

Complete Text of Gov. Landon's Speech

By United Press
MINNEAPOLIS, Minn., Sept. 25.—The text of Gov. Landon's address last night follows:

I am most happy to be with you here in the great Northwest. Many of your achievements stand as an inspiration to the rest of the country. You have developed an unusual degree of a system of combining dairy and general farming in such a way that it provides a year-round income and at the same time conserves the soil.

You have proved that farmer-owned and farmer-controlled organizations are an effective way for helping the income of the producer. The success of farm co-operation in Minnesota, Wisconsin and neighboring states is an epic chapter in American agriculture.

Tonight I am going to discuss the reciprocal trade program of the present Administration. I am going to discuss it from the point of view of the American farmer.

When this program was introduced by the present Administration our farmers were led to believe that it would be of particular benefit to them. They were told it was the only feasible way by which this country could regain its lost foreign markets. They were assured that it meant greater sales at better prices.

We have had only two years of this program. But within even that short time certain conclusions have been proved beyond all question. The reciprocal trade agreements made by this Administration have not benefited our farmers; they have hurt our farmers. They have not regained their markets for them; they have taken more of his markets away, both at home and abroad. They have not caused him to get better prices for his products; they have prevented him from getting as good prices as he otherwise would.

In a word, the reciprocal trade program of the present Administration has delayed recovery for our farmers. It has "sold" the American farmer down the river. I want to present the record of this destructive policy to you in some detail. Before doing so, however, there are two points that I want to make clear.

The first of these is that I am not opposed to reciprocal trade agreements. The general principle underlying them is simple. Under certain conditions it is to the mutual advantage of two countries to lift various commercial barriers to the general tariff program for special treatment. Both countries make concessions; both countries benefit. This is sound doctrine. In some cases it may be the only satisfactory method for meeting a situation. The Republican Party recognizes this in its platform. It does not condemn the principle of reciprocity. It condemns only the kind of trade agreements now being made. It condemns them because they are injurious to American citizens and offensive to American principles.

The second point I want to make clear is that I am opposed to a policy of isolation. I want to see a world as well as a prosperous America. Healthy international trade is essential to world prosperity. And even more than this, world prosperity is good insurance against war.

I am convinced, too, that reasonable protection, which is so essential to our own well-being, is not detrimental to world prosperity.

At a time like the present, when

economic nationalism is rampant, we can not afford to scrap our economic defenses. We can be a good neighbor without giving away the latchkey to our door.

The great enemy of world trade today is not the fair protection of efficient American producers and laborers. It is the war-inspired doctrine of isolation and its resulting demands for self-sufficiency. From this we get embargoes, exchange restrictions and trade quotas. These are the real hindrances to a healthy exchange of goods between nations. We must not join in this kind of madness. If we are to maintain our standard of living the channels of world trade must remain open.

Now let us consider some of the effects of the reciprocal trade program of the present Administra-

tion to reciprocal trade agreements. I refer to the sanitary requirements covering these industries. Our Federal and state governments, as well as the dairymen, have spent enormous sums in the eradication of contagious diseases of cattle. In addition we impose rigid standards for the care of barns and stock.

Only one other country has made equal progress in this field. As a result of our standards, consumers are always rest assured of the quality and purity of the products of American dairy farms.

Unfortunately the same standards are not imposed on imported products to correct this situation. The Republican Party is pledged "to impose effective quarantine against imported livestock, dairy and other farm products from countries which do not impose health and sanitary regulations fully equal to those required of our own producers."

Livestock producers and feeders have fared just as badly as the dairymen under the reciprocal trade agreements. In the Canadian agreement the tariff was reduced by one-third on a sliding quota of cattle weighing 700 pounds or more. On calves there was an even greater cut.

Consider the contradictions in this policy. The Administration was trying to hold down the nation's supply of meat by restricting the production of hogs. Last fall it was warning livestock men that there would be increased supplies of cattle on the market this spring. And yet it proceeded to make concessions on Canadian cattle that would be exchanged between two nations concerned.

That is, each country by means of such treaties makes it easier to trade the commodity of which it has a surplus, for something it needs from the other country. This is a question, when the reciprocity principle is properly used, of when non-competing commodities are to be exchanged between two nations concerned.

Such a program just doesn't make sense.

What happened? The Canadian agreement went into effect Jan. 1. Canadian cattle were rushed in and naturally prices fell. Here is the record. The first of January the average good grade steer of 900 to 1100 pounds was selling on the South St. Paul market at \$9.75 a hundredweight. By June the price was down to \$7.25 a hundredweight. On every occasion the biggest drop in prices followed the heaviest receipts of Canadian cattle.

The price decline was reflected in the cattle markets throughout the country. It wiped out the hope of any profit for thousands of cattle feeders in our Middle Western states.

In short, as a result of the policies of this Administration, there has been added to the drought and the depression another burden for the American farmer to carry—foreign competition. In spite of its promises, the present Administration has given American farmers the short end of the deal.

I have discussed only two of the casualties of the trade policies of the Administration. Numerous others might be listed. The Florida growers of early vegetables had their markets turned over to the cheap labor products of Cuba. The growth of citrus fruit in the Connecticut Valley last year in the agreement with the Netherlands, as did the bulb industry in the Pacific Northwest. And the hope of increased domestic production of corn and potato starches was destroyed in the same agreement because tapioca and sago were bound on the free list.

Now let us look at some general results. Eight of these agreements have been in force long enough for us to see the results. In these cases, the imports of farm products have increased 84 per cent over a cor-

responding period prior to the agreements. Exports of farm products increased only 26 per cent. In other words, under these eight agreements, our imports increased more than three times as fast as our exports.

Today the exports of our farm products represent the smallest portion of our foreign trade in the history of the nation. This is due in large measure to the confused and destructive policies of the administration. With the most intelligent and capable farm population in the world, and with unsurpassed natural resources, we are now one of the largest importers, not only of those things we do not produce, but of those we are adapted to produce.

"We strenuously oppose so-called reciprocal treaties which trade off the American farmer." To do this intelligently, we must know at all times the exact status of our trade with every nation—in other words, how we stand on the books so far as both consumers and competitors are concerned.

Another major shortcoming of these agreements is the use of the unconditional, most-favored nation principle. This principle when widely followed by the leading commercial nations is a proper and wholesome way of promoting international trade. But under it, countries have ceased to use the principle. In consequence, when we apply it we are making a concession to foreign nations without getting anything in return. This is not reciprocity. It is charity paid for by American producers.

One or more points on the making of the trade program of this Administra-

tion is made with a competitor, one side or the other is almost certain to lose.

Had the Administration been interested in using the principle of reciprocity in its proper manner it would have made agreements only with our customers. It wouldn't have made an agreement on agricultural products with our very good friend Canada, which is this field is a competitor, not a customer.

It is for this reason that the Republican platform pledges "to furnish government assistance in the making of surpluses in foreign trade by bargaining for foreign markets selectively by countries, both as to exports and imports."

"We strenuously oppose so-called reciprocal treaties which trade off the American farmer." To do this intelligently, we must know at all times the exact status of our trade with every nation—in other words, how we stand on the books so far as both consumers and competitors are concerned.

Another major shortcoming of these agreements is the use of the unconditional, most-favored nation principle. This principle when widely followed by the leading commercial nations is a proper and wholesome way of promoting international trade. But under it, countries have ceased to use the principle. In consequence, when we apply it we are making a concession to foreign nations without getting anything in return. This is not reciprocity. It is charity paid for by American producers.

One or more points on the making of the trade program of this Administra-

tion is made with a competitor, one side or the other is almost certain to lose.

Had the Administration been interested in using the principle of reciprocity in its proper manner it would have made agreements only with our customers. It wouldn't have made an agreement on agricultural products with our very good friend Canada, which is this field is a competitor, not a customer.

It is for this reason that the Republican platform pledges "to furnish government assistance in the making of surpluses in foreign trade by bargaining for foreign markets selectively by countries, both as to exports and imports."

"We require many things which we either do not produce or can produce only at great cost. In turn, we produce many products in greater abundance than we can use. The interchange of these two classes of goods is essential to our well-being.

We must not reduce farm production in this country to the needs of the domestic market. This is the doctrine of despair. It would mean the abandonment of at least one out of every 10 acres of our developed farm land. It would mean less production, less living among an increasing farm population. In short, it would mean a lower stand-

ard of living and a greatly increased relief load in the rural districts.

The Republican Party refuses to accept this philosophy of despair.

It believes in making it possible for the farmer to plant full crops.

It believes in increasing the demand for farm products, not reducing the supply. It believes the American farmer worthy of prosperity.

products we will not permit the shelves of our stores to be filled with foreign commodities suited to our soil and climate. It means we will not permit unnecessary imports of such products as meats, dairy and poultry products, grains, and such fruits and vegetables as we can grow to good advantage.

We require many things which we either do not produce or can produce only at great cost. In turn, we produce many products in greater abundance than we can use. The interchange of these two classes of goods is essential to our well-being.

We must not reduce farm production in this country to the needs of the domestic market. This is the doctrine of despair. It would mean the abandonment of at least one out of every 10 acres of our developed farm land. It would mean less production, less living among an increasing farm population. In short, it would mean a lower stand-

ard of living and a greatly increased relief load in the rural districts.

The Republican Party refuses to accept this philosophy of despair.

It believes in making it possible for the farmer to plant full crops.

It believes in increasing the demand for farm products, not reducing the supply. It believes the American farmer worthy of prosperity.

products we will not permit the shelves of our stores to be filled with foreign commodities suited to our soil and climate. It means we will not permit unnecessary imports of such products as meats, dairy and poultry products, grains, and such fruits and vegetables as we can grow to good advantage.

We require many things which we either do not produce or can produce only at great cost. In turn, we produce many products in greater abundance than we can use. The interchange of these two classes of goods is essential to our well-being.

We must not reduce farm production in this country to the needs of the domestic market. This is the doctrine of despair. It would mean the abandonment of at least one out of every 10 acres of our developed farm land. It would mean less production, less living among an increasing farm population. In short, it would mean a lower stand-

ard of living and a greatly increased relief load in the rural districts.

The Republican Party refuses to accept this philosophy of despair.

It believes in making it possible for the farmer to plant full crops.

It believes in increasing the demand for farm products, not reducing the supply. It believes the American farmer worthy of prosperity.

products we will not permit the shelves of our stores to be filled with foreign commodities suited to our soil and climate. It means we will not permit unnecessary imports of such products as meats, dairy and poultry products, grains, and such fruits and vegetables as we can grow to good advantage.

We require many things which we either do not produce or can produce only at great cost. In turn, we produce many products in greater abundance than we can use. The interchange of these two classes of goods is essential to our well-being.

We must not reduce farm production in this country to the needs of the domestic market. This is the doctrine of despair. It would mean the abandonment of at least one out of every 10 acres of our developed farm land. It would mean less production, less living among an increasing farm population. In short, it would mean a lower stand-

ard of living and a greatly increased relief load in the rural districts.

The Republican Party refuses to accept this philosophy of despair.

It believes in making it possible for the farmer to plant full crops.

It believes in increasing the demand for farm products, not reducing the supply. It believes the American farmer worthy of prosperity.

products we will not permit the shelves of our stores to be filled with foreign commodities suited to our soil and climate. It means we will not permit unnecessary imports of such products as meats, dairy and poultry products, grains, and such fruits and vegetables as we can grow to good advantage.

We require many things which we either do not produce or can produce only at great cost. In turn, we produce many products in greater abundance than we can use. The interchange of these two classes of goods is essential to our well-being.

We must not reduce farm production in this country to the needs of the domestic market. This is the doctrine of despair. It would mean the abandonment of at least one out of every 10 acres of our developed farm land. It would mean less production, less living among an increasing farm population. In short, it would mean a lower stand-

ard of living and a greatly increased relief load in the rural districts.

The Republican Party refuses to accept this philosophy of despair.

It believes in making it possible for the farmer to plant full crops.

It believes in increasing the demand for farm products, not reducing the supply. It believes the American farmer worthy of prosperity.

products we will not permit the shelves of our stores to be filled with foreign commodities suited to our soil and climate. It means we will not permit unnecessary imports of such products as meats, dairy and poultry products, grains, and such fruits and vegetables as we can grow to good advantage.

We require many things which we either do not produce or can produce only at great cost. In turn, we produce many products in greater abundance than we can use. The interchange of these two classes of goods is essential to our well-being.

We must not reduce farm production in this country to the needs of the domestic market. This is the doctrine of despair. It would mean the abandonment of at least one out of every 10 acres of our developed farm land. It would mean less production, less living among an increasing farm population. In short, it would mean a lower stand-

ard of living and a greatly increased relief load in the rural districts.

The Republican Party refuses to accept this philosophy of despair.

It believes in making it possible for the farmer to plant full crops.

It believes in increasing the demand for farm products, not reducing the supply. It believes the American farmer worthy of prosperity.

products we will not permit the shelves of our stores to be filled with foreign commodities suited to our soil and climate. It means we will not permit unnecessary imports of such products as meats, dairy and poultry products, grains, and such fruits and vegetables as we can grow to good advantage.

We require many things which we either do not produce or can produce only at great cost. In turn, we produce many products in greater abundance than we can use. The interchange of these two classes of goods is essential to our well-being.

We must not reduce farm production in this country to the needs of the domestic market. This is the doctrine of despair. It would mean the abandonment of at least one out of every 10 acres of our developed farm land. It would mean less production, less living among an increasing farm population. In short, it would mean a lower stand-

ard of living and a greatly increased relief load in the rural districts.

The Republican Party refuses to accept this philosophy of despair.

It believes in making it possible for the farmer to plant full crops.

It believes in increasing the demand for farm products, not reducing the supply. It believes the American farmer worthy of prosperity.

products we will not permit the shelves of our stores to be filled with foreign commodities suited to our soil and climate. It means we will not permit unnecessary imports of such products as meats, dairy and poultry products, grains, and such fruits and vegetables as we can grow to good advantage.

We require many things which we either do not produce or can produce only at great cost. In turn, we produce many products in greater abundance than we can use. The interchange of these two classes of goods is essential to our well-being.

We must not reduce farm production in this country to the needs of the domestic market. This is the doctrine of despair. It would mean the abandonment of at least one out of every 10 acres of our developed farm land. It would mean less production, less living among an increasing farm population. In short, it would mean a lower stand-

ard of living and a greatly increased relief load in the rural districts.

The Republican Party refuses to accept this philosophy of despair.

It believes in making it possible for the farmer to plant full crops.

It believes in increasing the demand for farm products, not reducing the supply. It believes the American farmer worthy of prosperity.

products we will not permit the shelves of our stores to be filled with foreign commodities suited to our soil and climate. It means we will not permit unnecessary imports of such products as meats, dairy and poultry products, grains, and such fruits and vegetables as we can grow to good advantage.

We require many things which we either do not produce or can produce only at great cost. In turn, we produce many products in greater abundance than we can use. The interchange of these two classes of goods is essential to our well-being.

We must not reduce farm production in this country to the needs of the domestic market. This is the doctrine of despair. It would mean the abandonment of at least one out of every 10 acres of our developed farm land. It would mean less production, less living among an increasing farm population. In short, it would mean a lower stand-

ard of living and a greatly increased relief load in the rural districts.

The Republican Party refuses to accept this philosophy of despair.

It believes in making it possible for the farmer to plant full crops.

It believes in increasing the demand for farm products, not reducing the supply. It believes the American farmer worthy of prosperity.

products we will not permit the shelves of our stores to be filled with foreign commodities suited to our soil and climate. It means we will not permit unnecessary imports of such products as meats, dairy and poultry products, grains, and such fruits and vegetables as we can grow to good advantage.