

and when in August, 1921, the United States signed that treaty the Corridor was already in existence. No protest ever appeared from any quarter, high or low, in the United States, against the restoration of Poland or against the Polish Corridor. I see in the situation which exists between Poland and Germany a manifest moral responsibility on the part of the United States. The Corridor had been, is, and will be the crucial point in Europe in spite of any treaties that may be signed in the future.

President Roosevelt's answer appears in his address to the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, which I am sure most of my honourable colleagues have read. He stopped short of full co-operation. After criticizing the negotiators of the Versailles Treaty for their ambitious spirit and claims, he said:

Nevertheless, through the League directly, or through its guiding motives indirectly, the states of the world have groped forward to find something better than the old way of composing their differences.

The League has provided a machinery which serves for international discussion, and in very many practical instances it has helped labour and health and commerce and education, and last but not least, the actual settlement of many disputes, great and small, among nations great and small.

To-day the United States is co-operating more openly in the fuller utilization of the League of Nations machinery than ever before.

I believe that I express the views of my countrymen when I state that the old policies, alliances, combinations and balances of power have proved themselves inadequate for the preservation of world peace.

The League of Nations, encouraging as it does the extension of non-aggression pacts, of reduction of armament agreements, is a prop in the world peace structure.

We are not members, and we do not contemplate membership. We are giving co-operation to the League in every matter which is not primarily political, and in every matter which obviously represents the views and the good of the peoples of the world, as distinguished from the views and the good of political leaders, of privileged classes or of imperialistic aims.

Mr. Roosevelt recognizes the importance of the League and its usefulness in very many fields, especially in the maintenance of peace, but he goes no further than to give it his blessing from afar. Perhaps he is restrained. I have no doubt that he is restrained by an uninformed public opinion not as far advanced as his own view or that of the élite of the two great parties in the United States, respecting full co-operation.

Another war in Europe would cause the United States a rude and cruel awakening. I believe that the world is now too small for any country, the United States or any other, to adopt a position of splendid isolation. No

nation, much less a great nation, can ask the world, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Great Britain and France need nothing but peace. Great Britain with the co-operation of the United States can insure the peace of Europe. Will not our great neighbour to the south go one step further and throw its mighty influence into the balance to help save our threatened civilization?

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The Speech from the Throne outlines a number of problems to come before us for discussion during the present session, most of them arising out of the crisis which it is admitted on all sides still exists; and some suggestions are made towards ending that crisis.

There has been an improvement in some directions; we notice signs of it in the reports that come to us from large institutions. There is a ray of hope. We seem to have reached the bottom of the valley and are, we trust, beginning to ascend. But one aspect of the situation—and it is alluded to in the Speech from the Throne—is still quite unsatisfactory. It is said that the price levels of agricultural products are too low to ensure the success of our farmers. This I believe to be the crux of our problem. Until our farmers are able to produce profitably I cannot see how their purchasing power can increase, particularly when their lot seems to be aggravated by high tariffs.

When the value of farm products is low the cost of living should be low, and if the cost of living is lowered the price of industrial products also should be lowered. High tariffs militate against such an adjustment.

The United States, under the direction of the new administration, has made an effort to increase the prices of farm products in that country; but attention seems to have been given first to increasing the price of industrial products by raising wages and reducing the number of hours of labour, and while that process was taking place there was no rise in the prices of agricultural products. As we have all heard, a million or two million farmers threatened to rebel because their products had not risen in value when the prices of all they had to buy had been increased.

Canada's special problem is the overproduction of wheat. For the last four years economists have been at loggerheads as to the causes of the crisis. It has been hard to find two economists who would agree, some claiming that overproduction was the cause, others that it was underconsumption. I think