

ing money over to Great Britain, Canadian money, to be spent there, and the contractors will take a slice of \$3,500,000 a year out of our money. I do not place much store by that argument, and I do not think my hon. friend would have used it if he had thought about it a little longer. Wherever ships are built, companies build them and make their profit. If they did not there would be no ships at all in the world.

THE MEMBER FOR RED DEER CAUGHT NAPPING.

But I think I have caught my hon. friend from Red Deer napping. Is he not a free trader?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): May I point out to my hon. friend that what he has just quoted as mine is a quotation of what is being said in England about the scheme.

Mr. FOSTER: My hon. friend then does not believe any of those things? I am entitled to finish my argument however, and here is where I think I caught him napping. Is he not a free trader, a disciple of Cobden, and is not the innermost principle of free trade to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend is a protectionist.

Mr. FOSTER: My hon. friend (Mr. Clark, Red Deer) denies to Canadians the right to spend their money in Britain. But my hon. friend knows that if we spend it over yonder we will get an effective fighting force for \$12,000,000 less of Canadian money than if we spent it here. Is he a protectionist? That is the costliest kind of protection, the hounty. Shades of Cobden! My Free Trade friend comes out in this House of Parliament in the twentieth century and pleads to pay the twelve millions more, give the work to the people of our own country, give them a bonus and give them a hounty, he will be protectionist enough for that. Just on that point I wish to say this, and I say it in all fairness; there are some things that we can do so as to help political and industrial conditions, but