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

Series 1: Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Political Ascension

File No. 401

1930 October 24

Albany, NY -
Campaign Speech re Republican Opposition

ADDRESS OF GOV. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

DELIVERED AT ALBANY, N. Y.

October 24, 1930.

GOVERNOR ROOSEVELT: I have been traveling around the state talking to the people on the various questions of government which have engaged our attention during the last two years, and which will be up for public discussion and consideration during the next two years. I have endeavored in these talks to discuss each night one subject of public and social importance. I have, for example, discussed the question of Old Age Security against want, the question of the bond issue for housing the unfortunate wards of the state; the matter of farm and rural tax relief, and the equalization of rural taxes; the question of water power and the providing of cheaper electricity for our household use; the problems of a new prison policy, and the matter of labor legislation in its various forms and social aspects.

I have pointed out to the voters of the state the accomplishments of my administration with reference to these subjects. I have tried to acquaint them with the legislative history of these various accomplishments, showing the hard, uphill struggle which I have had with the Republican legislative leaders and the continuous battle which had to be waged along the same lines by my illustrious predecessor and former neighbor of ours, Alfred E. Smith.

The history of each of these social reforms is very similar. In almost every case they have appeared for the first time in our Democratic State Platform. Then has followed a message from the Democratic

Governor asking the Republican legislature to enact laws to carry them out. That has been met by a flat refusal of the Republican legislative leaders to have anything to do with it. The first suggestion of these reforms for the welfare of the average citizen of the state never sees a bill introduced by any Republican to carry out the Governor's suggestion. The bills are introduced by Democrats in the Senate and in the Assembly. They are then promptly pigeon-holed by the Republican Committee Chairmen. That is the end of the attempt for the first year.

The following summer and autumn witness an increased public interest in the proposed legislation. This interest results in demands being made on the next legislature by civic and social organizations. But the second legislative session sees the same procedure as the first — complete refusal by the Republican leaders to stand for any of the proposed legislation.

Then we come to the third session, and by that time the Republican leaders begin to wake up to the fact that, because of public opinion, something has to be done by them.

In most cases, what they do is to take the Democratic bills of the previous two years, dress them up with the same titles, but carefully see to it that they are amended and weakened in every possible way. Next, they proceed to tell the public, that they are Republican bills, and how much the Republican Party loves this kind of legislation.

Amendments are offered by the Democratic legislators, to strengthen the bills so that they will have real teeth in them. These amendments are duly voted down, and the emasculated Republican measures

are put through. After this, the Democratic Governor finds on his desk a bill which is not like the bill that he and his party have been advocating for the past three or four years, but is at least a step in advance and is at least better than no bill at all. Naturally and rightly, he signs the bill and it becomes a law of the state.

Then comes the final step in the campaign of the following autumn when election time comes around. The Republican Party leaders carefully avoid any accurate mention of the history of the legislation. They avoid reminding the voters that for years, they had bitterly opposed the legislation; they avoid mentioning that the legislation itself is but a shadow of the reforms originally asked for. They point with pride to the fact that they passed the bill at Albany. They claim credit for the legislation and by this form of political dishonesty, hope to deceive the voting public.

Now, as a matter of simple fact, that is the true record of the way most of our progressive social reforms have got on the statute books during the past twelve years. Nobody who is interested in this kind of legislation is in the least bit deceived by the claims of the Republican leaders. These claims are on the face of them, completely and obviously inconsistent with the record. They never have gained and never will gain any votes for candidates for state office on the Republican ticket.

I need hardly point out to you how this precedent has been followed during the last two years. No better example exists of it than the question which the voters of the state will be called upon this fall to decide: - The question of the bond issue for housing the unfortunate wards of the state.

Very soon after we took office, Lieutenant Governor Lehman and I began a systematic inspection of the hospitals of the state. We found the condition of overcrowding to be more than serious. It was disgraceful to our state and a distinct handicap in caring for the patients along modern medical and scientific lines. We have in our hospitals about 55,000 patients, which means 14,000 more than the quarters are intended for. The actual sleeping quarters of the patients themselves are overcrowded, with the beds literally touching each other, and many of the patients sleeping out in the corridors. The first winter I came to Albany, realizing the seriousness of these conditions, I asked the legislature to submit to the people a proposal for the issuance of \$50,000,000 in bonds so that the building program for more beds in these hospitals and the necessary new hospitals could be started immediately.

The legislature refused to go along with me in this. Then in the summer I called a conference of the Republican legislative leaders, who again refused to authorize a bond issue. Instead they stated that they would appropriate a part of the necessary funds out of current revenues. Finally, this year, a year late, the legislature, forced by the pressure of public opinion, has authorized the bond issue, and has agreed to submit it to the people this fall for approval.

I pointed out last night, in my speech in Utica, how the Republican legislative leaders had been using the same tactics with bill after bill which marked steps in social progress. They did the same thing with the bill prohibiting the granting of temporary injunctions in industrial disputes. They are doing the same thing with the bill extending Workmen's Compensation to all occupational diseases. Instead of

passing or permitting the consideration of bills introduced by Democratic members which would have included all occupational diseases within the protection of Workmen's Compensation, they pass bills, one at a time, merely adding one or two to the list of compensable diseases.

They did the same thing with the subject of old age security against want. They have not yet given us what we have asked for.

I have repeatedly said that the old age pension law must be extended and amended. In the first place it should be amended by taking care of many old people who have not yet reached the age of 70, but who, through the effects of the terrific pace of modern industrial activity, have reached old age before their time.

Secondly, I have advocated and still advocate an amendment of the law so as to provide that this relief by old age assistance will not in any way even resemble a dole system. I look forward to the time when every young man and young woman entering business will begin to insure against the privations of old age.

You are all familiar with the struggle waged for the development of water power by the state for the benefit of its citizens and especially its home owners, at cheap rates. You have seen the same long struggle by Democratic governors to accomplish this outstanding and social reform.

And so, we have this continuous year in, year out struggle for the solution of our social problems by constructive, scientific legislation. Everybody knows who is for it and who is against it.

Connected with this question of our institutions and the inmates thereof, and with the whole social question of insanity and crime,

and only too often with the problem of poverty itself, is the matter of temperance.

It is increasingly apparent that intoxication has no place in this new mechanized civilization of ours. In our industry - in our recreation - on our highways - in our very sports - a drunken man is more than an objectionable companion; he is a peril to the rest of us.

The hand that controls the machinery of our factories - that holds the steering wheels of our automobiles - the brain that decides the course of our huge financial organizations, should alike be free from the effects of drugs or alcohol.

To those interested in social progress the question of temperance and the reduction of intoxication has always proved a most serious and difficult problem. I believe that the solution which was attempted by the American people after the war, the solution by legislative and constitutional fiat, has been a complete and tragic failure. It has been a failure for two major reasons: in the first place, it has attempted to legislate into being a condition that cannot be attained by legislation but only by the slow and orderly process of education; and, secondly, because it has attempted to encroach upon fields which should belong exclusively to the respective states of the Union.

I need not point out to you the general encouragement to lawlessness and to a widespread disrespect of law itself which has resulted from this attempt.

I need not point out to you that it has been a prolific source of corruption, hypocrisy, crime, and disorder. The situation has become impossible and intolerable. I, for one, believe that it is time to

retrace our steps — for we find that we have wandered far from the firm road toward eventual temperance into a hopeless morass of crime and law defiance.

We must start afresh. And the first step of that start should be as quickly as possible, — the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment.

It is becoming almost obvious that each sovereign state in the Union should be given the right to determine for itself whether alcoholic beverages should be made, manufactured, sold or transported within its borders.

Following the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, New York State must and will take such regulatory measures, as will promote temperance, definitely and effectively banish the saloon, and recognize the principle of home rule in all localities.

I stand flatly upon my party's platform; and I assure you that all of the Democratic candidates are united in this position. There is no diversity or doubt among us. We stand together. We do not attempt, one of us, to appeal to one portion of the state's population, while another appeals to a different portion.

We believe that the people of this state as a whole are interested in temperance — that they want temperance by constitutional and orderly means. While we have the greatest respect for those in our state who still believe that temperance can be best served by the continuance of Federal constitutional and legislative enactment, we disagree with them as to method. We believe that the whole question should be left to the determination of the respective states themselves.

There is another great social reform which the present

Democratic administration in Albany is attempting to accomplish, and which is now in the midst of the same hindering and hamstringing on the part of the Republican legislative leaders. I refer to the proper regulation of public utility companies. These companies, as you know, furnish to us electric light, gas light, transportation and telephone service. Their activities must, therefore, necessarily be bound up with the intimate lives of every one of us, the home lives of our families.

Every time we push an electric button which turns on our electric light, every time we lift up the telephone receiver, every time we get on the street car, every time we light our gas stove to boil some water or cook a meal, we are dealing with a public utility company.

Far back in 1907 during the governorship of Charles E. Hughes, it became apparent that some form of protection must be given to the people who use these various services. This protection was deemed to be necessary in order to protect us from exorbitant rates and to compel the companies to give us decent service, and it was directly in line with a principle dating back hundreds of years, that government has the right and the duty to supervise and regulate these public utility services.

Since that time, however, two important things have been happening which have forcibly brought to the public mind the necessity of reform. The first is that in recent years, the Public Service Commission itself has not been performing its original role of a militant protector of public rights. It was contenting itself with acting merely as an occasional judge between the utility companies on the one side and

the consumer on the other.

That was not the role that I want to see it fill. It should rather be an ever-watchful protector against exorbitant rates and improper service. It should, more than that, ever be on the lookout so that it, itself, can initiate proceedings to reduce rates if they are too high, or to compel fair service. The reason for this gradual letting down in the functions of the Public Service Commission has been that the legislature, instead of allowing the Public Service Commission to function as a commission of five men, had so written the law that it was completely under the dominance of whoever happened to be chairman of the commission.

Under the leadership of that chairman, the legitimate functions of the Public Service Commission were completely obscured. It was not until the chairman offered me his resignation because of his inability and unwillingness to go along with my ideas of proper public utility regulation that I was able to obtain for the leadership of that commission a man who, by training and instinct, was sympathetic with the proper functioning of this regulatory body.

You all recall the famous New York Telephone Case of last winter. You all recall how after almost ten years of battle in the courts, and after taking 63,000 pages of testimony, and after examining 4,300 exhibits, the telephone company was given permission by the Federal Courts to raise its rates in New York City. You all recall that immediately upon learning of this, I suggested that the Public Service Commission take immediate steps to protect the peoples' interest in the matter of telephone rates.

You all recall that the chairman of the Public Service Commission at that time resented what he termed as interference in the judicial processes of the Public Service Commission, but still I sent the letter, and still I insisted that the Public Service Commission go through with it.

Shortly thereafter this chairman resigned and I appointed the present chairman, Mr. Maltbie. Already, in the few months since his appointment, there has been an enormous improvement in the activity of the Public Service Commission. Complaints are being immediately investigated and proceedings are being vigorously followed up looking toward cheaper rates for all kinds of public utility services.

Take two practical examples under Chairman Maltbie's leadership -- the rates asked by the telephone company were drastically reduced this spring, and only yesterday a further reduction was ordered by the Public Service Commission in the long distance telephone rates.

More and more people of the state are receiving the proper kind of attention from the Public Service Commission. I know that under the present leadership the commission will measure up aggressively to the standards originally expected of it.

But there is a deeper reason for the breakdown in this regulation of public utilities. Ever since the Public Service Commissions were initiated in this state and in other states, there has grown up a body of court made law. This is not statute law, mind you, which is passed by any legislature, but was law built up by court decisions in the rate cases. The most important of these decisions is centered around the question of value.

This matter is of course an extremely technical and complicated one. For that reason I suggested very soon after my arrival at Albany that the legislature appoint a non-partisan commission to investigate the whole subject, and to revise the public service commission law so that legislation could be enacted to prevent this court made law from continuing to force upon our people exorbitant rates for their daily needs. I had hoped that the legislature would authorize the appointment of a really non-partisan commission, consisting of a small group of experts to work the thing out along scientific and technical lines. That was too much to expect. The legislature refused. Instead, it followed its usual policy by creating a commission of nine men, of whom they were to appoint six, and I was to appoint three. Of course, the result was there were six good Republican legislators, and three appointees by me, a Democrat, a Republican and an Independent.

What was the difference in the point of view? The Republican legislature put on six Republican politicians who knew as much about utilities as my granddaughter does. My point of view was a little different. I declined to take the political faith of my appointees into consideration at all. What I sought and what I got was three experts in public utility and social service problems.

Now this commission brought in a report, a very interesting report, and one which will form the basis for legislation for many years to come, not only in this state, but in other states as well. The report was divided into 2 parts. One was a majority report signed by the six Republican leaders of the legislature, and the other was the minority report signed by my three appointees. I need hardly point out that the

counsel to the commission was a very good Republican in good Republican standing.

The report of the minority of the Commission, my appointees, went to the very root and essence of the problem. They pointed out that the source of all the difficulty of rate-fixing was this question of value, and they proceeded to point out the remedies to meet the situation.

The Republican, or majority report, while admitting that the basis of the trouble was this question of valuation, was afraid to go to the real root of the difficulty in order to meet the question. Instead, they recommended some very nice innocuous measures, which would have permitted the utility companies, if they wanted to, to submit themselves to various valuation proceedings in order to fix their value. Mind you, they did not say that the utility companies would have to do it, but that they could do it, if they wanted to, for a period of ten years. The minority proposal, however, said that the public utilities of the state would have to submit themselves to a complete revaluation of their property so as to fix the value and that from then on, their values would have to depend upon the real investment by the utility company, and not upon any subsequent fictitious value.

It is needless to say that the legislation proposed by the minority received scant attention from the Republican majority, and no consideration at all. Instead, the Republican party introduced a series of bills carrying out the Republican report. Most of these bills were unimportant and really merited very little attention. I signed them, pointing out that while they did no good, they did no harm.

When it came to the real question, however, which went to the meat of the matter, the bills passed by the Republican leaders were nothing more than a joke. When they were first introduced, as weak and as ineffective as they were, they immediately aroused the opposition of all the utility companies. They came flocking to Albany. Legislative representatives of gas companies, electric companies, and the telephone companies began swarming through the corridors of the Capitol, and into the committee rooms of the legislature. This would never do. These vast utility combinations which for years had furnished the sinews of Republican political campaigns in the form of campaign contributions, were going to be subjected to a little regulation, even though it would be absolutely ineffective adequately to protect the rights of the people.

Public hearing after public hearing was held, and I am sure that there were many private hearings held which the public heard nothing about. Pretty soon, amendments began to be introduced, and more amendments and more amendments, and before you knew it, these bills had been so amended that the introducer of two of them refused to vote for them himself on the ground that they had been so often amended that he didn't recognize his own bills.

It is an open secret, for example, that the valuation bill and the so-called contract bill had struck a snag in the Senate so severe that although it had been amended and amended to meet the wishes of the utility companies, it still was not going to pass because one utility company in the western part of the state was opposed to it, and every member of the Assembly from that county had been told to vote

against it. It became a source of considerable amusement that Senator Knight, the czar of the Senate, who had backed these bills, couldn't even get them passed. He could not muster the necessary votes in the Senate and he absolutely refused to let the Senate adjourn unless they would do something about it.

Finally, on the last day the bill was further emasculated and amended so as to meet the wishes of this utility company, and was rushed through on the last day in typewritten form so that not one of the Republicans in the Senate who voted for it, except Senator Knight himself, knew what was in the bill. These two bills were passed, not with any intentions of their becoming law, because the leaders knew that I could not and would not sign them.

These bills were not passed on any recommendation either from the majority or minority members of the commission. They did nothing to meet the problem. They were absolutely meaningless. They tended to perpetuate a system of regulation which did not regulate; and they were nothing more or less than a cheap and inexcusable fraud on the public.

I do not feel discouraged at the failure of the last legislature to adopt these measures of regulation. It is the same old story of opposition to all forms of progress, but next year, if I am governor, I shall again present my effective proposals for regulation. By that time public opinion will begin to function. I know that the various leaders of thought and the various civic organizations will begin to make public opinion felt by the Republican leaders. The rights and interests of legitimate investors in public utility companies must and will be protected. But effective regulation must be imposed to prevent

unjust and extortionate rates, and to compel fair service for the consumer. Eventually, we will be able to compel the Republican legislative leaders to bow to the will of the people.

Of course your cooperation and assistance is needed. It is needed not only next year; it is needed now. You and I know that the election of a Republican governor and a Republican legislature means the end of efforts at regulation of public utilities. We know who the leaders of the Republican party are. We know their attitude on the public utility question. We know how little they will be interested in fair rates for the consumer, and how much they will be interested in large profits for their utility companies. The Republican campaign so far has said very little indeed about regulation of utilities. They have tried to keep it in the background as far as possible, but I have an everlasting confidence in the ultimate force of public opinion. I have everlasting confidence that the people of the state can and will see to it that their rights are ultimately protected, and that this great social question of utility regulation will ultimately be solved in the interest of the people themselves.

P. 800

**History of Republican Legislative Opposition to All Progressive
Measures of Past Eight Years**

CAMPAIGN ADDRESS

ALBANY, October 24, 1930.

I have been traveling around the State talking to the people on the various questions of government which have engaged our attention during the last two years, and which will be up for public discussion and consideration during the next two years. I have endeavored in these talks to discuss each night one subject of public and social importance. I have, for example, discussed the question of Old Age Security against want, the question of the bond issue for housing the unfortunate wards of the State; the matter of farm and rural tax relief, and the equalization of rural taxes; the question of water power and the providing of cheaper electricity for our household use; the problems of a new prison policy, and the matter of labor legislation in its various forms and social aspects.

I have pointed out to the voters of the State the accomplishments of my administration with reference to these subjects. I have tried to acquaint them with the legislative history of these various accomplishments, showing the hard, uphill struggle which I have had with the Republican legislative

leaders and the continuous battle which had to be waged along the same lines by my illustrious predecessor and former neighbor of ours, Alfred E. Smith.

The history of each of these social reforms is very similar. In almost every case they have appeared for the first time in our Democratic State Platform. Then has followed a message from the Democratic Governor asking the Republican legislature to enact laws to carry them out. That has been met by a flat refusal of the Republican legislative leaders to have anything to do with it. The first suggestion of these reforms for the welfare of the average citizen of the State never sees a bill introduced by any Republican to carry out the Governor's suggestion. The bills are introduced by Democrats in the Senate and in the Assembly. They are then promptly pigeon-holed by the Republican Committee chairmen. That is the end of the attempt for the first year.

The following summer and autumn witness an increased public interest in the proposed legislation. This interest results in demands being made on the next Legislature by civic and social organizations. But the second legislative session sees the same procedure as the first—complete refusal by the Republican leaders to stand for any of the proposed legislation.

Then we come to the third session, and by that time the Republican leaders begin to wake up to the fact that, because of public opinion, something has to be done by them.

In most cases, what they do is to take the Democratic bills of the previous two years, dress them up with the same titles, but carefully see to it that they are amended and weakened in every possible way. Next, they proceed to tell the public that they are Republican bills, and how much the Republican Party loves this kind of legislation.

Amendments are offered by the Democratic legislators, to strengthen the bills so that they will have real teeth, in them. These amendments are duly voted down, and the emasculated Republican measures are put through. After this, the Democratic Governor finds on his desk a bill which is not like the bill that he and his party have been advocating for the past three or four years, but is at least a step in advance and is at least better than no bill at all. Naturally and rightly, he signs the bill and it becomes a law of the State.

Then comes the final step in the campaign of the following autumn when election time comes around. The Republican Party leaders carefully avoid any accurate mention of the history of the legislation. They avoid reminding the voters that for years they had bitterly opposed the legislation; they avoid mentioning that the legislation itself is but a shadow of the reforms originally asked for. They point with pride to the fact that they passed the bill at Albany. They claim credit for the legislation and by this form of political dishonesty, hope to deceive the voting public.

Now, as a matter of simple fact, that is the true record of the way most of our progressive social reforms have got on the statute books during the past twelve years. Nobody who is interested in this kind of legislation is in the least bit deceived by the claims of the Republican leaders. These claims are, on the face of them, completely and obviously inconsistent with the record. They never have gained and never will gain any votes for candidates for State office on the Republican ticket.

I need hardly point out to you how this precedent has been followed during the last two years. No better example exists of it than the question which the voters of the State will be called upon this fall to decide: The question of the bond issue for housing the unfortunate wards of the State.

Very soon after we took office, Lieutenant Governor Lehman and I began a systematic inspection of the hospitals of the State. We found the condition of overcrowding to be more than serious. It was disgraceful to our State and a distinct handicap in caring for the patients along modern medical and scientific lines. We have in our hospitals about 55,000 patients, which means 14,000 more than the quarters are intended for. The actual sleeping quarters of the patients themselves are overcrowded, with the beds literally touching each other, and many of the patients sleeping out in the corridors.

The first winter I came to Albany, realizing the seriousness of these conditions, I asked the Legislature to submit to the people a proposal for the issuance of \$50,000,000 in bonds so that the building program for more beds in these hospitals and the necessary new hospitals could be started immediately.

The Legislature refused to go along with me in this. Then in the summer I called a conference of the Republican legislative leaders, who again refused to authorize a bond issue. Instead they stated that they would appropriate a part of the necessary funds out of current revenues. Finally, this year, a year late, the Legislature, forced by the pressure of public opinion, has authorized the bond issue, and has agreed to submit it to the people this fall for approval.

I pointed out last night, in my speech in Utica, how the Republican legislative leaders had been using the same tactics with bill after bill which marked steps in social progress. They did the same thing with the bill prohibiting the granting of temporary injunctions in industrial disputes. They are doing the same thing with the bill extending Workmen's Compensation to all occupational diseases. Instead of passing or permitting the consideration of bills introduced by Democratic members which would have included all occupational diseases within the protection of Workmen's Compensation, they pass bills, one at a time, merely adding one or two to the list of compensable diseases.

They did the same thing with the subject of old age security against want. They have not yet given us what we have asked for.

I have repeatedly said that the old age pension law must be extended and amended. In the first place it should be amended by taking care of many old people who have not yet reached the age of 70, but who, through the effects of the terrific pace of modern industrial activity, have reached old age before their time.

Secondly, I have advocated and still advocate an amendment of the law so as to provide that this relief by old age assistance will not in any way even resemble a dole system. I look forward to the time when every young man and young woman entering business will begin to insure against the privations of old age.

You are all familiar with the struggle waged for the development of water power by the State for the benefit of its citizens and especially its home owners, at cheap rates. You have seen the same long struggle by Democratic Governors to accomplish this outstanding and social reform.

And so, we have this continuous year in, year out struggle for the solution of our social problems by constructive, scientific legislation. Everybody knows who is for it and who is against it.

Connected with this question of our institutions and the inmates thereof, and with the whole social question of insanity and crime, and only too often with the problem of poverty itself, is the matter of temperance.

It is increasingly apparent that intoxication has no place in this new mechanized civilization of ours; in our industry—in our recreation—on our highways—in our very sports—a drunken man is more than an objectionable companion; he is a peril to the rest of us.

The hand that controls the machinery of our factories—that holds the steering wheels of our automobiles—the brain that decides the course of our huge financial organizations, should alike be free from the effects of drugs or alcohol.

To those interested in social progress the question of temperance and the reduction of intoxication has always proved a most serious and difficult problem. I believe that the solution which was attempted by the American people after the war, the solution by legislative and constitutional fiat, has been a complete and tragic failure. It has been a failure for two major reasons: in the first place, it has attempted to legislate into being a condition that cannot be attained by legislation but only by the slow and orderly process of education; and, secondly, because it has attempted to encroach upon fields which should belong exclusively to the respective states of the union.

I need not point out to you the general encouragement to lawlessness and to a widespread disrespect of law itself which has resulted from this attempt.

I need not point out to you that it has been a prolific source of corruption, hypocrisy, crime, and disorder. The situation has become impossible and intolerable. I, for one, believe that it is time to retrace our steps—for we find that we have wandered far from the firm road toward eventual temperance into a hopeless morass of crime and law defiance.

We must start afresh. And the first step of that start should be as quickly as possible,—the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment.

It is becoming almost obvious that each sovereign state in the Union should be given the right to determine for itself whether alcoholic beverages should be made, manufactured, sold or transported within its borders.

Following the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, New York State must and will take such regulatory measures, as will promote temperance, definitely and effectively banish the saloon, and recognize the principle of home rule in all localities.

I stand flatly upon my party's platform; and I assure you that all of the Democratic candidates are united in this position. There is no diversity or doubt among us. We stand together. We do not attempt, one of us, to appeal to one portion of the state's population, while another appeals to a different portion.

We believe that the people of this State as a whole are interested in temperance, that they want temperance by constitutional and orderly means. While we have the greatest respect for those in our State who still believe that temperance can be best served by the continuance of Federal constitutional and legislative enactment, we disagree with them as to method. We believe that the whole question should be left to the determination of the respective states themselves.

There is another great social reform which the present Democratic administration in Albany is attempting to accomplish, and which is now in the midst of the same hindering and hamstringing on the part of the Republican legislative leaders. I refer to the proper regulation of public utility companies. These companies, as you know, furnish to us electric light, gas light, transportation and telephone service. Their activities must, therefore, necessarily be bound up with the intimate lives of every one of us, the home lives of our families.

Every time we push an electric button which turns on our electric light, every time we lift up the telephone receiver, every time we get on the street car, every time we light our gas stove to boil some water or cook a meal, we are dealing with a public utility company.

Far back in 1907 during the governorship of Charles E. Hughes, it became apparent that some form of protection must be given to the people who use these various services. This protection was deemed to be necessary in order to protect us from exorbitant rates and to compel the companies to give us decent service, and it was directly in line with principle dating back hundreds of years, that government has the right and the duty to supervise and regulate these public utility services.

Since that time, however, two important things have been happening which have forcibly brought to the public mind the necessity of reform. The first is that in recent years, the Public Service Commission itself has not been performing its original role of a militant protector of public rights. It was contenting itself with acting merely as an occasional judge between the utility companies on the one side and the consumer on the other.

That was not the role that I want to see it fill. It should rather be an ever-watchful protector against exorbitant rates and improper service. It should, more than that, ever be on the lookout so that it, itself, can initiate proceedings to reduce rates if they are too high, or to compel fair service. The reason for this gradual letting down in the functions of the Public Service Commission has been that the Legislature, instead of allowing the Public Service Commission to function as a commission of five men, had so written the law that it was completely under the dominance of who happened to be chairman of the commission.

Under the leadership of that chairman, the legitimate functions of the Public Service Commission were completely obscured. It was not until the chairman offered me his resignation because of his inability and unwillingness to go along with my ideas of proper public utility regulation that I was able to obtain for the leadership of that commission a man who, by training and instinct, was sympathetic with the proper functioning of this regulatory body.

You all recall the famous New York Telephone case of last winter. You all recall how after almost ten years of battle in the courts, and after taking 63,000 pages of testimony, and after examining 4,300 exhibits, the Telephone Company was given permission by the Federal Courts to raise its rates in New York City. You all recall that immediately upon learning of this, I suggested that the Public Service Commission take immediate steps to protect the people's interest in the matter of telephone rates.

You all recall that the chairman of the Public Service Commission at that time resented what he termed my interference in the judicial processes of the Public Service Commission, but still I sent the letter, and still I insisted that the Public Service Commission go through with it.

Shortly thereafter this chairman resigned and I appointed the present chairman, Mr. Maltbie. Already, in the few months since his appointment, there has been an enormous improvement in the activity of the Public Service Commission. Complaints are being immediately investigated and proceedings are being vigorously followed up looking toward cheaper rates for all kinds of public utility services.

Take two practical examples under Chairman Maltbie's leadership—the rates asked by the Telephone Company were drastically reduced this spring, and only yesterday a further reduction was ordered by the Public Service Commission in the long distance telephone rates.

More and more people of the State are receiving the proper kind of attention from the Public Service Commission. I know that under the present leadership the commission will measure up aggressively to the standards originally expected of it.

But there is a deeper reason for the breakdown in this regulation of public utilities. Ever since the Public Service Commissions were initiated in this State and in other states, there has grown up a body of court made law. This is not statute law, mind you, which is passed by any Legislature, but was law built up by court decisions in the rate cases. The most important of these decisions is centered around the question of value.

This matter is of course an extremely technical and complicated one. For that reason I suggested very soon after my arrival at Albany that the Legislature appoint a non-partisan commission to investigate the whole subject, and to revise the Public Service Commission Law so that legislation could be enacted to prevent this court made law from continuing to force upon our people exorbitant rates for their daily needs. I had hoped that the Legislature would authorize the appointment of a really non-partisan commission, consisting of a small group of experts to work the thing out along scientific and technical lines. That was too much to expect. The Legislature refused. Instead, it followed its usual policy by creating a commission of nine men, of whom they were to appoint six, and I was to name three. Of course, the result was there were six good Republican legislators, and three appointees by me, a Democrat, a Republican and an Independent.

There was the difference in the point of view. The Republican Legislature put on six Republican politicians who knew as much about utilities as my granddaughter does. My point of view was a little different. I declined to take the political faith of my appointees into consideration at all. What I sought and what I got was three experts in public utility and social service problems.

Now this commission brought in a report, a very interesting report, and one which will form the basis for legislation for many years to come, not only in this State, but in other states as well. The report was divided into two parts. One was a majority report signed by the six Republican leaders of the Legislature, and the other was the minority report signed by my

three appointees. I need hardly point out that the counsel to the commission was a very good Republican in good Republican standing.

The report of the minority of the Commission, my appointees, went to the very root and essence of the problem. They pointed out that the source of all the difficulty of rate-fixing was this question of value, and they proceeded to point out the remedies to meet the situation.

The Republican, or majority report, while admitting that the basis of the trouble was this question of valuation, was afraid to go to the real root of the difficulty in order to meet the question. Instead, they recommended some very nice innocuous measures, which would have permitted the utility companies, if they wanted to, to submit themselves to various valuation proceedings in order to fix their value. Mind you, they did not say that the utility companies would have to do it, but that they could do it, if they wanted to, for a period of ten years. The minority proposal, however, said that they the public utilities of the State would have to submit themselves to a complete revaluation of their property so as to fix the value and that from then on, their values would have to depend upon the real investment by the utility company and not upon any subsequent fictitious value.

It is needless to say that the legislation proposed by the minority received scant attention from the Republican majority, and no consideration at all. Instead, the Republican Party introduced a series of bills carrying out the Republican report. Most of these bills were unimportant and really merited very little attention. I signed them, pointing out that while they did no good, they did no harm.

When it came to the real questions, however, which went to the meat of the matter, the bills passed by the Republican leaders were nothing more than a joke. When they were first introduced, as weak and as ineffective as they were, they immediately aroused the opposition of all the utility companies. They came flocking to Albany. Legislative representatives of gas companies, electric companies, and the telephone companies began swarming through the corridors of the Capitol, and into the committee rooms of the Legislature. This would never do. These vast utility combinations which for years had furnished the sinews of Republican political campaigns in the form of campaign contributions, were going to be subjected to a little regulation, even though it would be absolutely ineffective adequately to protect the rights of the people.

Public hearing after public hearing was held, and I am sure that there were many private hearings held which the public heard nothing about. Pretty soon, amendments began to be introduced, and more amendments and more amendments, and before you knew it, these bills had been so amended that the introducer of two of them refused to vote for them himself on the ground that they had been so often amended that he didn't recognize his own bills.

It is an open secret, for example, that the valuation bill and the so-called contract bill had struck a snag in the Senate so severe that although it had been amended and amended to meet the wishes of the utility companies, it still was not going to pass because one utility company in the western part of the State was opposed to it, and every member of the Assembly from that county had been told to vote against it. It became a source of considerable amusement that Senator Knight, the czar of the Senate, who had backed these bills, couldn't even get them passed. He could not muster the necessary votes in the Senate and he absolutely refused to let the Senate adjourn unless they would do something about it.

Finally, on the last day, the bill was further emasculated and amended so as to meet the wishes of this utility company, and was rushed through on the last day in typewritten form so that not one of the Republicans in the Senate who voted for it, except Senator Knight himself, knew what was in the bill. These two bills were passed, not with any intentions of their becoming law, because the leaders knew that I could not and would not sign them.

These bills were not passed on any recommendation either from the majority or minority members of the commission. They did nothing to meet

the problem. They were absolutely meaningless. They tended to perpetuate a system of regulation which did not regulate; and they were nothing more or less than a cheap and inexcusable fraud on the public.

I do not feel discouraged at the failure of the last Legislature to adopt these measures of regulation. It is the same old story of opposition to all forms of progress, but next year, if I am Governor, I shall again present my effective proposals for regulation. By that time public opinion will begin to function. I know that the various leaders of thought and the various civic organizations will begin to make public opinion felt by the Republican leaders. The rights and interests of legitimate investors in public utility companies must and will be protected. But effective regulation must be imposed to prevent unjust and extortionate rates, and to compel fair service for the consumer. Eventually, we will be able to compel the Republican legislative leaders to bow to the will of the people.

Of course your cooperation and assistance is needed. It is needed not only next year; it is needed now. You and I know that the election of a Republican Governor and a Republican Legislature means the end of efforts at regulation of public utilities. We know who the leaders of the Republican party are. We know their attitude on the public utility question. We know how little they will be interested in fair rates for the consumer, and how much they will be interested in large profits for their utility companies. The Republican campaigners so far have said very little indeed about regulation of utilities. They have tried to keep it in the background as far as possible, but I have an everlasting confidence in the ultimate force of public opinion. I have everlasting confidence that the people of the State can and will see to it that their rights are ultimately protected, and that this great social question of utility regulation will ultimately be solved in the interest of the people themselves.
