

not in favour of controlling acreage, but if I had the opportunity I think I could work out a scheme for controlling deliveries to the market. I had another resolution ready for the order paper—I do not suppose it will be reached this session—to the effect that the government should consider the advisability of amending the Canada Wheat Board Act to empower the board to control deliveries to it through a system of licensing producers to sell or deliver a given number of bushels per seeded acre, and that the permits to sell should be negotiable among the producers only.

I understand the meaning and implications of one of those sentences. The other I do not understand, and I am going to bring it to the attention of my hon. friend in order that he may elucidate it to the house at some later date. He is recommending that only a certain number of bushels per seeded acre could be sold. In other words, he is making a bid to keep the marginal lands under cultivation and to penalize the land with high crop returns. The land the dominion government wants to keep in use and under cultivation is the land he is willing to penalize by allowing only a certain number of bushels per seeded acre to be marketed. Surely that is too ridiculous for even a Conservative government to think of, assuming they had the opportunity to take such action. As to what he means by saying that the sale of these certificates should be permitted only among the producers, I am at a loss to know. I wonder if he is going to encourage some kind of speculation in dealing with these certificates. I leave him to answer that question at some later date; I simply draw the point to his attention now. There is one thing I want to thank him for. He said that after all he had seen, after all the years he had lived in the west, he was not a pessimist but was still an optimist in regard to the question of marketing of wheat. I thank him sincerely for that, because I have reason to believe he is on the right track in making that statement.

Mr. PERLEY: I feel quite sure my hon. friend will support my scheme when I have a chance to explain it.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): That will be fine. Then the hon. member for Weyburn took up a good deal of the time of the house in complaining about Canada and conditions within this country. He talked about defence and suggested graft, until the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) asked him where the evidence was. Then he withdrew the insinuation. But the fact is that he talked about it in this house; and if he had not been checked when he was, the hon. member would have been able to go out into the country and say he had dealt with the question of

graft in the House of Commons and that his statements had gone uncontradicted. So I think it was well that the point was raised. My hon. friend complained a great deal because, he said, we were selling abroad a certain amount of material which might be used for munitions. He went on to say:

But what right have we to ask the Canadian taxpayer to contribute between \$50,000,000 and \$60,000,000 a year for national defence, while at the same time we permit armament manufacturers in this dominion to send a steady stream of aeroplanes, munitions and war material to the very countries against which this government is asking us to arm ourselves?

I remember that two years ago, when a small increase was asked in the defence estimates, my hon. friends over there kept saying, "Against whom are we to arm?" The hon. member for Weyburn has found out; we are arming apparently against the people to whom we are sending a stream of munitions and armaments. My hon. friend nods his head. Well, perhaps I am not so well informed as he is, but I do not know of any country to which we have sent aeroplanes and streams of munitions that is likely to be in the field against Canada now or at any other time. If he refers to scrap-iron, nickel and matters of that kind, I think his attention should be drawn to the fact that to-day Canada has no monopoly on nickel and scrapiron. These commodities go into commerce and domestic trade everywhere, and it would be impossible for Canada to carry on business if it segregated or tied up its exports of nickel or scrap-iron to any country that might want those articles. It is true that an embargo could be placed against one or two countries; but at least my hon. friends have made some progress. They now know against whom we are arming.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I am sure the hon. member would not want to mislead the house—

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Certainly not, but I have the book right under my hand.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The hon. member directed a question to me, and I should like to answer him. If he does not wish me to do so, it is all right.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I shall be pleased to answer a question, though that is greater courtesy than is usually shown me.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I asked the hon. member if he would allow me to ask a question. He asked a rhetorical question about the shipment of aeroplanes. I ask him if he has looked up the licences issued last year for the shipment of aeroplanes and