
Franklin D. Roosevelt — “The Great Communicator”

The Master Speech Files, 1898, 1910-1945

Series 1: Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Political Ascension

File No. 399

1930 October 22

**Syracuse, NY -
Campaign Speech re Water Power**

ADDRESS OF GOV. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

DELIVERED AT SYRACUSE, N. Y.

October 22, 1930.

GOV. ROOSEVELT: I want to talk to you tonight on a subject which I deem of paramount importance to the state, but on which the Republican party this Fall cannot point to their record with great pride. It has been a matter of controversy for many years in this state. It has been discussed at length in practically every gubernatorial election in the last ten years in this state. It has been referred to in this campaign as one of the dominant issues. Apparently, however, so far as possible, the strategy of the Republican campaign seems to be to talk as little as possible about the subject. I refer to the question of the development of the water power resources of the state by a public agency for the public benefit.

I am trying in this campaign to bring this subject as close to the homes of the voters as I can. I am trying to point out to our citizens how the development of electricity by the state will directly affect and benefit them in their daily lives.

While it is true that industry, and particularly manufacturers, have for years enjoyed the benefits and advantages of electricity, it is equally true that the average small consumer in his home is just beginning to realize how important it is for him to obtain not just electricity, but cheap electricity in his home. It was clearly brought out before the Commission on Revision

of the Public Service Commission Law why the power companies were willing to sell cheap electricity to big industrial consumers. It was because a large manufacturing corporation could produce its own power very cheaply, and the utility companies were compelled to sell electricity at low rates in order to prevent these large corporations from setting up their own plants and producing their own electric power. In other words, the competitive principle protects the corporations against exorbitant rates, whereas the private home owner is compelled to buy from a monopoly because he could not under any circumstances produce his own electricity.

We all know that the great magic of electricity was originally used for lighting purposes only. It then spread to the factory for industrial uses. Now, however, the time has come when electricity should be carried right into our very homes so as to lighten the drudgery of housekeeping. You and I know that scores of electrically operated household appliances have been invented. Of course, the housewives of the state cannot enjoy these new inventions as long as the rates for current continue to run as high as they now do.

We can observe at close hand the benefits of cheap electricity in the home. Across the St. Lawrence River is the Province of Ontario, Canada. There electricity is developed from water power, by what is known as the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario, through a league of municipalities where service is rendered to each class of consumer on a strictly cost of service basis.

It has been estimated by experts that for an average family of four people occupying six rooms, and about one thousand square feet

of space, it would require about 285 kilowatt hours to run a completely electrified household. This means the using of electricity for light, cooking, refrigeration, ironing, toasting, vacuum cleaning, radio operation, washing machine, fans, waffle irons, chafing dish and other kitchen appliances. I need not dwell at length on the reduction in household labor which such electrical appliances could bring about. In Toronto and other large cities of Canada, it would surprise you to know that all of these appliances can be operated for as little as \$3.40 per month. I mean that a woman could have all the benefits of these household labor saving devices for a month, at the rate of \$3.40.

I am sure that that is a sharp contrast to what you people in Syracuse, in New York, in any city, or in any country district, would pay for the same thing. As a matter of fact, you in Syracuse would pay almost three times as much; and, at that, you in Syracuse enjoy a rate which is at least cheaper than most other cities of the State. In New York City, for example, the housewife, for the same appliances, would pay almost six times as much per month, or \$19.95. Down in Westchester, which pays almost the highest electricity rates of this state — Mt. Vernon or White Plains, for example — the rate would be almost eight times as much, or \$25.63. Close by here, in Auburn, and in Rochester, the rate would be \$13.40. In other words, whereas a woman in Ontario, Canada, in a city of the size of Syracuse can enjoy a completely electrified household for about \$3.40 per month, here in Syracuse you could only get your electricity at the rates now prevailing in our state is out of the question, except for rich people.

In New York City an amount of \$3.40 a month would perhaps buy electric lights and maybe an electric iron and a toaster. In New Rochelle, down in Westchester, you would be lucky to get your lights alone for this amount; and in Geneva, it would all be consumed in paying merely for electric lights.

Now of course there are several reasons why there should be such wide difference in rates between the cities in Ontario and the cities in New York State. A kilowatt of electricity is the same whether it is used in Canada or in New York. It takes the same number of kilowatts to cook a beef stew in Toronto as it does in Syracuse. There are several reasons why there should be the wide difference in cost for these kilowatt hours. Some of these reasons such as our failure in the past to regulate effectively the public utility companies of the state, and more particularly, the electric light and power companies, and the absence in this state of the effective threat of competition by municipalities, I shall discuss in later speeches during this campaign.

It is unquestionably true that the break-down in regulation has done much to keep our electrical rates high and that we have been far behind other governments in permitting our municipalities to go into the business of selling its citizens electricity whenever its citizens wish to do so, and whenever they find that they are being charged unreasonable and exorbitant rates by their local utility companies; but I wish to concentrate on what is by far the more important and fundamental reason. In Canada, this League of Municipalities develops electricity from their own water power. They develop it for the benefit

of their own citizens. They sell it to their citizens at as near cost as possible. While, for decades, we have been permitting the millions of horsepower lying in the flow of the St. Lawrence River to go idly by on its way to the ocean, the Canadian municipalities have been taking advantage of their natural water power resources so as to convert it into cheap electricity.

Here in New York we have not been so wise. We have given franchises to private corporations to develop electricity from both water power and coal. After the electricity has been developed by these private corporations, they, of course, naturally want to sell it for as great a profit as they possibly can. They naturally are not interested in the consumer. They are interested only in their own profit. In Canada, electricity is more cheaply developed and is sold only with a view toward benefiting the consumer. In New York, we have electricity developed in a more expensive manner, and sold primarily with a view toward benefiting the private corporation.

Now, why haven't we been doing the same thing in New York. It is an old story, and those of you who have been interested in state campaigns are familiar with it. As far back as 1907, the question had become acute as to how the water power in the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers was going to be developed. Up to that time, and indeed as late as five years after, the state of New York had been granting franchises to private corporations permitting them to use the waters of the Niagara River for their own private profit.

During the last two summers, I have been up to the Niagara and St. Lawrence River a number of times. On these visits I have seen power

houses erected by private corporations which obtained franchises from the state practically for nothing. I could not but reflect on the short-sighted policy of those past legislatures which had so wantonly given away the heritage of the people of the state.

I had long before that given the subject much consideration and had come definitely to the conclusion that that policy had been un-economic and unsound; but as I stood on the banks of the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers and saw this rich possession which should rightfully belong to the people of our state, going into the power houses of private corporations, I formed a firm resolve that so long as I am Governor, and so long as it is at all possible for a state agency to develop these resources, that no more would they be given or leased to private corporations.

You all recall the violent struggle which Governor Smith carried on with a Republican Legislature over this question since his very first election. He and our party had definitely aligned themselves on the side of the principle that these water power resources must be developed by an agency of the people for the benefit of the people themselves. The Republican party, on the other hand, in its platform, in its public utterances, and in the speeches of its leaders, had definitely thrown down the gauntlet in favor of leasing these resources to private corporations for private exploitation. Four times we went to the polls on that predominant issue; four times the people of the state voted in favor of public development. The Republican Legislative leaders refused to yield. You all remember the stirring days, at the end of the year 1926. Under the plan of reorganized government which was to go into effect on January 1, 1927,

water power leases were not to be effective unless approved by the governor. Up to January 1, 1927 water power leases could have been given out by the Republican controlled water power commission without the consent of the governor. A few weeks remained of the year 1926. The Republican leaders of the state had come to the conclusion that now, if ever, was their opportunity to lease this water power to private companies. They publicly announced that they were going to do it; just three weeks before they were to go out of existence themselves; and just three weeks before the governor was to be given the veto power over leases. The people of the state were startled at this daring. Public opinion was aroused. Protests began to come in from various parts of the state. Finally, Governor Smith, not being able to obtain the assistance of the Republican Attorney-General, Mr. Ottinger, whose signature was about to be affixed to the lease, was compelled to go out to obtain private counsel to prevent this wrong on the people. He issued a challenge daring the Republican leaders to go through with it. The Republican leaders were afraid to do it. The lease was never signed.

And since then the fight has been carried on. When I first came to Albany we were no nearer a solution than ever before. The Republican leaders were still for private development. They had for years been engaged in an attempt to deceive the people of the state by such phrases as inalienable rights of the people in the fee of their water power resources. They used these high sounding expressions and at the same time recommended that the development be by means of leases for long terms. Now, you and I know, that if we own a piece of property and lease it away for 99 years, it doesn't do us very much good to talk about our inalienable rights in the fee

of that piece of property. If the state is going to lease away to private corporations for a period of 99 years, the benefits of its water power, it won't do you or me any good to reflect upon our inalienable rights in the fee of that water power. The point is that for 99 years we have no control over the uses to which our property is put. The fact will still remain, and I am sure will be impressed upon us with each monthly electric light bill, that although the people might have the inalienable right to the power, the private electric corporations will continue to have their inalienable right to their inordinate profits.

In my speech of acceptance, as the Democratic candidate for governor, I stated that the time had come for the definite establishment of the principles as a part of our fundamental law, that the physical possession and development of our state owned water power sites shall not pass from the hands of the people of the state. In my very first annual message to the legislature, I asked them to take up the question of the development of our water power resources so that the title and constant control of the power generated at the sources shall remain vested in the people and shall not be alienated by long term leases. I asked the Republican leaders of the legislature to introduce these bills themselves, so that it could be made a non-partisan measure. They refused to do it. I then asked the Democratic leaders to introduce it, and they not only introduced it, but made motions to discharge the Republican Committee from consideration of the bills, so that each individual legislator might have an opportunity to express himself on the matter. The Republican leaders would not even permit the bills to get out of the

committee, and they were smothered. During the last days of the 1929 session, I again urged the legislature to pass this legislation, and again they refused.

In the meantime, public opinion had become more and more aroused. It was becoming more and more felt. Finally the next year, 1930, after I had again requested the legislature to take steps towards this development, and when they could no longer withstand the force of public opinion, they introduced and passed a bill providing for a commission to be appointed by me to set up a plan whereby the water power resources of the state on the St. Lawrence River could be developed by a state agency for the benefit of the consumers themselves so as to provide the cheapest rates and best service for the people of the state.

That commission has been appointed by me and is now at work formulating a plan by which I hope the people will ultimately obtain the real advantages in cheap electricity which their natural resources contain.

I do not, of course, claim the credit for this final victory. For years the fight had been carried on by Democratic statesmen, and particularly by Governor Smith. I merely took up the battle where he had left off, but neither he nor I nor both of us could have made any headway had it not been for that ever-growing, ever-insistent public opinion which had expressed itself so overwhelmingly time and again at the polls throughout the state, and which was demanding its right and due in the form of cheaper electricity. And although the claim has been made by the Republican Party that it was they who started this Commission on its way, I can but quote from an editorial of the New York Times of September 24, 1930, which says, "The truth is that the Republicans, their protestations to the

contrary notwithstanding, surrendered to the Governor on this issue last winter."

But still the surrender was only a half-hearted one. I was indeed surprised to read this in the 1930 platform of the Republican Party, "We promise a speedy solution of the problem of development of water power resources of the state which shall be based on sound and economic principles rather than on political expediency." Those words have a familiar air. I used to read words like them in the Republican Platforms which had definitely declared for the policy of private leases. Frankly, I do not like that language. I much prefer, and I am sure the voters of the state will much prefer, the language of the Democratic Platform, which says on this subject, "Electric energy should be developed by the state from its water power resources in order to insure low-priced electricity." Now in this campaign, let us face the obvious facts. You and I know who the leaders of the Republican Party are. You and I know that these leaders or at least a great many of them are definitely and publicly aligned with the great electric utility companies of the state. They are officers and they are large stockholders in electric and power companies which, in combination, have almost a monopoly of electricity and power in this state. Do they want the state to develop this water power or would they like to have their own companies do it? Are they interested in providing cheap electricity for you or are they interested in providing large profit for themselves? You and I know that these leaders of the Republican Party, so closely tied up with the great electric utility companies of the state, are the ones who dictate to the Party, not only their policies, but also in many cases, their candidates.

You must remember that when this commission which I appointed brings in its report, the work is only half done. I know that that commission will do its full duty. I, myself, personally, went up to the St. Lawrence River with them and personally inspected the sites on which we all hope the state will soon erect its huge power structures.

But when that work is done by the commission, before anything further can be done the legislature of the State of New York and the Governor must approve. I cannot believe and I am sure that the voters of the State will not believe that a Republican Legislature and a Republican Governor will look so kindly upon this plan of public development against which they have for so many years and through so many administrations fought and protested. I cannot believe, especially in view of the language of the Republican Platform this year, that they will not do all in their power to hamper and prevent and delay any form of public development for the benefit of the people.

It would be only common sense on the part of the people to entrust the development of that plan and the carrying out of those policies to the party which, for so many years, has struggled and fought for its initiation. You can, each one of you, do your share on election day toward the realization of that theory of development which has so long actuated and formed intelligent public opinion in this state.

Some Republican statesmen and Party leaders are still renewing the old objection that this plan is putting the state into business. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Suppose the Republican Party had had its way and had given a franchise to a private corporation to develop

this power, what would have happened? It would have gone out and would have hired engineers and would have proceeded to construct a dam across the St. Lawrence River. It would of course, have first obtained by negotiation the cooperation of the authorities of the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada and of the Federal authorities in this state. The state can do the same thing. It can get the same engineers and can by contract build the same kind of dam, and I for one, am unwilling to say that the State can not do this job just as efficiently as a private corporation. In fact, by virtue of its powers as to tax exemption, and eminent domain, it could do it much more cheaply and efficiently.

Once the power is developed, and is ready for sale, then the state is in a position to dictate the price at which it can be delivered to the ultimate consumer. We have no desire to infringe upon the legitimate reasonable profits of any investor in public utility stocks. He is entitled to a fair return on his investment.

That is the whole story, and let us once and for all stop talking about whether the state should be put into business or not.

The important duty of every citizen of the state — lawyers, business men, the press, the agricultural interests, and the average "man in the street" — is from now on to work wholeheartedly for the carrying out of the proposed policy and the plan which, I am confident, will result therefrom. I am confident that the great majority of citizens of the state want to see something done, believe that we must work out a state agency method of development of our great natural electrical resources in such a way that the control of these resources will never pass from the actual possession of the state itself.

p.79D

Development of Water Power Resources of the State by a Public Agency for the Public Benefit

CAMPAIGN ADDRESS

SYRACUSE, October 22, 1930.

I want to talk to you tonight on a subject which I deem of paramount importance to the State, but on which the Republican Party this Fall can not point to their record with great pride. It has been a matter of controversy for many years in this State. It has been discussed at length in practically every gubernatorial election in the last ten years in this State. It has been referred to in this campaign as one of the dominant issues. Apparently, however, so far as possible, the strategy of the Republican campaign seems to be to talk as little as possible about the subject. I refer to the question of the development of the water power resources of the State by a public agency for the public benefit.

I am trying in this campaign to bring this subject as close to the homes of the voters as I can. I am trying to point out to our citizens how the development of electricity by the State will directly affect and benefit them in their daily lives.

While it is true that industry, and particularly manufacturers, have for years enjoyed the benefits and advantages of electricity, it is equally true that the average small consumer in his home is just beginning to realize how important it is for him to obtain not just electricity, but cheap electricity in his home. It was clearly brought out before the Commission on Revision of the Public Service Commission Law why the power companies were willing to sell cheap electricity to big industrial consumers. It was because a large manufacturing corporation could produce its own power very cheaply, and the utility companies were compelled to sell electricity at low rates in order to prevent these large corporations from setting up their own plants and producing their own electric power. In other words, the competitive principle protects the corporations against exorbitant rates, whereas the private

home owner is compelled to buy from a monopoly because he could not under any circumstance produce his own electricity.

We all know that the great magic of electricity was originally used for lighting purposes only. It then spread to the factory for industrial uses. Now, however, the time has come when electricity should be carried right into our very homes so as to lighten the drudgery of housekeeping. You and I know that scores of electrically operated household appliances have been invented. Of course, the housewives of the State cannot enjoy these new inventions as long as the rates for current continue to run as high as they now do.

We can observe at close hand the benefits of cheap electricity in the home. Across the St. Lawrence River is the Province of Ontario, Canada. There electricity is developed from water power, by what is known as the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario, through a league of municipalities where service is rendered to each class of consumer on a strictly cost of service basis.

It has been estimated by experts that for an average family of four people occupying six rooms, and about 1,000 square feet of space, it would require about 285 kilowatt hours to run a completely electrified household. This means the using of electricity for light, cooking, refrigeration, ironing, toasting, vacuum cleaning, radio operation, washing machine, fans, waffle irons, chafing dish and other kitchen appliances. I need not dwell at length on the reduction in household labor which such electrical appliances could bring about. In Toronto and other large cities of Canada, you would surprise you to know that all of these appliances can be operated for a little as \$3.40 per month. I mean that a woman could have all the benefits of these household labor saving devices for a month at the rate of \$3.40.

I am sure that that is a sharp contrast to what you people in Syracuse, in New York, in any city, or in any country district, would pay for the same thing. As a matter of fact, you in Syracuse would pay almost three times as much; and at that, you in Syracuse enjoy a rate which is at least cheaper than many other cities of the State. In New York City, for example, the housewife, for the same appliances, would pay almost six times as much per month, or \$19.65. Down in Westchester, which pays almost the highest electricity rates of this state—Mt. Vernon or White Plains, for example—the rate would be almost eight times as much, or \$25.63. Close by here, in Auburn, and in Rochester, the rate would be \$13.40. In other words, whereas a woman in Ontario, Canada, in a city of the size of Syracuse can enjoy a completely electrified household for about \$3.40 per month, here in Syracuse you could only get your lights, electric refrigeration and perhaps a toaster. The idea of cooking by electricity at the rates now prevailing in our State is out of the question, except for rich people.

In New York City an amount of \$3.40 a month would perhaps buy electric lights and may be an electric iron and a toaster. In New Rochelle, down in Westchester, you would be lucky to get your lights alone for that amount, and in Geneva, it would all be consumed in paying merely for electric lights.

Now of course there are several reasons why there should be such wide difference in rates between the cities in Ontario and the cities in New York State. A kilowatt of electricity is the same whether it is used in Canada or in New York. It takes the same number of kilowatts to cook a beef stew in Toronto as in down Syracuse. There are several reasons why there should be the wide difference in cost for these kilowatt hours. Some of these reasons such as the failure in the past to regulate effectively the public utility companies of the State, and more particularly, the electric light and power companies, and the absence in this State of the effective threat of competition by municipalities, I shall discuss in later speeches during this campaign.

It is unquestionably true that the break-down in regulation has done much to keep our electrical rates high and that we have been far behind other governments in permitting our municipalities to go into the business of selling its citizens electricity whenever its citizens wish to do so, and whenever they find that they are being charged unreasonable and exorbitant rates by their local utility companies; but I wish to concentrate on what is by far the

more important and fundamental reason. In Canada, this League of Municipalities develops electricity from their own water power. They develop it for the benefit of their own citizens. They sell it to their citizens at as near cost as possible. While, for decades, we have been permitting the millions of horsepower lying in the flow of the St. Lawrence river to go idly by on its way to the ocean, the Canadian municipalities have been taking advantage of their natural water power resources so as to convert it into cheap electricity.

Here in New York we have not been so wise. We have given franchises to private corporations to develop electricity from both water power and coal. After the electricity has been developed by these private corporations, they, of course, naturally want to sell it for as great a profit as they possibly can. They naturally are not interested in the consumer. They are interested only in their own profits. Canadian electricity is more cheaply developed and is sold only with a view toward benefitting the consumer. "In New York, we have electricity developed in a more expensive manner, and sold primarily with a view toward benefitting the private corporation."

Now, why haven't we been doing the same thing in New York? It is an old story, and those of you who have been interested in State campaigns are familiar with it. As far back as 1907, the question had become acute as to how the water power in the St. Lawrence and Niagara rivers was going to be developed. Up to that time, and indeed as late as five years after, the State of New York had been granting franchises to private corporations permitting them to use the waters of the Niagara river for their own private profit.

During the last two summers, I have been up to the Niagara and St. Lawrence rivers a number of times. On these visits I have seen power houses erected by private corporations which obtained franchises from the State practically for nothing. I could not but reflect on the short-sighted policy of those past legislatures which had so wantonly given away the heritage of the people of the State.

I had long before that given the subject much consideration and had come definitely to the conclusion that that policy had been uneconomic and unsound; but as I stood on the banks of the St. Lawrence and Niagara rivers and saw this rich possession which should rightfully belong to the people of our State, going into the power houses of private corporations, I formed a firm resolve that so long as I am Governor, and so long as it is at all possible for a State agency to develop these resources, that no more would they be given or leased to private corporations.

You all recall the violent struggle which Governor Smith carried on with a Republican Legislature over this question since his very first election. He and our party had definitely aligned themselves on the side of the principle that these water power resources must be developed by an agency of the people for the benefit of the people themselves. The Republican Party, on the other hand, in its platform, in its public utterances, and in the speeches of its leaders, had definitely thrown down the gauntlet in favor of leasing these resources to private corporations for private exploitation. Four times we went to the polls on that predominant issue; four times the people of the State voted in favor of public development. The Republican legislative leaders refused to yield. You all remember the stirring day at the end of the year 1926. Under the plan of reorganized government which was to go into effect on January 1, 1927, water power leases were not to be effective unless approved by the Governor. But up to January 1, 1927, water power leases could have been given out by the Republican controlled water power commission without the consent of the Governor. A few weeks remained of the year 1926. The Republican leaders of the State had come to the conclusion that now, if ever, was their opportunity to lease this water power to private companies. They publicly announced that they were going to do it, just three weeks before they were to go out of existence themselves, and just three weeks before the Governor was to be given the veto power over leases. The People of the State were startled at this daring. Public opinion was aroused. Protests began to come in from various parts of the State. Finally, Governor Smith, not being able to obtain the assistance of the Republican Attorney-General, Mr. Ottinger,

whose signature was about to be affixed to the lease, was compelled to go out to obtain private counsel to prevent this wrong on the people. He issued a challenge daring the Republican leaders to go through with it. The Republican leaders were afraid to do it. The bill was never signed.

And since then the fight has been carried on. When I first came to Albany we were no nearer a solution than ever before. The Republican leaders were still for private development. They had for years been engaged in an attempt to deprive the people of the State by such phrases as inalienable rights of the people in the fee of their water power resources. They used these high sounding expressions and at the same time recommended that the development be by means of leases for long terms. Now, you and I know, that if we own a piece of property and lease it away for 99 years, it doesn't do us very much good to talk about our inalienable rights in the fee of that piece of property. If the State is going to lease away to private corporations for a period of 99 years, the benefits of its water power, it won't do you or me any good to reflect upon our inalienable rights in the fee of that water power. The point is that for 99 years we have no control over the uses to which our property is put. The fact will still remain, and I am sure will be impressed upon us with each monthly electric light bill, that although the people might have the inalienable right to the power, the private electric corporations will continue to have their inalienable right to their inordinate profits.

In my speech of acceptance, as the Democratic candidate for Governor, I stated that the time had come for the definite establishment of the principles as a part of our fundamental law, that the physical possession and development of our State-owned water power sites shall not pass from the hands of the people of the State. In my very first annual message to the legislature, I asked them to take up the question of the development of our water power resources so that the title and constant control of the power generated at the sources shall remain vested in the people and shall not be alienated by long term leases. I asked the Republican leaders of the legislature to introduce these bills themselves, that it could be made a non-partisan measure. They refused to do it. I then asked the Democratic leaders to introduce it, and they not only introduced it, but made motions to discharge the Republican committee from consideration of the bills, so that each individual legislator might have an opportunity to express himself on the matter. The Republican leaders would not even permit the bills to get out of the committee and they were smothered. During the last days of the 1929 session, I again urged the legislature to pass this legislation, and again they refused.

In the meantime, public opinion had become more and more aroused. It was becoming more and more felt. Finally the next year, 1930, after I had again requested the legislature to take steps towards this development, and when they could no longer withstand the force of public opinion, they introduced and passed a bill providing for a commission to be appointed by me to set up a plan whereby the water power resources of the state on the St. Lawrence River could be developed by a state agency for the benefit of the consumers themselves so as to provide the cheapest rates and best service for the people of the state.

That commission has been appointed by me and is now at work formulating a plan by which I hope the people will ultimately obtain the real advantages in cheap electricity which their natural resources contain.

I do not, of course, claim the credit for this final victory. For years the fight had been carried on by Democratic statesmen, and particularly by Governor Smith. I merely took up the battle where he had left off, but neither he nor I nor both of us could have made any headway had it not been for that ever-growing, ever-insistent public opinion which had expressed itself so overwhelmingly time and again at the polls throughout the state, and which was demanding its right and due in the form of cheaper electricity. And although the claim has been made by the Republican Party that it was they who started this Commission on its way, I can but quote from an editorial of the New York Times of September 24, 1930, which says, "The

truth is that the Republicans, their protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, surrendered to the Governor on this issue last winter."

But still the surrender was only a half-hearted one. I was indeed surprised to read this in the 1930 platform of the Republican Party. "We promise a speedy solution of the problem of development of water power resources of the state which shall be based on sound and economic principles rather than on political expediency." Those words have a familiar air. I used to read words like those in the Republican Platform which had definitely declared for the policy of private leases. Frankly, I do not like that language. I much prefer, and I am sure the voters of the state will much prefer, the language of the Democratic Platform, which says on this subject, "Electric energy should be developed by the state from its water power resources in order to insure low-priced electricity." Now in this campaign, let us face the obvious facts. You and I know who the leaders of the Republican Party are. You and I know that these leaders or at least a great many of them are definitely and publicly aligned with the great electric utility companies of the state. They are officers and they are large stockholders in electric and power companies which, in combination, have almost a monopoly of electricity and power in this state. Do they want the state to develop this water power or would they like to have their own companies do it? Are they interested in providing cheap electricity for you or are they interested in providing low profit for themselves? You and I know that these leaders of the Republican Party, so closely tied up with the great electric utility companies of the state, are the ones who dictate to the Party, not only their policies, but also, in many cases, their candidates.

You must remember that when this commission which I appointed brings in its report, the work is only half done. I know that that commission will do its full duty. I, myself, personally, went up to the St. Lawrence River with them and personally inspected the sites on which we all hope the State will soon erect its huge power structures.

But when that work is done by the commission, before anything further can be done the legislature of the State of New York and the Governor must approve. I cannot believe and I am sure that the voters of the State will not believe that a Republican Legislature and a Republican Governor will look so kindly upon this plan of public development against which they have for so many years and through so many administrations fought and protested. I cannot believe, especially in view of the language of the Republican Platform this year, that they will not do all in their power to hamper and prevent and delay any form of public development for the benefit of the people.

It would be only common sense on the part of the people to entrust the development of that plan and the carrying out of those policies to the party which, for so many years, has struggled and fought for its initiation. You can, each one of you, do your share on election day toward the realization of that plan of development which has so long actuated and formed intelligent public opinion in the state.

Some Republican statesmen and Party leaders are still renewing the old objection that this plan is putting the State into business. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Suppose the Republican Party had had its way and had given a franchise to a private corporation to develop this power, what would have happened? It would have gone out and would have hired engineers and would have proceeded to construct a dam across the St. Lawrence River. It would, of course, have first obtained by negotiation the cooperation of the authorities of the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada and of the Federal authorities in Washington. The State can do the same thing. It can get the same engineers and can by contract build the same kind of dam, and I for one am unwilling to say that the State, through its agency, cannot do this job just as efficiently as a private corporation. In fact, by virtue of its powers as to tax exemption, and eminent domain, it could do it much more cheaply and efficiently.

Once the power is developed, and is ready for sale, then the State is in a position to dictate the price at which it can be delivered to the ultimate

consumer. We have no desire to infringe upon the legitimate reasonable profits of any investor in public utility stocks. He is entitled to a fair return on his investment.

That is the whole story, and let us once and for all stop talking about whether the State should be put into business or not.

The important duty of every citizen of the State—lawyers, business men, the press, the agricultural interests, and the average “man in the street”—is from now on to work wholeheartedly for the carrying out of the proposed policy and the plan which, I am confident, will result therefrom. I am confident that the great majority of citizens of the State want to see something done, believe that we must work out a State agency method of development of our great natural electrical resources in such a way that the control of these resources will never pass from the actual possession of the State itself.