

is made, the government as such, not a member but the government, may make a denial on the strength of the information received from the individual whose name is given, in order that there may be no question about it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Let any hon. member try to do it.

Mr. BENNETT: I beg the hon. member's pardon.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Let any hon. member try to do what the Prime Minister has done.

Mr. BENNETT: It was frequently done by hon. members opposite.

The following legislation will be submitted to the house before—

Mr. DUFF: Before the Prime Minister gives the leader of the opposition the information asked may I make a statement?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister has the floor.

Mr. DUFF: But it is a question of privilege.

Mr. BENNETT: All right.

Mr. DUFF: The other day when I brought up the matter about something which occurred in a committee of the house the Prime Minister was the first to rise in his seat and state I had no right to do so. To-day however the Prime Minister does deliberately what I tried to do the other day. So far as I am concerned, and so far as Mr. McFarland is concerned, it is quite possible that Mr. McFarland might not have known whose wheat he was buying in Chicago. He does not say so in that telegram. Let me say to the Prime Minister that there is no question about it, and I think I know what I am talking about when I say that the wheat Mr. McFarland bought, and the money guaranteed by this government, was wheat which Mr. Cutten sold to Mr. McFarland on the Winnipeg grain exchange.

Mr. BENNETT: The statement which is made by the hon. member does not add anything to what has already been said by him.

Mr. DUFF: Or yourself.

Mr. BENNETT: But it will be recalled that it was stated by Mr. McFarland, and it is a matter of evidence, that he had bought not a single grain of wheat in Chicago.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): He did not say Chicago.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, he said Chicago.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

STATEMENT AS TO LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): The business which will be submitted to the house comprises amendments to the Food and Drugs Act; The Proprietary Medicines Act; The Criminal Code; The Soldier Settlement Act; The Customs Act; The Elections Act; The Farm Loan Act and The Bankruptcy Act. Compromises or arrangements with creditors it is hoped will be in the form of one bill. Possibly there will be one other administrative change in addition to the legislation now pending before the house and the senate, and the changes which will arise from the deliberations of the existing committees on the Bank Act and the Bank of Canada Act, if they emerge successfully from the committee to which they have been sent. There will be changes of course in the Currency Act, some changes in the Finance Act and some changes in the Notes Act. There will be submitted also a consolidated Excise Act which cannot be submitted until after the budget has been delivered. There will be a new Companies Act and a Franchise Act arising out of the Elections Act. I think I may say to the right hon. gentleman that the main features of the Elections Act will remain as they are, but an effort will be made to enact a statute along the lines of the recommendations of the first chief electoral officer, that is the establishment of a basic list which will not depart from the principles of the present Elections Act. There will also be an Emergency Public Works Act, to which reference has already been made. There is in addition another bill in process of preparation which to-day I cannot speak about—with certainty, but about which I may be able to speak with certainty by the end of the week. There will also be amendments to the Judges Act.

Mr. POULIOT: In the meantime prosperity will be around the corner.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT

The house in committee on Bill No. 38, to amend the Dairy Industry Act.—Mr. Weir (Melfort)—Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Prime Minister mentioned yesterday that to-day we would go on with the marketing bill. Is there any reason why that should not be proceeded with?