

great commodity of Western Canada. If there is an omission in the Speech in that particular, it has been made designedly. I think I am right when I say that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition has one view, which he has expressed, as to the way in which wheat should be marketed, but that view does not accord with the view which my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) holds. I think there are others who hold yet another view. If I am correct, there are three main bodies of opinion as to the manner in which the marketing of wheat may best be carried on. The first may be described as the compulsory wheat board method, such as we had in Canada in 1919. The second is the voluntary wheat board method, such as my right hon. friend advocated during the campaign. The third is the farmers' own co-operative method carried on by the co-operative companies, such as the United Grain Growers, of which the hon. member for Marquette is president, and the Saskatchewan Co-operative Company, they holding the view that these co-operative companies should handle the crop themselves. Here are three bodies of opinion, each of which is entitled to consideration. The Government is anxious in this matter to do the best it can to serve the interests of Western Canada. Under the circumstances, is it possible to devise a better method of ascertaining what is likely to be of most service to those interests than that this question should, during the present session, be referred to the Select Standing Committee of Agriculture, with power to go carefully into the whole matter and report to the House as to which if any of the three methods it would recommend, or what course it thinks can be taken with most advantage? I may say that the Government has decided that that course will be adopted with respect to this important question. I hope that on that committee we shall have representatives from all groups in this House so that the policy ultimately adopted will be based upon the best information that can be obtained.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have touched on most of the points which my right hon. friend dealt with in the course of his remarks. He made some reference to the reduction of freight rates, but I think I will leave that matter also until my colleague the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) has occasion to speak on the subject. I might point out, however, that while it is perfectly true, as the leader of the Opposition has said, that the Board

of Railway Commissioners has power to regulate the railway rates, there is nothing which precludes the Administration from using its influence to bring together the different railway companies with a view to their taking, of their own accord, a course which should result in a reduction of freight rates on basic commodities in the best interests of all parties concerned. That step has already been taken and we hope that the railway companies will see the wisdom of speedily bringing about a reduction on basic articles. If it is not successful, then it will be for Parliament to consider other methods which will, perhaps, be more effective.

My right hon. friend concluded his address by making reference at considerable length to negotiations that took place prior to the formation of the present Administration. A little earlier in the course of his remarks he taunted me with having given a somewhat broad interpretation to the word "Liberalism"; indeed, he went so far as to say that I had made the word almost synonymous with "political dishonesty." Well, may I say to my right hon. friend that at least I have never been ashamed of the name of the party with which I have been connected. When my right hon. friend was in power in a previous Administration, it was first of all, I think, the "Liberal-Conservative" Administration. That name became questionable, and my right hon. friend was one of those who helped to give the new Administration the name of "Unionist." That name lasted for a short while, but it became even worse, and when my right hon. friend's predecessor went out of office, my hon. friend took it upon himself to insist that the party should have a new name and gave it the name "National Liberal and Conservative"—whatever that meant. That was his first act in becoming Leader of the Government. I now understand that my right hon. friend's party has just held another caucus, and that this time he has insisted on another change. He calls his party once more "Liberal-Conservative." Well, I do not know what interpretation may be placed upon the word, "Liberal" in that case, but if I am to judge the meaning of the word by hon. gentlemen who surround my right hon. friend at the present moment, for my part, I should never stretch the word "Liberal" sufficiently to include any of them. Speaking of "political dishonesty," if he wishes to avoid the charge, I think my right hon. friend should come right out