

us how farmers can earn not merely a bare subsistence on the land but sufficient to put themselves in a position to enjoy what other members of the community enjoy in the way of modern inventions. I had a man say to me, "By spring you will find me the fattest and the raggedest man in the country." He simply meant that on the farm he had plenty to eat but that the prices at which he was able to sell his produce were not sufficient to enable him to clothe himself properly. Another man said to me in a jocular way, "I wish this depression would end. I am tired of eating turkey." It is true that there are exceptional circumstances in the west at the present time but the difficulty in most cases is not that the farmers have not sufficient to eat but that they cannot dispose of their surplus at a price that will enable them to buy clothing and the other necessities and conveniences that every civilized man has a right to expect. I wish I could see the problem as simple as the hon. member for Stanstead and the hon. member for Bonaventure see it, but it is beset with infinitely greater difficulties than they seem to see.

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: I wish I could see this problem as simple as the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) sees it, or the members mentioned by the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Brown), or the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young), who made a remark to which I shall refer a little later.

The hon. member for Stanstead stated that the farmers were dependent upon the cities. That may be so in the east, but it is not so in the west. Cities like Edmonton or Calgary are certainly exceptions to the rule. In Alberta generally, excluding Edmonton and Calgary, the farmers can live without the cities, but certainly the cities, neither Edmonton nor Calgary, and so forth, can live without the farmers of the west. So the hon. member's argument does not hold water so far as Alberta is concerned.

What we are suffering from is a lack of balance between town and country, between the rural and urban parts. I was in Detroit the other day and saw a beautiful Chrysler car marked \$495, and you have to pay \$1,000 for the same car in any automobile establishment in Ottawa. I felt pretty badly about that because I certainly would like to have such a car for \$495.

Mr. MORAND: My hon. friend is surely not serious in suggesting that there is a difference of about \$600 for the same car.

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: I certainly am serious. It makes a big difference to me and to any farmers or labourers in Canada.

Mr. MORAND: It might, if it were a fact. Does my hon. friend seriously say that the same car costs \$1,000 in Ottawa?

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: Yes. I was offered a car in Detroit for \$495, a Chrysler coach. I saw the price marked on it.

What I think is the trouble to-day is the lack of balance between city and country, between the price the farmer gets for his produce and the price he has to pay for the manufactured articles he buys. No one would quarrel with fifty cent wheat if you could buy a suit for \$15 or \$18 as you could fifteen or twenty years ago. Under such conditions fifty cents would be a very good price for wheat. So I think it is up to any government to-day to try to bring about a better balance between agricultural and manufacturing prices so that the farmer in the west may be able to buy his necessities far more cheaply than he can to-day.

The hon. member for Weyburn twitted the Prime Minister for his lack of negotiations with foreign countries, and at the time it came to my recollection that Germany, Italy and France shut down on our wheat during the regime of the present leader of the opposition. My hon. friend from Weyburn spoke with great energy of greater international trade and how to bring it about, and suggested that one way would be by negotiation, but certainly the leader of the opposition, when he was Prime Minister, failed to retain the market for our wheat in Germany, Italy and France when those countries shut down on our wheat during his regime. Does the hon. member think that by negotiation to-day we can force Germany or Italy or France to buy our surplus wheat?

Mr. YOUNG: Would you rather try blasting?

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: I do not know just what the hon. member means by blasting, but if he thinks by negotiation he can force Germany, Italy and France to buy our wheat he is sadly mistaken. They refused to buy our wheat at any price, and the people in those countries to-day are compelled to pay \$1.25 and \$1.50 a bushel when they could certainly buy wheat more cheaply from Canada. Such being the fact the Liberal opposition certainly have turned out to be very poor negotiators.

Mr. YOUNG: Did my hon. friend notice what the French delegate said at the wheat conference the other day?

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: I say that these countries shut down on our wheat during the regime of the present leader of the opposi-