
Franklin D. Roosevelt — “The Great Communicator”
The Master Speech Files, 1898, 1910-1945

Series 1: Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Political Ascension

File No. 262

1928 October 17

Binghamton, NY - Speech Opening Campaign

BINGHAMTON HIGH SCHOOL

Arlington area Wednesday Evening people. The place
was packed, and October 17, 1928. Why, this is quite
amazing that there should be such a fine reception in
Binghamton, the finest thing that has happened-

Governor Walker, and my friends of Binghamton:
I was very much moved tonight, and so were my associates
on the Democratic State Ticket, at the perfectly splendid
reception that you good people have given us, and I hope
that you will tell your neighbors and friends from us how
very deeply we appreciate it.

It took me back for a moment or two to the last
time I was in Binghamton in the campaign of 1920, when I
was running for Vice-President and Harry Walker was running
for the United States Senate. (Laughter) It was not a
very successful campaign that year (Laughter). This year
of 1920 we had better forget. But this year of 1928 is
something very different. You can feel it in the air.
(Applause). When I got off the train in 1920, instead of
finding a thousand or more people there as there were to-
day, there was a faithful, loyal, corporal's guard
(laughter), and when we had walked up to the Arlington
to my delight and surprise in sight of the lobby of the

Arlington paper this same picture taken in Binghamton;

Arlington were literally hundreds of people. The place was jammed, and I said to myself, "Why, this is quite astounding that there should be such a fine reception in my honor in Binghamton, the finest thing that has happened anywhere in the State of New York," and when I got in I found that the backs of that enthusiastic gathering in the Arlington lobby were all turned towards me. The people were headed in the other direction, and on closer examination I found that one-half the crowd was headed that way, and the other half of the crowd was headed that way, and I became more and more mystified until I found the reason. There in the right-hand corner was the famous operatic star, Madam Galli Curci (laughter), and there in the other corner that other famous operatic star, Babe Ruth (laughter), and a mere candidate for the Vice-Presidency stayed on the outskirts of the crowd (laughter). However, some of the newspaper boys got onto it and they brought the three of us together, and they took a flash-light of Madam Galli Curci with Babe Ruth on the right and Franklin Roosevelt on the left; and in some way that paper was distributed around this country, and it must have been six months later that I saw in a copy of a California paper this same picture taken in Binghamton;

and why? What do you suppose it was labelled -- "Beauty and the beasts" (laughter). Well, one of those beasts helped to win the World Series last week (applause), and the other of those beasts is going to help win the state series on November 6th (laughter and applause).

This was to have been my first speech of the active campaign. That was the intention on the part of everybody until I left Jersey City this morning, and the whole thing was knocked into a cocked hat; first at Middletown, and then at Port Jervis, and then at Calicoon, and then at Hancock, and then Neponsit, and then at Susquehanna (laughter). So this is the seventh speech of the campaign (laughter and applause).

I am not going to keep you very long, because I know that figures do not set very well for more than five or ten minutes.. But I want to say at the outset, I want to pay tribute to my opponent, Attorney General Ottinger, because for the large part of his work as Attorney General of the State during the past four years, especially with regard to the active campaign which he and his associates have conducted against various forms of fraud, the people of the State should give him due credit for

his activities in carrying out the State laws against various forms of financial trickery. And having said this, I have got to go right on in the next paragraph and say that I wish that he had not started off in the very beginning of his speech of acceptance by using erroneous figures to give an erroneous impression to the voters of the State. Somehow his speech of acceptance and his speech of last night do not accord with his fine record of exposing financial and figure trickery.

You know, there seems to be a definite disease; I take it more seriously than my friend, Mr. Tremaine, who calls them ghost stories. I am afraid they are worse than that. I am afraid it is a disease among some of the Republican spell-binders in this State, the principal symptom of which is to try to prove that black is white. Starting off to show that we in New York are spending a great deal of money for our State Government, my friend, Mr. Ottinger, makes the glib misstatement that the cost of government under President Coolidge in Washington was reduced from over \$5,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending in 1921 to just over \$3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending in 1929. Frankly, it is a mighty bad start for

the rest of Mr. Ottinger's campaign, and I propose to drive a horse and cart through that first speech of his during the next ten days, and I commence by showing up this very complete misstatement at the very beginning.

Here are the facts, and it is just as well that the people of the State of New York should know them. I happen to know them because I happened to have been a part of the Federal Government down in Washington that fiscal year, 1921, that Mr. Ottinger talks about, in which he says we spent \$5,000,000,000; that goes back to 1919. In other words, it was the fiscal year that ended on the 30th of June, 1921, but began on the first of July, 1920, and the estimates for it were made up in the autumn of 1919, and I helped to make them up myself (applause). These estimates made in 1919 reflected, very properly and of course, the heavy cost of demobilization at the close of the war. Therefore, to take the figure of \$5,000,000,000 and make it compare - a war year - with the year 1929, a time eight years later, is a piece not only of financial but of political trickery (Applause).

Now, if he had gone down one more year and talked about this being a Republican administration, even

one year later, he would have been wrong. The fiscal year ending in 1922 shows expenditures in Washington of \$3,300,000,000. When were those appropriations and expenditures authorized? They were authorized before President Wilson went out of office in the Spring of 1921 (applause). And right there it is just as well to have this go on record in this State and every other state in the Union; during the final months of the administration a budget was brought in and appropriations were passed by Congress, and under those budgets and those appropriations, the costs of the United States Government were taken off the war basis of \$5,100,000,000 and put once and for all on a peace basis of \$3,300,000,000 (Applause).

There was the drop; \$1,800,000,000, and under the authority and by and with the signature of Woodrow Wilson and not Harding and not Coolidge (applause).

Now let us see what happened after that. Let us carry it all the way through. The first year that Mr. Harding sat in the White House the expenditures under a Wilson budget under Wilson estimates and with Wilson's signatures, came to \$3,300,000,000. What has been happen-

ing since then? Year by year under President Harding, and then under President Coolidge, they have been going up and up and up, with the exception of one year, when they went down slightly, and the next year making up for it many-fold (applause). Where they were only \$3,300,000,000 in the fiscal year 1922, they have averaged \$3,500,000,000 in these past seven years, and this year the official estimate shows that they will be \$3,700,000,000.

Where do you get your boasted economy? Where do you get the stories that are being handed around by these people of -- well, I suppose imagination is about the politest term you can apply to it (laughter). The cost of the Federal Government has gone up right there in the expenditures between \$300,000,000 and \$400,000,000 since 1922, the last estimates approved by Woodrow Wilson, and in addition to this, they are spending in this total figure for general government purposes, the Department of Commerce among other purposes, over \$300,000,000 that back in 1922 were being used to pay the interest on the war debt. Sufficient principal of that war debt has, of course, been paid year by year, and there is a net

saving of \$300,000,000 since then in what the government has to pay. Has the current appropriation bill down in Washington been cut by that \$300,000,000? No. They just slid it in, converted it into the general pot, and hoped that nobody would find it out (applause).

It is, therefore, an absolutely fair statement to make, both to my friend Mr. Ottinger and to that vastly greater expert on figures, Secretary Hoover (applause), that the uncontestable and incontrovertible fact is that the Federal Government is today costing the nation over \$600,000,000 a year more than it did seven years ago.

Mr. Ottinger is, I think, guilty; guilty of what I hope is an innocent attempt to make the people believe that Republican economy in Washington has reduced the cost of government by nearly \$2,000,000 in seven years, whereas the figures show an actual increase in the costs of over \$600,000,000. My delightful and charming opponent is only out \$2,600,000,000 in his total (applause).

But the trouble is, my friends, that this innocent misstatement is the forerunner of a dozen other glaring instances of a complete lack of knowledge on the

part of Mr. Ottinger of existing conditions of public affairs both in Washington and Albany. (applause).

I propose in the course of the next ten days or so to take them up point by point, and prove how necessary it is that sound business management be continued at Albany for the next two years, and how dangerous it would be to hand over our State Government to people who are so reckless with facts and figures (applause).

But if it were only facts and figures I would not worry so much. The trouble is that in the very next sentence my friend Mr. Ottinger lets creep in a pretty mean note of innuendo that nobody likes to see injected into a campaign unless you have facts to back it up. We have had enough of whisperings in the United States (applause). My friend says in regard to State expenditures, "It is important that the money, once authorized and appropriated, shall be honestly and intelligently spent and properly audited." What does he mean by that? Just a platitude? Or does he mean to infer that Governor Smith's administration has spent the State moneys dishonestly and that the auditing has been improper? I sug-

gest that Mr. Ottinger give us some facts in regard to the dishonest expenditure of money (applause). the con-

In regard to auditing, it is a matter of record which Mr. Ottinger can find out by going around to the Comptroller's office, that the only error in auditing in Albany during the last twenty years was a mistake of five dollars made a few years ago, and he is also, I am afraid, getting on dangerous ground when he talks about the improper selection of sites for public buildings, because these sites happened to be picked last year and the year before by a committee of seven, consisting of four Republican members of the Legislature and the Governor, the Superintendent of Public Works, and the State Architect. Of course, I have not had the opportunity of being in Albany day after day during the past four years. But there is the record of the membership of the committee that picked those sites, and I would suggest that Mr. Ottinger first consult the four legislative members of his own party who helped to select them (applause). any

And then, in coming up on the train today I got down as far as the third paragraph of that famous speech of acceptance. I hope this campaign will last

long enough for me to get down to the last paragraph (laughter). Mr. Ottinger's third subject was the consolidation of the State departments. I am glad that he approves of what has been done, even though no fairminded person will quite like his giving all the credit to Mr. Root and Mr. Hughes, deliberately forgetful of the simple fact that it was the insistence of Governor Smith that brought about this consolidation, and that the real right against a consolidation was made by that little group of present Republican leaders that I have referred to already and will refer to again many times (applause).

I am a little amused to find the Attorney General stating that he is curious to note that his own legal department was not reorganized when the reorganization went through, and he goes on to wish that it might be reorganized. Why wasn't it reorganized when the rest of the State government was reorganized? Mr. Ottinger was Attorney General at the time (laughter).

All of which gives me a very good opportunity to point out the relationship of the magnificent practical business results in our State government in their bearing on the national campaign. A little over two

weeks ago, before that convention in Rochester took the action which it did, I had planned during this final period of three weeks of the campaign to speak in the State of New York, my own State, on behalf of the election of Governor Smith (applause). You know, a few weeks ago my friend Will Rogers remarked in one of his daily squibs that Franklin Roosevelt had got the habit of nominating Al Smith so badly that if you would wake him up in the middle of the night he would start to make a nominating speech for Al Smith (laughter). Well, there is some truth in it. But down at Houston in June I tried the medicine for the first time, and it took (laughter and applause), and since then I have been going around the United States a good deal talking not nomination but election, and it is going to take too (applause).

I wonder if we people in the State of New York have got any conception of what a perfectly splendid thing it has been for our state to have Governor Smith nominated for the Presidency. Everywhere that I go, whether it be in the south or the middle west or New England, people come up to me asking me questions about the reorganization of the Government of the State of New

York, about our humane legislation, about our public works, about all the great things that we are so proud of, and the State of New York today stands right up on a little pedestal among all the states. They are all looking at us and they all think that we are fine, and one reason why this Governor of ours is going to carry a great many more than a majority of the forty-eight states in the Union is because people in the other states know that this Governor of ours put our State up on that pedestal (applause).

But I cannot take up all the subjects tonight, and I want to talk particularly about this practical reorganizing in State Government that we are all so proud of, and that is bearing fruit in the Legislatures and the administrations of other states of the Union; the record that Governor Smith has put there in four years should be properly compared to what has been going on in the Federal Government during the same time. I am not so certain whether I told the story of the four bears when I was in Binghamton last. I probably did, because in that national campaign of 1920 both parties were talking about the need of reorganizing our Federal Government. Down

there in Washington, back there in 1919 and 1920, the situation was just as bad as it was in the State of New York three years ago. They had, I think, 170 or 180 different departments and commissions and boards and institutes and all the other things, and back in the last year of the Wilson administration the Wilson Cabinet made a very careful study looking to a consolidation and reorganization of all of this governmental machinery, and in 1920 we Democrats put it into our National Platform and the Republicans got wise to this businesslike appeal of ours and put it into theirs too.

I spent many weeks going up and down the United States, clear out to the Coast, down South, up in New England, and almost everywhere I went I was telling the story about the four bears. It is a very simple little story, as I told it then. I had almost forgotten it until I saw it trotted out two months ago. There are four different kinds of bears in the United States, and, of course, all these bears come under the jurisdiction of one government department or another. I think it is the brown bear that comes under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and I think the black bear

comes under the department, by law, of Agriculture; and the Alaska bear comes under the Department of Commerce; and jurisdiction over the grizzly bear is held by the Department of War. That has been going on from time immemorial in Washington. Each bear, the care of the bear, and everything else about the bear, falls under a different department, depending on the genus of the bear (laughter), and I am told confidentially that sometimes there is a most awful mixup, because sometimes a black bear falls in love with a brown bear, and then nobody knows under what department the puppies belong (laughter).

Well, it is not a very funny story, but it was used quite effectively in the campaign of 1920, and during that campaign Senator Harding, the Republican candidate for the Presidency, was going up and down the United States, and he stole my story about the bears (laughter), and he used -- no, he was not going up and down the United States, he was sitting in his front porch in Marion, Ohio, and he used that story, but he claimed that if he got into power he would accomplish great things in reorganizing the departments of the government.

Well, he did get into power and we poor Democrats

Well, the people elected him and then he said

were thrown out into the cold. He got into power and he put in a Cabinet of the best minds. Perhaps it is best that I should not recall all the names of that Cabinet (applause). Well, one of them was the present Republican candidate for the Presidency, the Secretary of Commerce, and I believe that it is perfectly true that President Harding gave to Mr. Hoover the task of drawing up a plan for the consolidation of the 160 or 170 rag-tag and bob-tail of the collection of departments, bureaus and commissions of the Federal Government, and Mr. Hoover drew up a plan and the chief feature of the plan was the consolidation of nearly all of the Federal Government machinery into Mr. Hoover's own Department of Commerce (applause).

Well, the other members of the department didn't seem to like it, and after a number of lengthy discussions the plan disappeared into a pigeon hole in the desk, and it stayed there until 1924, and then President Coolidge, running for election, took out the plan and dusted it off and held it up to the audience of the United States and said "Now, if we are returned to power we will put through this great plan of reorganization and consolidation in (applause). ~~Again this campaign is going to hinge on~~

Well, the people elected him and then he and

Secretary Hoover forgot all about it. The plan went into a pigeon hole and there it stayed until last June, four years more, and they trotted it out again and dusted it off, and then took it out to Kansas City and they put it back for the first time as a plank in the Republican platform. And then, to my joy, because it had gone clean out of my head, when Secretary Hoover made his speech of acceptance in August, he trotted out my story about the four bears (laughter).

So, my friends, for the third time they are asking you to believe in their promise. There is the same old collection of departments and boards and commissions today that existed on October 17, 1920, only a few extra ones have been added for good measure. Now Mr. Hoover, hoping to succeed Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Harding, has trotted out the same old promise. Two men have disregarded the promise. Is the third man likely to carry it out, the third who has served as a part of the official family of the other two? I don't know; you can fool some people a long time. It may take another four years, but I don't think so (applause), and I believe that in the last analysis this campaign is going to hinge on whether a man's word is sacred or not; whether a party's

word is sacred or not. ~~ates of the Union, are beginning to~~

There is one example. It is not very thrilling to us, these details of government business. We people in New York, thanks to Governor Smith, have been given a new interest in simple figures. To me it is a joy and a delight to go around this state and find audiences that are willing to listen to simple facts about their own government. Think back ten years. Could you get in any town or hamlet in the State of New York, could you have got back there the same interest in matters affecting our State Government as we have been able to get since we have had Alfred E. Smith up there in Albany to teach us? Why, the whole body politic in this State has got a different point of view. We are willing to listen, we are willing to have him report to us, and every time that he does it, we not only trust him, because he carries out his pledges and because he makes his policies clear, but we have been sending him back to Albany each time with a bigger majority than ever before (applause).

To me it is very significant that even in these short two months that the Governor has been campaigning, less than two months since his speech of acceptance, the

country, the other states of the Union, are beginning to share in our interests. They are beginning to look into this record here in New York. They are listening to a whole hour's speech by Alfred E. Smith down in Louisville or out in Sedalia, Missouri, or up in Chicago, figures and facts. It is the first time that figures and facts have ever been talked to them honestly. All they got before was lies, and lies, like the time they talk of in this State about the saving in the Federal Government.

Now, this man Smith, if we could only give him three months more, if he could only get into every state in this Union, we would not have to have an election at all (applause). And there is another reason why I wish this campaign could go on for another three months instead of another three weeks. I refer to the reason that you all know. I refer to a reason that is particularly well known around Binghamton. But it is not half so bad here as it is in other states. I have just come from the South and I have seen down there in the southern states circulars that any man or woman in this audience would be ashamed to have in their homes. I have seen circulars

that were so unfit for publication that the people who wrote and printed and paid for them ought not to be put in jail, but ought to be put on the first boat and sent away from the United States (applause).

And down there in the South and out there in the West I have had people come up to me and talk to me about the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution; people who are complaining about us people in New York, because they said we didn't care anything about the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution, and then those same people, in the same breath, would turn around and say they would not vote for Alfred E. Smith, and they never read and did not care to talk about the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the one guaranteeing religious liberty throughout the nation (loud applause). And the curious part of it is this: in a fairly extensive trip around the country, I have noticed that this un-Americanism, this type of assault on the principles on which our country was founded, exists most greatly where there is least education (applause).

You go to any state and you will find that the religious bigotry in this campaign is more glaring in the

out-of-the-way farms and hills and valleys and small towns, where there is no contact with the outside world. You do not find it in cities to anything like the same extent.

Just after I got down to Georgia, in a small country town, a man, an old friend of mine, a farmer, came in to see me, and he said, "Mr. Roosevelt, I am worried. A lot of my neighbors, they are all Democrats -- we are all Democrats down here -- but my neighbors say that they cannot vote for Governor Smith, and I don't know what the reason is. But there must be some good answer. Will you tell me so that I can go back and talk to them? They tell me, these neighbors of mine, and they show me printed handbills, leaflets, telling them that if Governor Smith becomes President of the United States, that their Methodist and Baptist marriages over here among our neighbors will all be void and that their children will be illegitimate." (Laughter). Yes, you may laugh; they weren't laughing, they thought it was true; and they were honest, law-abiding citizens. They didn't have the education, the contact, to know better. Oh, I could go on and tell you a thousand stories along that same line.

It was upstate in New York, over near my section of the Hudson River, that a young Irishman was running for office, a boy who had been born up there in Dutchess County and who was running for office of, I think, Town Assessor, and he was going around before the election seeing his neighbors, and one evening he was passing a farm, and he went to call on the farmer with a good deal of trepidation to ask the farmer to support him; and the farmer said to the young Irishman, "Yes, I will be glad to support you in this election. I have known you, you are a fine young fellow, you are a good influence in the community." This young man said to the farmer, "I greatly appreciate your support. But I know you won't mind me telling you that I am a little surprised, because I had understood that you were opposed to Catholics." The farmer, stepping forward, and putting his hand on the young man's shoulder, said, "My boy, you have got it all wrong. I am not opposed to Irish Catholics. What I am opposed to is those Roman Catholics." (Laughter and Applause).

So when you come right down to it, what I believe to be true is that the day will come in this country when through better education, and incidentally

we have never had a Governor in the State of New York that has done more for the cause of education than Alfred E. Smith (applause). The time will come when education in our own state and in every state of the west and every state of the south, in the cities and the hamlets and the farms, in the back valleys and up on the mountains, will be so secure, so clean, so American, that this vile thing that is hanging over our heads in this Presidential election will not be able to stand.

It may be years to come, but I believe that this year we in the State of New York have got beyond those days of prejudice and bigotry. I believe that in our state we have come to visualize the right, because I like to think our education is high enough to make that possible (applause).

And so you see that I have treated this delicate subject from the point of view of one who cares for the future of the country; from the point of view of one who wants to eradicate ignorance, because ignorance is at the bottom of it all, and let that man whom that cap fits put it on (loud applause).

I am certain of two points in this campaign.

The average voter is going to read both sides and is not going to be misled by faulty figures or broken promises. The average voter knows how to discriminate between two kinds of figures, two kinds of promises, the figures and the promises made by people who have an eight year record of faulty figures and broken promises; and on the other hand, the promises and figures made by men who have a definite record of having accomplished definite results and kept every promise they ever made (applause).

That is why we who have been nominated on the Democratic Ticket in this year of grace are going before the people of the State of New York, not making promises indiscriminately; going before them with, I think, at least in part, a record, and with a very serious, firm intention of making no promise that we cannot fulfill. That is why so many people in the State of New York, Democrats, yes -- of course, and all that host of a new party. There is born this year, there is going to live for eight years more, the Smith Republican party (applause). That is why they believe and know that Alfred E. Smith, if elected President, will be far more successful in keeping promises, in getting things done, than

any President we have had in a generation (applause).

And so as I said to my friend at the station down in Susquehanna -- by the way, I did not make the mistake of a namesake of mine of asking for their votes for Governor (laughter) -- as I said to them, we Democrats are just silly enough to give a lot of attention on the evening of November sixth to give a lot of attention to the vote from Pennsylvania (applause). There is something in the air; there is something in the air as I climbed today through these little towns along the Erie, where I have known the people for years; some of them in my own Congressional District over in Orange County; as I came through there, there is something in the air. It is a something that you cannot put your hand on, but it is there; you know it is, and you and I feel it.

What were these people doing out on the streets today? They were all actuated by that something in the air, and we will know jolly well what that something in the air is about eight o'clock in the evening of November sixth (applause).

... source of danger to the public and
... curious plot to the honest farmers who could not com-
pete with cheap western milk.

Infantile Wheel oct 17-38

At the outset of my active campaign, I want to pay tribute to my opponent, Mr. Ottinger, for a large part of his work as Attorney General of this State during the past four years, especially in regard to the active campaign which he and his associates have conducted against various forms of fraud. The people of the State should give him due credit for his activities against various forms of financial trickery.

I wish, however, that he had not started off in the very beginning of his speech of acceptance by using erroneous figures to give an erroneous impression to the voters of this State.

There seems to be a definite disease among Republican spellbinders in this State, the principle symptom of which is to prove that black is white. Starting off to show that we in New York are spending much money for our State government, he makes the glib misstatement that the cost of government under President Coolidge was reduced from \$5,115,000,000 for the fiscal year ending 1921, to \$3,260,000,000 for the current fiscal year ending in 1929. It is a bad start for the rest of Mr. Ottinger's speech, and as I propose to drive a horse and cart through that speech during the next ten days, I can well commence by showing up the complete misstatement at the beginning.

Here are the facts: The fiscal year 1921, in which Mr. Ottinger says we spent over \$5,000,000,000, falls directly under the estimates and budget made in 1919, and reflected, of course, the very heavy cost of demobilization after the war.

The fiscal year of 1922 showed up expenditures in Washington of \$3,372,000,000, this being based on the appropriation law passed in the spring of 1920 while Woodrow Wilson was still President. In other words, the actual demobilization was completed under the Presidency of Wilson and the expenditures were brought down to a normal degree.

Since 1922 the Federal expenditures have averaged over \$3,500,000,000, and during the current fiscal year of 1929 will run to approximately \$3,700,000,000, or an increase of \$328,000,000 over 1922. In addition, we are spending in Washington today for current government purposes \$300,000,000 which, in 1922, was being paid for interest on the war debt. Therefore, the Federal Government

is today costing the nation about \$600,000,000 more than it did seven years ago.

Mr. Ottinger is guilty of, I think, an innocent attempt to make people believe that Republican economy in Washington has reduced the cost of Government by nearly \$2,000,000,000 in seven years, whereas the figures show an actual increase in the cost of the Federal government of \$800,000,000. This innocent misstatement is the forerunner of a dozen other glaring instances of a lack of knowledge on the part of Mr. Ottinger of the existing conditions of public affairs in both State and Nation. I propose to take them up point by point during the next few days, and prove how necessary it is that sound business management be continued at Albany for the next two years, and how dangerous it would be to hand over our State government to people who are so reckless with facts and figures.

But in the next sentence of Mr. Ottinger's speech there crops up a ~~whispering~~ note of innuendo which no one likes to see injected into a campaign unless it is substantiated by facts. We have had enough of "whisperings".

Mr. Ottinger says in regard to State expenditures, "It is important that the money once authorized and appropriated shall be honestly and intelligently spent and properly audited." What does he mean by that? Just a platitude? Or does he mean to infer that Governor Smith's administration has spent the State ~~monies~~ dishonestly and that the auditing has been improper? I suggest that Mr. Ottinger give us some facts in regard to the dishonest expenditure of money. In regard to auditing, it is a matter of record that the only error in audit in Albany during 20 years was a mistake of \$5., made a number of years ago.

He is also getting on dangerous ground when he talks about the improper selection of sites for public buildings

Because these sites were picked by a committee of seven, consisting of four Republican Legislative leaders, the Governor, the Superintendent of Public Works, and the State Architect.

Take up next Mr. Ottinger's third subject: The consolidation of the State Departments. I am glad that he approves even though no fairminded person will quite like his giving the credit to Mr. Root and Mr. Hughes, deliberately forgetful of the simple fact that it was the insistence of Governor Smith that brought about consolidation, and that the real fight against consolidation was made by that little group of present Republican leaders whom I have referred to already, and will refer to many times again. ~~xxxx~~
~~unlighted~~

I am delighted that the Attorney-General is curious to note that his own legal department was not reorganized when the reorganization went through. Why not? Mr. Ottinger was Attorney-General at the time.

All of which gives me an excellent opportunity to point out the relationship of the magnificent business results in our State government in their bearing on the national campaign.

Governor Smith has a record of having effected an actual practical reorganization of the State Government during the past four years. We, as citizens, are extremely proud of what he has done and we know that our record is being copied by many other states.

What is the record on the other side? In 1920, Mr. Harding, the Republican Presidential Candidate, said much about reorganizing the 160 rag-tag and bob-tailed collection of departments, bureaus and commissions in Washington. Mr. Hoover, drew up a magnificent plan when he went into President Harding's cabinet. The chief feature of the plan was the consolidation of most of the Federal Government business into Mr. Hoover's own department of Commerce. We all know what happened to that plan. It went into a pigeon-hole and stayed there. Four years later, in 1924, President Coolidge talked a lot in his campaign about the reorganization, consolidation of the federal administrative functions. Today, four years later, nothing has happened. There is the same old collection of depart-

ments, boards and commissions, with a few extra ones added on for good measure. Now, Mr. Hoover, hoping to succeed Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Harding, is trotting out the same old promise. Unlike Governor Smith, he not only has no record of accomplishment, but he has the definite handicap of having been a part of administrations which for eight years have failed 100% to keep up to their promises.

I am certain of two points in this campaign. The average voter is going to read both sides, and is not going to be misled by faulty figures, secondly, the average voter knows how to discriminate between two different kinds of promises -- the promises made by ~~my~~ ^{have a} people whose ~~past~~ record of broken promises, and the promises made by people who have a definite record of having accomplished definite results and kept every promise they ever made. That is why so many people in the State of New York believe that Alfred E. Smith will, if elected President, be far more successful in keeping promises, and in getting things done, than Herbert C. Hoover.

[Oct. 17, 1928]

File

-1-

At the outset of my active campaign, I want to pay tribute to my opponent, Mr. Ottinger, for a large part of his work as Attorney General of this State during the past four years, especially in regard to the active campaign which he and his associates have conducted against various forms of fraud. The people of the State should give him due credit for his activities against various forms of financial trickery.

I wish, however, that he had not started off in the very beginning of his speech of acceptance by using erroneous figures to give an erroneous impression to the voters of this State.

There seems to be a definite disease among Republican spellbinders in this State, the principle symptom of which is to prove that black is white. Starting off to show that we in New York are spending much money for our State government, he makes the glib misstatement that the cost of government under President Coolidge was reduced from \$5,115,000,000 for the fiscal year ending 1921, to \$3,260,000,000 for the current fiscal year ending in 1929. It is a bad start for the rest of Mr. Ottinger's speech, and as I propose to drive a horse and cart through that speech during the next ten days, I can well commence by showing up the complete misstatement at the beginning.

Here are the facts: The fiscal year 1921, in which Mr. Ottinger says we spent over \$5,000,000,000, falls directly under the estimates and budget made in 1919, and reflected, of course, the very heavy cost of demobilization after the war.

The fiscal year of 1922 showed up expenditures in Washington of \$3,372,000,000, this being based on the appropriation law passed in the spring of 1920 while Woodrow Wilson was still President. In other words, the actual demobilization was completed under the Presidency of Wilson and the expenditures were brought down to a normal degree.

Since 1922 the Federal expenditures have averaged over \$3,500,000,000, and during the current fiscal year of 1929 will run to approximately

\$5,700,000,000, or an increase of \$328,000,000 over 1922. In addition, we are spending in Washington today for current government purposes \$300,000,000 which, in 1922, was being paid for interest on the war debt. Therefore, the Federal Government

is today costing the nation about \$800,000,000 more than it did seven years ago.

Mr. Ottinger is guilty of, I think, an innocent attempt to make people believe that Republican economy in Washington has reduced the cost of Government by nearly \$2,000,000,000 in seven years, whereas the figures show an actual increase in the cost of Federal Government of \$600,000,000. This innocent misstatement is the forerunner of a dozen other glaring instances of a lack of knowledge on the part of Mr. Ottinger of the existing conditions of public affairs in both State and Nation. I propose to take them up point by point during the next few days, and prove how necessary it is that sound business management be continued at Albany for the next two years, and how dangerous it would be to hand over our State Government to people who are so reckless with facts and figures.

But in the next sentence of Mr. Ottinger's speech there crops up a note of innuendo which no one likes to see injected into a campaign unless it is substantiated by facts. We have had enough of "whisperings".

Mr. Ottinger says in regard to State expenditures, "It is important that the money once authorized and appropriated shall be honestly and intelligently spent and properly audited." What does he mean by that? Just a platitude? Or does he mean to infer that Governor Smith's administration has spent the State monies dishonestly and that the auditing has been improper? I suggest that Mr. Ottinger give us some facts in regard to the dishonest expenditure of money. In regard to auditing, it is a matter of record that the only error in audit in Albany during 20 years was a mistake of \$5. made a number of years ago.

He is also getting on dangerous ground when he talks about the improper selection of sites for public buildings

-34-

Because these sites were placed by a committee of seven, consisting of four Republican Legislative leaders, the Governor, the Superintendent of Public Works, and the State Architect.

Take up next Mr. Ottinger's third subject: The consolidation of the State Departments. I am glad that he approves even though no fairminded person will quite like his giving the credit to Mr. Root and Mr. Hughes, deliberately forgetful of the simple fact that it was the insistence of Governor Smith that brought about consolidation, and that the real fight against consolidation was made by that little group of present Republican leaders whom I have referred to already, and will refer to many times again.

I am delighted that the Attorney-General is curious to note that his own legal department was not reorganized when the reorganization went through. Why not? Mr. Ottinger was Attorney-General at the time.

All of which gives me an excellent opportunity to point out the relationship of the magnificent business results in our State government during the past four years. We, as citizens, are extremely proud of what he has done and we know that our record is being copied by many other states.

What is the record on the other side? In 1920, Mr. Harding, the Republican Presidential Candidate, said much about reorganizing the 160 rag-tag and bog-tailed collection of departments, bureaus and commissions in Washington. He Hoover drew up a magnificent plank when he went into President Harding's cabinet. The chief feature of the plan was the consolidation of most of the Federal Government business into Mr. Hoover's own department of Commerce. We all know what happened to that plan. It went into a pigeon-hole and stayed there. Four years later, in 1924, President Coolidge talked a lot in his campaign about the reorganization, consolidations of the federal administrative functions. Today, four years later, nothing has happened. There is the same old collection of depart-

ments, boards and commissions, with a few extra ones added on for good measure. Now, Mr. Hoover, hoping to succeed Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Harding, is trotting out the same old promise. Unlike Governor Smith, he not only has no record of accomplishment, but he has the definite handicap of having been a part of administrations which for eight years have failed 100% to keep up to their promises.

I am certain of two points in this campaign. The average voter is going to read both sides, and is not going to be misled by faulty figures; secondly, the average voter knows how to discriminate between two different kinds of promises -- the promises made by people who have a past record of broken promises, and the promises made by people who have a definite record of having accomplished definite results and kept every promise they ever made. That is why so many people in the State of New York believe that Alfred E. Smith will, if elected President, be far more successful in keeping promises, and in getting things done, than Herbert C. Hoover.