or of any