

---

**Franklin D. Roosevelt — “The Great Communicator”**

**The Master Speech Files, 1898, 1910-1945**

**Series 1: Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Political Ascension**

---

**File No. 583**

**1932 November 3**

**New York City, NY –  
Address Republicans for Roosevelt League**

SPEECH OF GOVERNOR FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT  
BEFORE THE "REPUBLICAN FOR ROOSEVELT LEAGUE",  
NEW YORK CITY, METROPOLITAN OPERA HOUSE,  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1932.

---

I am here tonight at the invitation of a group of public-minded citizens who have placed principle above party. These citizens whose party affiliation has been Republican have publicly declared that they consider that a change in the administration of this government is necessary -- that it is, in fact, indispensable to a restoration to normal conditions. On such an occasion it is fitting to speak as a citizen rather than as a partisan.

In this campaign, indeed, the personal view I have had of the conditions of need and distress in every part of the Union has brought home to me the deep conviction that in this crisis the national and not the partisan objective must prevail.

To begin with, let me propose a text which, in my opinion, expresses a sentiment that is widely held this year. It is presented so clearly, so distinctly and so admirably that I would not change a word of it, even though it was spoken twelve years ago. Coming from a great figure in our national life it deserves serious consideration, and coming from a great Republican it deserves particular consideration from Republicans:

"For one reason or another even a wisely led political party, given a long enough tenure of office, finally fails to express any longer the will of the people, and when it does so fail to express the will of the people it ceases to be an effective instrument of government. It is far better for such a political party -- and certainly better for the state -- that it should be relegated to the role of the critic and that the opposing political party should assume the reins of government. This condition appears to have arrived in America."

That, my friends, is the sober conclusion of a cautious public man, not long ago President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge. With every word of it I heartily agree.

There are more reasons than that for a change this year. There are ten million or more reasons embodied in the blighted hopes of the ten million or more of the unemployed. No doubt seeking to extend the campaign of fear so foolishly and so wickedly put in motion, the present Republican leader, the President, the other night <sup>made the statement</sup> ~~referred to the fact~~ that if the policies he had so valiantly developed be not continued "the grass would grow on the streets of the cities". Well, the grass has little chance to grow in the

streets of our cities now. It would be trampled into the ground by the men who wander these streets in search of employment.

You have heard in this very city the President's exhortation that to abandon or to change one letter or one word of his policies would mean the destruction of this great Republic. But what do those policies boil down to when analyzed by the average citizen?

First, the President takes enormous credit for huge federal loans to prevent the industrial and banking situation from getting worse. Well and good. But that is a negative credit and does nothing positive to make things better.

Then he would exhort employers who have no markets for their wares to start their factories, to employ more labor, and thereby to increase production. I ask the simple question, what good is that if the purchasing power of the people to buy these products is not increased? And, especially I point to the fact that his program in no shape, manner or form calls for a restoration of the prices of farm products in order that the half of our



population which lives directly or indirectly by farming may have the wherewithal to buy the factory products.

Next he brings out a brand new suggestion. He would have us sit like Micawber and wait for something to turn up. He hints that some great invention, hidden away as he puts it in the "lockers of science" may appear overnight and put ten million people to work.

This is no new fantasy. Many people have been saying this for a long time. They hope for some new equivalent of the automobile or electric power, to pop out around the corner like magic.

The President asks that "the American government continue to be conducted in this faith and in this hope". I assert that the American government can not be conducted on the speculation of some new invention which has not yet been made.

Faith and hope are splendid things but the hunger and suffering of millions of unemployed men are too insistent to justify a governmental policy that pins its faith on such a mere, remote possibility. This expression is another example of the old gambling spirit

of the speculative boom that has so sorely mismanaged the country for the past few years. It is the attitude of mind that guessed in 1929 that we might escape the consequences of over-speculation. It is the gamble with fate that led to the foreign loans abroad. It is the gamble with fate that led the administration to guess in one budget after another that business would suddenly improve, and provide by that gamble the taxable means to meet an extravagant outlay of expenditure. It is this kind of government by guess and by gamble that the people of this country have resolved to put out of power. I rejoice that Republicans everywhere have decided to lay aside party, to put their shoulders to the wheel to achieve recovery, not by magic or gambling, but by hard commonsense and above all by serious and resolute action.

To condense the sum of all of the arguments of the President for his reelection, into two sentences, is not hard.

He asks a vote of confidence because he says that but for him the situation would have been worse. He asks the Nation to wait and hope for some miracle of invention to make things better.

As you who have followed the nationwide campaign which I have conducted for the past three months will fully appreciate, both my political philosophy and my chart of action for the country's future differ widely from those of President Hoover.

Throughout this campaign in every State, -- and I have been in thirty-seven of them, -- I have insisted upon the theme that there is a definite and distinct difference between his policies and mine. I have repeated that this program entrusted to me is essentially a national program. Its watchword is interdependence of all groups, of all sections, of all economic interests. Such a program permits of no yielding to sectional or immediate selfish special interests such as those represented by the clients and backers of Mr. Grundy. It represents a recognition of the fact that a neglected group, a submerged group, - be it agriculture, labor, or finance or industry, - will prevent the recovery of the entire nation. It is not in ignoring the fact that there are different interests and different parts of the country, and different people with different needs that we build a nation, it is in recognizing them, looking at

them, seeing them, consulting them, helping them, always with a view to the larger interest - the interest of the nation.

Now the President took occasion in this city to speak of the American system and then proceeded to demonstrate that he does not know what the American system really means.

The American system is not the special, exclusive, vested, patented possession of the Republican party or, for that matter, of the Democratic party. The rank and file of both great parties have deep-seated devotion to the essentials of that system. The rank and file of Democrats believe in the patriotism and loyalty to that system which exists among the rank and file of the Republican party. And the rank and file of the Republican party feel the same way about the rank and file of the Democratic party. In our century and a half of national life we have been ruled by Democrats and Republicans. We have had our ups and downs under both parties.

Therefore, the rank and file of the voters of both parties agree with me today that the most extraordinary,

the most amazing, and I believe the most un-American episode of this entire campaign of 1932 is the eleventh hour effort of the President to arrogate to himself and his handful of associates in Washington the right to claim an exclusive interpretation of and ownership in the American system of government. The American system is the common heritage and common possession of all Americans. Five days from today these Americans by overwhelming vote intend to deny and reject the exclusive patent sought by the President and his friends.

H > The interpretation which you give and I give to the American system of government certainly does not mean the combination of foreign and domestic gambling that the present leadership of the Republican party has sponsored. It does not mean inviting on one hand the trade of other countries and on the other declaring economic war against them. This is not an American system, as I understand the American system. You do not spell out America by combining the economics of John Law and his Mississippi Bubble with those of Mr. Grundy and his campaign contributors.

The American system, the American government itself, was founded on the principle that many men from many states with many economic views and many economic interests might, through the medium of a national government,

build for national harmony, national unity and interdependent well-being. This is the American system. And if the President will turn from his made-to-order statistics, which he so sadly misrepresents and misinterprets, if he will turn his eyes from his so-called "backward and crippled countries" and turn to the great and stricken markets of Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois and the other agricultural states, if he will cease his Utopian dreaming of inventions hidden in the "lockers of science" that are going to make us rich, and turn to the true lessons of American history and the real words of the founders of this Republic, he will know what the American system really is.

I offer as a witness, a man who sat and labored with incredible zeal for the making of the Federal Constitution, who participated in the deliberations of the convention that made it, who expended his inexhaustible labors in the writing of the record of this convention, and who in his defense of this Constitution set forth in "The Federalist" the most authentic and imperishable interpretation of the American system that the world has ever seen. Here is his interpretation:

"A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation."

This means that government is intended to be the means by which all these interests and policies are brought into equilibrium and harmony within a single Republic. This, my friends, is an expression of the American system at its best and I leave it to you to decide whether the most authentic, the most unselfish, the most unworried and dignified and true exponent of the American system is James Madison or Herbert Hoover.

I have sought during these months to emphasize a broad policy of construction, of national planning and of national building, constructed in harmony with the best traditions of the American system. I have concentrated of necessity upon the broad and immediately insistent problems of national scope.

At Topeka I outlined a complete national plan for the restoration of agriculture to its proper relationship to the Nation.

At Salt Lake City I outlined a definite program to give us a national transportation policy, including the rehabilitation of the railroads of the nation.

At Portland I set forth in definite terms a national policy for the conduct of utilities and especially those engaged in manufacturing and distributing electric power.

At Sioux City I proposed a tariff policy aimed to restore international trade and commerce not only with this nation but between all nations.

At Boston I championed the principle that the national government has a positive duty to see that no citizen shall starve.

At Columbus I proposed the protection of the investing public against the evils and the fraud perpetrated against them during the past ten years.

At Pittsburgh I proposed an honest, national budget system.



And now as to the actual conduct of government itself - what a business man would call the executive and operating task of the corporation.

It is necessary first of all to recognize the simple fact that, apart from the occasional judicial interpretations relating to government, we have in Washington as in all the states two constant factors which are working year in and year out, side by side and in constant contact with each other - in the case of states the Governor and the Legislature, and in Washington the President and The Congress.

Unthinking people have inveighed against The Congress in every generation of our Republic - little realizing that they are striking at the very fabric of our Constitution. If we were to eliminate The Congress of the United States, we would automatically cease to be a Republic.

The real purpose of the Constitution was based on the rightful assumption that the President and The Congress would be sufficiently right-minded, sufficiently practical and sufficiently patriotic to make every effort to cooperate the one with the other. It is not an overstatement either of the fact, or of the opinion of the American public to say that the present Chief Executive of our nation has shown

a singular lack of ability to cooperate with The Congress. I am not speaking only of the past eleven months since the House of Representatives became Democratic by the margin of a handful of votes. I am speaking also of the previous 2-1/2 years, during which time The Congress in both of its branches was controlled by the same party to which the President himself belongs. From the earliest days of the special session which he summoned in the spring of 1929, the relations between the Capitol and the White House have, to say the least, lacked cordiality, understanding and common national purpose.

Let me make it clear that I do not assert that a president and The Congress must on all points agree with each other. Many times in history there has been complete disagreement between the two branches of the government, and in these disagreements sometimes The Congress has won and sometimes the President has won. But during the administration of the present President, we have had neither agreement nor a clear-cut battle. Either would have cleared the atmosphere and would have been far preferable to the smouldering ill-feeling that has seemed to prevail.

I have the right to point out my own conception of the relationship between an executive and a legislative body. I have served as a legislator and as a chief executive. I

believe that from the point of view of a Governor or a President his relations with the legislative body can be based on cooperation. The fact is that with the great majority of problems mere partisanship should, in so far as possible, be kept in the background. In meeting this great majority of problems they can and should be treated primarily from the point of view of national good rather than of party good. And let me add that in the case of most reconstruction legislation there ought to be no great difference in the policy of the two great political parties.

We are all influenced by our personal experiences. For four long years, as Governor of New York, I have been faced by a Legislature Republican in both of its branches. From the beginning I have worked on the assumption that the members of this Legislature were human beings, that they were patriotic, and that most of our state problems could best be solved by cooperation between them and myself. We have differed on certain matters of fundamental policy. In those cases, I have given them battle; sometimes they have won -- sometimes, and I think in the majority of cases, I have won; but in all these cases we have had good, clean, open fights.

However, when the problem has been one affecting human welfare, the Legislature and I have always ended by

sitting around a table and getting something practical done. That was the history of the labor legislation in this state during the past four years - of the legislation for the improvement of our hospitals, and our prison system, of the legislation that enacted <sup>the</sup> ~~that~~ old-age-security law - of the legislation that made this state the leader among <sup>more than a year ago</sup> ~~that~~ all the states in providing unemployment relief. In the latter case, I called a special session, I proposed a bill, the Republican leaders proposed another bill, we had our fight, we sat around a table, I met them 20 per cent of the way, they met me 80 per cent of the way, they passed the bill, I signed the bill, the relief work was started - and all of this in the space of six weeks, while it took <sup>present</sup> The Congress six months to get the President to see that such measures were necessary in the nation as well.

I want to drive home the point that I have practiced what I preach -- that there can be cooperation between an executive and a legislative body in the interest of action, of getting things done.

And while I draw from my personal experience one part of my record in Albany well illustrates my point. Up to the time I was inaugurated as Governor, the record for vetoes belonged to former Governor Grover Cleveland. But in each of the last four years I have vetoed more legislative acts than did Cleveland himself, and the percentage of laws passed which received my executive disapproval has run from 25% to as high as 31% of all bills passed. That is not all. During those four years, not one single bill which received my disapproval has been passed by the legislature over my veto. And likewise with my record of appointments. As in the Federal Government, nearly all important administrative or judicial appointments require confirmation by the Senate. During my four years as Governor, not a single one of my appointments has been rejected by the Senate of the State of New York.

One final point on this subject. It seems of course fairly obvious that the next Congress of the United States will have a majority of Democrats in both its branches. Any child can understand that it will be easier for a Democratic President to cooperate with the next Congress than it would be if the present chief executive were re-elected. But, at the same time, I honestly believe that even if The Congress of the United States were to be Republican in one or both of its branches, I could get along with it better than the gentleman who is running for President on the Republican ticket.

The great issue this year is national, comprehensive and humane. I have painted it with broad lines because it is a program for a great nation. That is why, from the beginning, insisting upon the principle of a new deal I have invited to join our cause Republicans who believe that this country needs the tonic of a new alignment of party loyalties, a new and enlightened support of our national faith. This country needs the tonic effect of such a reiteration of American principles. It calls to its service with particular emphasis the independent and courageous spirits who are willing

to leave the household of a betrayed faith, who are asking for substance not shadows, who are seeking for truth, not names for truth.

In speaking for the common purposes of all of these forward-looking men and women I have, I believe, avoided the delusion that this is a campaign of persons or of personalities. To indulge in such a fantastic idea of my own individual importance would be to betray the common hope and the common cause that has brought us all together this year. A great man left a watch-word that we can well repeat.

"There is no indispensable man."

But there are indispensable principles - without which government cannot serve its purpose. These are the principles of fair and open dealing with the public, of using the great powers of the government to serve no mean party advantage, of keeping promises made to agriculture and labor, of friendly relations between the executive and the legislature, of economic peace with foreign nations, of protection for those who must entrust their savings to others, of social justice for all, and relief for those who are in need.

Reducing it all to the essentials of my speech of acceptance, we want to get for the American people, two great human values - work and security. To achieve this end I invite you all. It is no mere party slogan. It is a definition of national need. It is a philosophy of life. I repeat it with a courage lent by the knowledge that I speak a philosophy of government as well - the ideals which have made us and kept us a nation.



ADDRESS OF GOVERNOR FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT  
BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN-FOR-ROOSEVELT LEAGUE,  
Metropolitan Opera House, New York City  
Thursday, November 3, 1932

Mrs. Child (?), Mr. Young, my fellow-Americans:

I am here tonight at the invitation of a group of public-minded citizens who have placed principle above party. (Applause) These citizens, whose party affiliation has been Republican, have publicly declared that they consider that a change in the administration of this government is necessary -- that it is, in fact, indispensable to a restoration to normal conditions. (Applause) And so, on such an occasion it is fitting for me to speak as a citizen rather than as a partisan. (Applause)

In this campaign, my friends, indeed the personal view that I have had from coast to coast -- the view of the conditions of need and distress in every part of the Union, has brought home to me the deep conviction that in this crisis the national and not the partisan objective must prevail. (Applause)

And so, to begin with, let me propose a text which, in my opinion, expresses a sentiment that is widely held this year. It is presented so clearly, so distinctly and so admirably that I would not change a word of it even though it was



spoken twelve years ago. Coming from a great figure in our national life it deserves serious consideration, and coming from a great Republican it deserves particular consideration from Republicans. Here is the text:

"For one reason or another even a wisely led political party, given a long enough tenure of office, finally fails to express any longer the will of the people, and when it does so fail to express the will of the people it ceases to be an effective instrument of government. It is far better for such a political party -- and certainly better for the state -- that it should be relegated to the role of the critic and that the opposing political party should assume the reins of government. This condition appears to have arrived in America." (Applause)

That text, my friends, is the sober conclusion of a cautious public man, not long ago President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge. (Applause) With every word of it I heartily agree. (Applause)

But there are more reasons than that for a change this year. There are ten million or more reasons embodied in the blighted hopes of the ten million or more of the unemployed. No doubt seeking to extend the campaign of fear so

foolishly and so wickedly put in motion, the present Republican leader (the President) the other night (referred to) made the (fact) statement that if the policies he had so valiantly developed be not continued "the grass would grow on the streets of the cities." Well, my friends, the grass has little chance to grow in the streets of our cities now, because it would be trampled into the ground by the men who wander (these) those streets in search of employment. (Riotous applause)

You have heard in this very city the President's exhortation that to abandon or to change one letter or one word of his policies would mean the destruction of this great Republic. But what do those policies boil down to when analyzed by the average citizen?

First, the President takes enormous credit for huge (federal) industrial loans to prevent the industrial and banking situation from getting worse. Well and good. But that is a negative credit and does nothing positive to make things better. (Applause)

And then, he would exhort employers who have no markets for their wares to start their factories, to employ more labor, and thereby to increase production. And I ask the simple question, what good is that if the purchasing power of the people to buy these products is not increased? And,

especially I point to the fact that his program in no shape, manner or form calls for a restoration of the prices of farm products in order that the half of our population which lives directly or indirectly by farming may have the wherewithal to buy the (factory) products of our factories.

(Next) And then he brings out a brand new suggestion. He would have us sit like our old friend Micawber and wait for something to turn up. (Laughter) He hints that some great invention, hidden away, as he puts it, in the "lockers of science", may appear overnight and put ten million people to work. (Laughter)

(This) That is no new fantasy. Many people have been saying (this) that for a long time. They hope for some new equivalent of the automobile or electric power, or the radio, to pop out around the corner like magic. (Laughter)

And the President asks that "the American government continue to be conducted in this faith and in this hope." I assert that the American government cannot be conducted on the mere speculation of some new invention which has not yet been made. (Applause)

Yes, faith and hope are splendid things, but the hunger and suffering of millions of unemployed men are too insistent to justify a governmental policy that pins its

faith on such a mere remote possibility. It seems to me that this expression is another example of the old gambling spirit of the speculative boom that has so sorely mismanaged the country for the past (few) four years. It is the attitude of mind that guessed in 1929 that we might escape the consequences of over-speculation. It is the gamble with fate that led to the foreign loans abroad. It is the gamble with fate that led the administration to guess in one budget after another that business would suddenly improve -- that prosperity was just around the corner -- and provide by that gamble the taxable means to meet an extravagant outlay of expenditures. Yes, it is this kind of government by guess and by gamble that the people of this country have resolved to put out of power. (Applause) And I rejoice that Republicans everywhere have decided to lay aside party, to put their shoulders to the wheel to achieve recovery -- not by magic or gambling, but by hard common sense and above all by serious and resolute action. (Applause)

To condense the sum of all of the arguments of the President for his reelection into two sentences is not hard. He asks a vote of confidence because he says that but for him the situation would have been worse. (Laughter) And, secondly, he asks the Nation to wait and hope for some miracle of invention to make things better.

As you who have followed the nation-wide campaign which I have conducted for the past three months will fully appreciate, both my political philosophy and my chart of action for the country's future differ widely from those of the President (Hoover) himself. (Applause)

Throughout this campaign in every State -- and I have been in 37 of them -- I have insisted upon the theme that there is a definite and distinct difference between his policies and mine. I have repeated that this program entrusted to me is essentially a national program. Its watchword is interdependence of all groups, of all sections, of all economic interests. Such a program permits of no yielding to sectional or immediate selfish special interests such, for example, as those represented by the clients and backers of our old friend Mr. Grundy. (Applause) It represents a recognition of the fact that a neglected group, a submerged group, be it agriculture, labor, or finance or industry, will prevent the recovery of the entire Nation. It is not in ignoring the fact that there are different interests and different parts of the country, and different people with different needs that we build a nation; it is in recognizing them, looking at them, seeing them, consulting them, helping them, always with a view to the larger interest -- the interest of the Nation.

Now, the President took occasion in this city to speak of the American system, and then proceeded to demonstrate that he does not know what the American system really means. (Applause)

Let us be definite! The American system is not the special, exclusive, vested, patented possession of the Republican party or, for that matter, of the Democratic party. (Applause) The rank and file of both great parties have deep-seated devotion to the essentials of that system. The rank and file of Democrats believe in the patriotism and loyalty to that system which exists among the rank and file of the Republican party. And the rank and file of the Republican party feel the same way about the rank and file of the Democratic party. (Applause) We remember well that in our century and a half of national life we have been ruled by Democrats and Republicans. We have had our ups and downs under both parties. (Applause)

Therefore, the rank and file of the voters of both parties agree with me today that the most extraordinary, the most amazing, and I believe the most un-American episode of this entire campaign of 1932 is the eleventh-hour effort of the President to arrogate to himself and to his handful of associates in Washington the right to claim an exclusive



interpretation of and ownership in the American system of government. (Applause) The American system is the common heritage and common possession of all Americans. Five days from today these Americans by overwhelming vote intend to deny and reject the exclusive patent sought by the President and his friends. (Riotous applause)

It seems to me that the interpretation which you give and I give to the American system of government certainly does not mean the combination of foreign and domestic gambling that the present leadership of the Republican party has sponsored. (Applause) It does not mean inviting on one hand the trade of other countries and on the other declaring economic war against them. (Applause) This is not an American system, as I understand the American system. You do not spell out America by combining the economics of John Law and his Mississippi Bubble with those of Mr. Grundy and his campaign contributors. (Applause)

(The American) This system, the American government itself, was founded on the principle that many men from many states with many economic views and many economic interests might, through the medium of a national government, build for national harmony, national unity and interdependent well-being. (This) That is the American system. And if the President will

turn from his made-to-order statistics, which he so sadly misrepresents and misinterprets, if he will turn his eyes from his so-called "backward and crippled countries" and turn to the great and stricken markets of Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois and the other agricultural states -- if he will cease his Utopian dreaming of inventions hidden in the "locker of science" that are going to make us rich, and turn to the true lessons of American history and the real words of the founders of this Republic, he will know what the American system really is. (Riotous applause)

I offer as a witness, a man who sat and labored with incredible zeal for the making of the Federal Constitution, a man who participated in the deliberations of the convention that made it, who expended his inexhaustible labors in the writing of the record of this convention, and who in his defense of this Constitution set forth in "The Federalist" the most authentic and imperishable interpretation of the American system that the world has ever seen. Here is his interpretation:

"A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations and

divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation."

(This) That means that government is intended to be the means by which all these interests and policies are brought into equilibrium and harmony within a single Republic. This, my friends, is an expression of the American system at its best, and I leave it to you to decide whether the most authentic, the most unselfish, the most unworried and dignified and true exponent of the American system is James Madison or Herbert Hoover. (Applause)

I have sought during these months to emphasize a broad policy of construction, of national planning and of national building, constructed in harmony with the best traditions of the American system. I have concentrated of necessity upon the broad and immediately insistent problems of national scope.

At Topeka, in Kansas, I outlined a complete national plan for the restoration of agriculture to its proper relationship to the Nation, and to restore its buying power.

At Salt Lake City I outlined a definite program to give us a national transportation policy, including the rehabilitation of the railroads of the Nation.

At Portland I set forth in definite terms a national policy for the conduct of utilities and especially those engaged in manufacturing and distributing electric power.

At Sioux City I proposed a tariff policy aimed to restore international trade and commerce not only with this Nation but between all nations of the world. (Applause)

At Boston I championed the principle that the national government has a positive duty to see that no citizen shall starve. (Applause)

At Columbus, Ohio, I proposed the protection of the investing public against the evils and the fraud perpetrated against them during the past ten years. (Applause)

At Pittsburgh I proposed an honest, national budget system, and the balancing thereof. (Applause)

And now (as) I want to talk to you very simply from my own personal experience in regard to the actual conduct of government itself -- what a business man would call the executive and operating task of the corporation.

It is necessary first of all for us to recognize the simple fact that, apart from the occasional judicial interpretations relating to government, we have in Washington, as in all the states, two constant factors which are working

year in and year out, side by side and in constant contact with each other -- in the case of states the Governor and the Legislature, and in Washington the President and the Congress.

Many unthinking people have inveighed against the Congress in every generation of our Republic -- little realizing that they are striking at the very fabric of our Constitution. If we were to eliminate the Congress of the United States, we would automatically cease to be a Republic. If they would but think for a moment they would realize that if we were to eliminate the Congress of the United States we would automatically cease to be a Republic.

The real purpose of the Constitution was based on the rightful assumption that the President and the Congress would be sufficiently right-minded, sufficiently practical and sufficiently patriotic to make every effort to cooperate the one with the other. (Applause) It is not an overstatement either of the fact, or of the opinion of the American public, to say that the present Chief Executive of our Nation has shown a singular lack of ability to cooperate with the Congress. (Applause) I am speaking also only of the past eleven months since the House of Representatives became Democratic by the margin of a handful of votes. I am speaking

also of the previous two and one-half years, during which time the Congress in both of its branches was controlled by the same party to which the President himself belongs. (Applause) From the earliest days of the special session which he summoned in the spring of 1929, the relations between the Capitol and the White House have, to say the least, lacked cordiality, understanding and common national purpose. (Applause)

Now let me make it clear that I do not assert that a President and the Congress must on all points agree with each other at all times. Many times in history there has been complete disagreement between the two branches of the government, and in these disagreements sometimes the Congress has won and sometimes the President has won. But during the administration of the present President we have had neither agreement nor a clear-cut battle. Either would have cleared the atmosphere and would have been far preferable to the smouldering ill-feeling that has (seemed to) prevailed during the past three and one-half years in Washington. (Applause)

I believe that I have the right to point out my own conception of the relationship between an executive and a legislative body. I have served as a legislator and as a chief executive. I believe that from the point of view of a Governor

or a President his relations with the legislative body can be based on cooperation. The fact is that with the great majority of problems mere partisanship should, in so far as possible, be kept in the background. And in meeting this great majority of problems they can and should be treated primarily from the point of view of national good rather than of party good. And let me add that in the case of most reconstruction legislation there ought to be no great difference in the policy of the two great political parties. (Applause)

We are all influenced by our personal experiences. For four long years, as Governor of New York, I have been faced by a Legislature Republican in both of its branches. From the beginning I have worked on the assumption that the members of this Legislature were human beings, that they were patriotic, and that most of our state problems could best be solved by cooperation between them and myself. (Applause) We have differed on certain matters of fundamental policy. In those cases, I have given them battle. Sometimes they have won -- sometimes, and I think in the majority of cases, I have won; but in all these cases we have had good, clean open fights. And the people have known the story of the case.

(However) But, my friends, when the problem has been one affecting human welfare, the Legislature and I have

always ended by sitting around a table and getting something practical done. (Applause) That (was) has been the history of the labor legislation in this state during the past four years -- of the legislation for the improvement of our hospitals, and our prison system, of the legislation that enacted that old-age-security law -- (applause) -- of the legislation that made this state the leader among all the states in providing unemployment relief. (Applause) In the latter case, I called a special session. I proposed a bill, the Republican leaders proposed another bill, and we had (our) a good old-fashioned drag-down and knock-out fight. We sat around a table, and I met them twenty per cent of the way; they met me eighty per cent of the way; they passed the bill, I signed the bill, the relief work was started -- (and all of this in the space of six weeks, while) -- in less than a month. (Riotous applause) Contrast that with the fact that it took the Congress six months to get the President to see that such measures were necessary in the Nation as well. (Applause)

I want to drive home the point that I have practiced what I preach -- that there can be cooperation between an executive and a legislative body in the interest of action, of getting things done.

And while I draw from my personal experience one



part of my record in Albany well illustrates my point. Up to the time I was inaugurated as Governor, the record in this state for vetoes belonged to former Governor Grover Cleveland. But in each of the last four years I have vetoed more legislative acts than did Cleveland himself, and the percentage of laws passed which received my executive disapproval has run from 25% to as high as 31% of all bills passed. That is not all. During those four years, not one single bill which received my disapproval has been passed by the Legislature over my veto. (Applause) And likewise with my record of appointments. As in the Federal Government, nearly all important administrative or judicial appointments require confirmation by the Senate. During my four years as Governor, not a single one of my appointments has been rejected by the Senate of the State of New York. (Applause)

One final point on this subject of cooperation. It seems, of course, fairly obvious that the next Congress of the United States will have a majority of Democrats in both its branches. (Applause) Any child can understand that it will be easier for a Democratic President to cooperate with the next Congress than it would be if the present Chief Executive were reelected. But, let me add this, in all seriousness and from my heart, at the same time, I honestly believe that even

if the Congress of the United States were to be Republican in one or both of its branches I could get along with it better than the gentleman who is running for President on the Republican ticket. (Riotous applause)

My friends, the great issue this year is national, comprehensive and humane. I have painted it with broad lines because it is a program for a great nation. That is why, from the beginning, insisting upon the principle of a new deal, I have invited to join our cause Republicans who believe that this country needs the tonic of a new alignment of party loyalties, a new and enlightened support of our national faith. This country needs the tonic effect of such a reiteration of American principles. It calls to its service with particular emphasis the independent and courageous spirits who are willing to leave the household of a betrayed faith, who are asking for substance not shadows, who are seeking for truth, not names for truth. (Applause)

And in speaking for the common purposes of all of these forward-looking men and women I have, I believe, avoided the delusion that this is a campaign of persons or of personalities. To indulge in such a fantastic idea of my own individual importance would be to betray the common hope and the common cause that has brought us all together this year. (A

great man left a watch-word that we can well repeat:) And I am glad that Mr. Young spoke to you about the indispensable man. "There is no indispensable man." (Applause)

But there are indispensable principles -- without which government cannot serve its purpose. These are the principles of fair and open dealing with the public, of using the great powers of the government to serve no mean party advantage, of keeping promises made to agriculture and labor, of friendly relations between the Executive and the Legislature, of economic peace with foreign nations, of protection for those who must entrust their savings to others, of social justice for all, and relief for those who are in need.

Reducing it to all the essentials of my speech of acceptance, we want to get for the American people two great human values -- work and security. (Applause) To achieve this end I invite you all. It is no mere party slogan. It is a definition of national need. It is a philosophy of life. I repeat it with a courage lent by the knowledge that I speak a philosophy of government as well -- the ideals which have made us and kept us a nation. (Prolonged applause)

---

**Franklin D. Roosevelt — “The Great Communicator”**

**The Master Speech Files, 1898, 1910-1945**

**Series 1: Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Political Ascension**

---

**File No. 584**

**1932 November 4**

**Brooklyn, NY - Academy of Music –  
Campaign Address**

30 July 1954

This speech placed on exhibit

R. H. Cary

[ Address at Academy of Music, Bklyn, N. Y., Nov. 4, 1932,  
typed, reading copy, 14 pp. ]

ADDRESS OF  
GOVERNOR FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT  
ACADEMY OF MUSIC,  
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK  
November 4, 1932.

I have returned to the State of New York to spend the last four days before Election among my neighbors and it is to me a happy homecoming. I have visited thirty-seven states, traveled thousands of miles, and I cherish with <sup>a</sup> deep feeling of appreciation the courtesy and enthusiasm with which literally millions of my fellow-Americans have greeted me.

I have returned with the first-hand knowledge that the Nation in every part is stirred by a great human crisis. The outpourings of humanity in the great cities, and in the agricultural communities brought to me an even deeper realization of the responsibility I face.

Because of what I have seen, I have been scrupulously careful to make no idle promises, to raise no false hopes, and at the same time to engage in no personalities, no unfair innuendoes, no baseless charges against the President of the United States.

In simple terms I have attempted to say to the people of this country that the way out of disaster and depression is a battle to be fought by the people;

that the task of rebuilding must come from the resolute action of millions of men and women who belong to all parties; but at the same time, that leadership is essential to provide for them, plans of action and to keep vividly before them the definite objectives.

Leadership looking to action is the greatest issue to be decided on Election Day. If the voters of the United States are content with the President's slogan "it might have been worse", they will give him the opportunity to pursue his present policy of merely preventing things from getting worse. If, on the other hand, they are unwilling to stop there, and believe that vigorous leadership and planned action will make things better, then the Democratic National ticket will receive an overwhelming mandate in every section of the land to proceed with the task.

I have built, as the weeks have passed, a program of action for the Federal Government, - no Utopia to delude us again with the thought of magic things still hidden, - just around the corner, - no glittering generalities to make us believe that all has been done

that could have been done; and above all, thank God, no gospel of fear and panic to sweep away the fine patience and sane courage that I have seen everywhere.

Instead, I have offered the practical common sense of the Democratic platform, a document which will live in history as a model for brevity and clarity - a document which by contrast with the thousands of words of bombast, of evasion and of deception in the Republican platform, <sup>has</sup> set the keynote for the whole campaign and started four months ago <sup>that great</sup> the surge to Democracy which will result in a victory that will be heard around the world on Tuesday next.

I have pointed out and driven home by straight argument, based on undisputed facts, that the administration of government under the present leadership in Washington has been distinguished by destruction, delay, deceit and despair.

When I think of the innumerable people I have seen in this campaign, patient, steadfast,



though bitterly hurt in the collapse of our economic life, I feel that to take advantage of their deprivation to spread among them a gospel of fear is about the most reprehensible act of a campaign that has yielded many examples of unscrupulous appeals for votes. The businessmen of the country, battling hard to maintain their financial solvency and integrity were told in blunt language in Des Moines, Iowa, how close an escape the country had some months ago from going off the gold standard. This, as has been clearly shown since, was a libel on the credit of the United States.

No adequate answer has been made to the magnificent Phillipic of Senator Glass the other night, in which he showed how unsound was this assertion. And I might add, Senator Glass made the devastating challenge that no responsible government would have sold to the investors of the country, securities payable in gold, if it knew that the promise, yes, the covenant, - embodied in these securities, was as dubious as the President of the United States claims it was.

Of course, the assertion was unsound. In the reiterated apologies for it that have come from the Administration, many words have been added, like leaches to suck from the original statement its deadly meaning. But this Administration is not content with adding words to make a bad case look good. It also knows how to take words away to make a bad case look better.

One of the most commonly repeated misrepresentations by Republican speakers, including the President, has been the claim that the Democratic position with regard to money has not been made sufficiently clear. The President is seeing visions of rubber dollars. That is only a part of his campaign of fear. I am not going to characterize that statement. I merely present the facts.

The Democratic <sup>platform</sup> ~~policy~~ specifically declares, "We advocate a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards." That is plain English.

In discussing this platform on July 30th, I said, "Sound money is an international necessity; not a domestic consideration for one nation alone."

Far up in the Northwest at Butte, I repeated the pledge of the platform, saying, "Sound currency must be maintained at all regards."

In Seattle I reaffirmed my attitude on this question. The thing has been said, therefore, in plain English three times in my speeches. It is stated without qualification in the platform and I have announced my unqualified acceptance of that platform.

So much for that misrepresentation!

I cannot take the time to give adequate attention to the entire range of the President's panic-stricken recital. It would be a dreary though amazing record. We are able, however, to determine the quality of a candidate's representation to the country by the process of sampling. I have given you one sample. I shall add another. The President at Madison Square Garden on last Monday night, not only misrepresented me, but misquoted himself.

The President stated:

"In my acceptance speech four years ago at Palo Alto I stated that:

'In America to-day we are nearer a final triumph over poverty than in any land. The poorhouse has vanished from among us; we have not reached that goal, but given a chance to go forward we shall with the help of God, be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this nation.'

"Our Democratic friends have quoted this passage many times in this campaign. I do not withdraw a word of it..."

No more surprising statement has been uttered by a man occupying the highest office in the gift of the American people. No Democrat has ever quoted that passage because no such utterance was ever made by the President in his acceptance speech at Palo Alto.

Democrats and many others have quoted the statement made by the President in his Acceptance Speech four years ago as it appears in the Republican campaign book of 1928, and also in the book entitled "The New Day", which contains the campaign speeches of President Hoover.

As presented in these official books the President said,

"We in America today are nearer to the final triumph over poverty than ever before in the history of any land. The poorhouse is vanishing from among us. We have not YET reached the goal, but, given a chance to go forward with the policies of the last eight years, and we shall SOON with the help of God be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this nation."

I beg you to observe how the President has misquoted himself. First, he has eliminated the word "YET",

which indicated that the millenium was soon possible.

Second, he has eliminated the word "SOON", which gave to the people the hope that his election would accomplish its arrival.

Third, he has eliminated the words "WITH THE POLICIES OF THE LAST EIGHT YEARS," which were then used to indicate that the arrival of the millenium would be brought about only by a continuation of the policies of the Republican administrations preceding him.

Certainly, I subscribe, and all citizens will subscribe, to the ideal expressed by President Hoover in his speech at Madison Square Garden Monday night. But we do not subscribe to the absurd promise of Candidate Hoover in 1928, nor can we understand how the candidate has in this amazing way misquoted himself.

I cannot completely recount the extent to which this Administration has misinterpreted the facts in order to retain its power. I pointed out the fallacious and ruinous business administration that has characterized its budget transactions. After the President and Secretary of the Treasury had purported to answer my arguments, a staid and impartial business journal, the Annalist, justified what I had said in the following words:

"Specifically, and foremost, the Federal budget is in a shocking state. The Washington administration knew quite well that it was not even 'substantially' balanced, when Congress adjourned last June. The actual deficit for the current fiscal year, amounting now in the middle of the

fourth month to seven hundred millions or more, has been concealed as far as possible by the Administration. Returns from new taxation have discredited practically every forecast made by the Treasury."

This conservative and dependable Journal likewise speaks of the unreliability of the President's utterances with regard to other subjects. It says that in his eleventh hour campaign he has made "loose, if not completely misleading, references to recent and current records." It speaks of inaccuracies in his statements with regard to building contracts and freight loadings; moreover, it challenges the assertion of the Federal Reserve Bulletin about a decrease of hoarding; and finally, it publishes an article with something close to editorial endorsement, which sadly upsets the sweeping assertion that the depression began **abroad**. This feeble alibi I destroyed in my Louisville speech. So far as I know, the Administration has failed to controvert me.

I have said that the present administration has abandoned even the historic principles of the Republican Party.

What, for example, would William McKinley, James G. Blaine, or William Howard Taft, if they were alive today, say to the insistence of President Hoover that reciprocal tariffs are unworkable, and unsound? They advocated such reciprocal tariffs.

I note once more that the President ridicules a tariff commission set up in harmony with the principles laid down by President Theodore Roosevelt, and enacted into law by President Wilson. I proposed that kind of a tariff Commission in my Sioux City speech six weeks ago: And I wonder if President Hoover has ever read the address of President Roosevelt at Sioux Falls on September 3, 1910 where President Roosevelt proposed as a way to end Tariff log-rolling in the Congress, the very measure that President Hoover now declares,-- will encourage log-rolling.

I wonder too if the President thinks that the country is satisfied with the present method of operation of the tariff commission?

During two long years, President Hoover's Tariff Commission has investigated the duties upon only 73 commodities, -- 73 out of many thousands. 18 schedules were reduced and 13 were increased, and it is worth noting that among the articles investigated the Tariff Commission has busied

itself with pipe organs, peppers, egg-plants and bicycle bells. A careful estimate shows that at the present rate of progress President Hoover's Tariff Commission will complete its examination of schedules and report upon them by the year 2005!

At Pittsburgh I stated that there must be a reduction in the cost of government and set forth in detail the means by which it could be accomplished. In reply the President states it cannot be done. The people of America demand a reduction of federal expenditure. It can be accomplished not only by reducing the expenditures of existing departments but it can be done by abolishing many useless commissions, bureaus and functions, and it can be done by consolidating many activities of the government.

The people of the State of New York well know the efficiency that can come through reorganization of government departments. The long fight of Governor Smith with a Republican Legislature ended in a constitutional amendment which brought about this end. The same kind of reorganization ought to be effected in Washington. Many bureaus overlap that should be merged or consolidated. It is not necessary to create a new commission to secure the information necessary for this reform. Such information has been in the process of collection in Washington for 22 years. What is needed in this, as in many other things, is the will to do. There is no need for delay in this matter. The President has power



under the law to recommend to Congress the abolishment of bureaus, and the absolute power to consolidate certain specific bureaus. He has done nothing. In the process of consolidation, I propose to apply the lessons of economy and efficiency that we learned so well in the State of New York and through the striking experience of reorganization in other states of the Union. I am convinced that through such reorganization there can be a very substantial reduction of expenditures.

While I am on the subject of government, I want to repeat what I have suggested before -- that of late years, and especially during the administration of President Hoover, the relationship between the Federal Government and the State governments has been almost wholly forgotten. I know from practical experience as Governor of the most populous state of the Union that in many instances a different attitude on the part of the President would have brought about much closer cooperation between Washington and my state capitol, and this without any interference with the rights of States. It is entirely possible and entirely practical for the President to solve and to simplify many governmental problems by contact and discussion with the Governors of the several states.

For the last four years, I have also been a member of the Executive Committee of the Conference of Governors.

And the thought of many of my fellow chief executives coincides with mine -- that great opportunities for constructive action, for cooperation and mutual effort have been overlooked by the present national administration.

This is one of the many reasons why I greatly hope that if I am elected I will know that my long-time associate and friend, Lieutenant Governor Lehman, is directing the affairs of the State of New York as its chief executive. Colonel Lehman is eminently qualified for the governorship. Governor Smith knows, and I know from long experience, that discharging the duties of the office of Governor of the State of New York is no easy task -- that it calls for wide experience, and wide knowledge of the state and its problems.

The voters are going to elect Colonel Lehman because they apply to him the two simple words, "best qualified". You and I know that he is familiar with every section of the state, with every institution of the state, with every department of the state, and furthermore he has an intelligent understanding of the relationship between the Legislature and the office of Governor.

In leaving the governorship I want to see the office of Governor held by one who has the courage to be his own master, but who at the same time thinks of the public good in the same broad terms as Governor Smith and myself.

May I also urge upon you the high importance of re-electing Senator Robert F. Wagner. In his case it is not alone the interests of the State of New York which are involved. He is known throughout the nation as a Senate leader who has made himself an expert on that vital subject of relief for the unemployed. I shall need him in Washington.

The lessons of this campaign are plain enough. I am confident that the overwhelming majority of the voters of the nation seek unity, seek ordered progress, seek the security that comes from these things. These are what the people expect from a united Democracy, and from a leadership that is committed to progress through action.

Help us keep the faith. Help us to fight  
the good fight. Help us to attain the goal.

*Franklin D. Roosevelt*  
: : : : :

GOVERNOR ROOSEVELT'S ADDRESS

Brooklyn Academy of Music

Friday, November 4, 1932

GOVERNOR ROOSEVELT: A campaign would not be a campaign to me

without coming over here to the Academy of Music. I have returned to the State of New York to spend the last four days before election among my neighbors and it is to me a happy homecoming. You good people know that I have visited thirty-seven States, traveled thousands of miles, and I cherish with a deep feeling of appreciation the courtesy and enthusiasm with which literally millions of my fellow-Americans have greeted me.

I have returned, too, with the first-hand knowledge that the nation in every part is stirred by a great human crisis. The outpourings of humanity in the great cities, and in the agricultural communities, brought to me an even deeper realization of the responsibility I face.

Because of what I have seen, I have been scrupulously careful to make no idle promises, to raise no false hopes, and at the same time to engage in no personalities, no unfair innuendoes, no baseless charges against the President of the United States.

In simple terms I have attempted to say to the people of this country that the way out of disaster and depression is a battle to be fought by the people; that the task of rebuilding must come from the resolute action of millions of men and women who belong to all parties; but at the same time that leadership is essential to provide for them plans of action and to keep vividly before them the definite objectives.

And so leadership - leadership looking to action - is the greatest issue to be decided on election day. If the voters of the

Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

This is a transcript made by the White House stenographer from his shorthand notes taken at the time the speech was made. Underlining indicates words extemporaneously added to the previously prepared reading copy text. Words in parentheses are words that were omitted when the speech was delivered, though they appear in the previously prepared reading copy text.

Without coming over here to the Academy of Music. I have returned to the State of New York to spend the last four days before election among my neighbors and it is to me a happy homecoming. For good people know that I have visited thirty-seven States, traveled thousands of miles, and I cherish with a deep feeling of appreciation the courtesy and enthusiasm with which literally millions of my fellow-Americans have greeted me.

I have returned, too, with the first-hand knowledge that the nation in every part is stirred by a great human crisis. The responsibilities of humanity in the great cities, and in the agricultural communities, brought to me an even deeper realization of the responsibility I face. Because of what I have seen, I have been particularly careful to make no false promises, to raise no false hopes, and at the same time to engage in no personalities, no unfair innuendoes, no baseless charges against the President of the United States.

In simple terms I have attempted to say to the people of this country that the way out of disaster and depression is a battle to be fought by the people; that the task of rebuilding must come from the resolute action of millions of men and women who belong to all parties; but at the same time that leadership is essential to provide for them plans of action and to keep vitally before them the definite objectives and leadership - leadership looking to action - is the greatest theme to be decided on election day. In the voters of the

United States are content with the President's slogan, "It might have been worse", they will give him the opportunity to pursue his present policy of merely preventing things from getting worse. If, on the other hand, they are unwilling to stop there, and believe that vigorous leadership and planned action will make things better, then the Democratic national ticket will receive an overwhelming mandate in every section of the land to proceed with the task.

I have built, as the weeks have passed, a program of action for the Federal Government - no utopia to delude us again with the thought of magic things still hidden, just around the corner - no glittering generalities to make us believe that all has been done that could have been done; and above all, thank God, no gospel of fear and panic to sweep away the fine patience and sane courage that I have seen in every part of the land.

Instead, I have offered the practical common sense of the Democratic platform, a document which will live in history as a model for brevity and clarity - a document which by contrast with the thousands of words of bombast, of evasion and of deception in the Republican platform, set the keynote for the whole campaign and started four months ago that surge to Democracy which will result in a victory that will be heard around the world next Tuesday.

I have pointed out and driven home by straight argument, based on undisputed facts, that the administration of government under the present leadership in Washington has been distinguished by destruction, delay, deceit and despair.

When I think of the innumerable people I have seen in this campaign, patient, steadfast, though bitterly hurt in the collapse of our

economic life, I feel that to take advantage of their deprivation to spread among them a gospel of fear is about the most reprehensible act of a campaign that has yielded many examples of unscrupulous appeals for votes. The business men of the country, battling hard to maintain their financial solvency and integrity, were told in blunt language in Des Moines, Iowa, how close an escape this country had some months ago from going off the gold standard. But that, my friends, as has been clearly shown since, was a libel on the credit of the United States.

And it is worthy of note that no adequate answer has been made to the magnificent philippic of Senator Glass the other night, in which he showed how unsound this assertion was. And I might add, Senator Glass made a devastating challenge that no responsible government would have sold to the country securities payable in gold if it knew that the promise - yes, the covenant - embodied in these securities was as dubious as the President of the United States claims it was. Why, of course, the assertion was unsound.

In the reiterated apologies for it that have come from the administration, many words have been added, like leeches to suck from the original statement its deadly meaning. But this administration is not content with adding words to make a bad case look good. It also knows how to take words away to make a bad case look better.

Let us see. One of the most commonly repeated misrepresentations by Republican speakers, including the President, has been the claim that the Democratic position with regard to money has not been made sufficiently clear. The President is seeing visions of rubber dollars. But that is only a part of his campaign of fear. I am not going to characterize these statements. I merely present the facts.

The Democratic platform specifically declares, "We advocate a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards." That, I take it, is plain English.

In discussing this platform on July 30, I said, "Sound money is an international necessity; not a domestic consideration for one nation alone." In other words, I want to see sound money in all the world.

Far up in the Northwest at Butte I repeated the pledge of the platform, saying "sound currency must be maintained at all regards." In Seattle I reaffirmed my attitude on this question. The thing has been said, therefore, in plain English three times in my speeches. It is stated without qualification in the platform and I have announced my unqualified acceptance of that platform in every plank.

So much for that example.

I cannot take the time to give adequate attention to the entire range of the President's panic-stricken recital. It would be a dreary though perhaps an amusing record. We are able, however, to determine the quality of a candidate's representation to the country by the process of sampling. I have given you one sample. I shall add another.

The President at Madison Square Garden on last Monday night not only misrepresented me but misquoted himself. As Al Smith would say, let's look at the record. The President stated:

"In my acceptance speech four years ago at Palo Alto I stated that 'in America today we are nearer a final triumph over poverty than in any land. The poorhouse has vanished from among us; we have not reached that goal, but given a chance to go forward we shall with the help of God, be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this nation.'"

"Our Democratic friends have quoted this passage many times in this campaign. I do not withdraw a word of it. \* \* \*"



Now, my friends, no more surprising statement has been uttered by a man occupying the highest office in the gift of the American people. No Democrat has ever quoted that passage because no such utterance was ever made by the President in his acceptance speech at Palo Alto.

Democrats and many others have quoted the statement made by the President in his acceptance speech four years ago at Palo Alto as it appears in the Republican campaign book of 1928, and also in the book entitled "The New Day", which contains the campaign speeches of President Hoover.

As officially presented in these official books, the President said:

"We in America today are nearer to the final triumph over poverty than ever before in the history of any land. The poorhouse is vanishing from among us. We have not yet reached the goal, but, given a chance to go forward with the policies of the last eight years, and we shall soon with the help of God be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this nation."

Now, my friends, I beg you to observe the difference between that and what the President said he said in Madison Square Garden. Firstly, he has eliminated the word "yet", which indicated that the millennium was soon possible.

Secondly, he has eliminated the word "soon", which gave to the people the hope that his election would accomplish its arrival.

And third, he has eliminated the words "with the policies of the last eight years", which were then used to indicate that the arrival of said millennium would be brought about only by a continuation of the policies of the Republican administration preceding him.

Certainly, I subscribe, and all citizens will subscribe, to the ideal expressed by President Hoover in his speech at Madison Square Garden Monday night. But we do not subscribe to the absurd promise of Candidate Hoover in 1928, nor can we understand how the candidate has in this amazing way misquoted the words of four years ago.

I cannot completely recount the extent to which this administration has misinterpreted the facts in order to retain its power. I pointed out the fallacious and ruinous business administration that has characterized its budget transactions. After the President and the Secretary of the Treasury had purported to answer my arguments, a staid and impartial business journal, The Annalist, justified what I had said in the following words:

"Specifically, and foremost, the Federal budget is in a shocking state. The Washington administration knew quite well that it was not even 'substantially' balanced when Congress adjourned last June. The actual deficit for the current fiscal year, amounting now in the middle of the fourth month" - this was after October 15 - "to seven hundred millions or more, has been concealed as far as possible by the administration. Returns from new taxation have discredited practically every forecast made by the Treasury."

This conservative and dependable journal likewise speaks of the unreliability of the President's utterances with regard to other subjects. It says that in his eleventh hour campaign he has made "loose, if not completely misleading, references to recent and current records." It speaks of inaccuracies in his statements with regard to building contracts and freight loadings; moreover, it challenges the assertion of the Federal Reserve Bulletin about a decrease of hoarding, and finally, it publishes an article with something close to editorial endorsement, which sadly upsets the sweeping assertion that the depression began abroad. This feeble alibi I destroyed in my Louisville speech. So far as I know the administration has failed to controvert me, up to this time.

Now, my friends, I have said that the present administration has abandoned even the historic principles of the Republican party itself.

What, for example - you older people will appreciate this - would William McKinley, James G. Blaine or William Howard Taft, if they were alive today, say to the insistence of President Hoover that reciprocal tariffs are unworkable and unsound? For they themselves advocated reciprocal tariffs.

I note once more that the President ridicules a tariff commission set up in harmony with the principles laid down by President Theodore Roosevelt, and enacted into law by President Wilson. I proposed that kind of a tariff commission in my Sioux City speech six weeks ago. And I wonder if the President has ever read the address of President Roosevelt at Sioux Falls on September 3, 1910, where President Roosevelt proposed as a way to end tariff log-rolling in the Congress the very measure that President Hoover now declares will encourage log-rolling.

I wonder, too - these are just thoughts that occur to me toward the end of the campaign - if the President thinks that the country is satisfied with the present method of operation of the tariff commission?

During two long years, President Hoover's tariff commission has investigated the duties upon only seventy-three commodities - seventy-three out of many thousands. And as a result eighteen schedules were reduced and thirteen were increased, and it is worth noting that among the articles investigated the tariff commission has busied itself with complete investigation into pipe organs, peppers, egg plants and bicycle bells. It is worth noting too, that a careful estimate shows that at

the present magnificent rate of progress President Hoover's tariff commission will complete its examination of schedules and report upon them by the year 2005.

I like to think about the places I've been in. At Pittsburgh I stated that there must be a reduction in the cost of government and set forth in detail the means by which it could be accomplished. In reply the President states it cannot be done. The people of America demand, as you and I do, a reduction of Federal expenditures. And that, my friends, as you and I know can be accomplished not only by reducing the expenditures of the existing departments, but it can be done by abolishing many useless commissions, bureaus and functions, and it can be done by consolidating many activities of the government.

The people of the State of New York well know the efficiency that can come through reorganization of government departments. The long fight of my distinguished predecessor, who sits with me on the platform tonight, with a Republican Legislature ended in a constitutional amendment which brought about this end. The same kind of reorganization ought to be effected in Washington. Many bureaus overlap that should be merged or consolidated.

It is not necessary to create a new commission to secure the information necessary for this reform. Such information has been in the process of collection - it has been on tap in Washington for twenty-two years. What is needed in this, as in many other things, is the will to get something done. There is no need for delay in this matter. The President, under the law as it exists today, has power to recommend to Congress the abolishment of bureaus and the absolute power to consolidate certain specific bureaus. He has done nothing.

In the process of consolidation, I propose to apply the lessons of economy and efficiency that we learned so well in the State of New York and through the striking experience of reorganization in other States of the Union. I am convinced that through such reorganization there can be a very substantial reduction of expenditures.

While I am on the subject of government, I want to repeat what I have suggested before - that of late years, and especially during the administration of President Hoover, the relationship between the Federal Government and the State Governments has been almost wholly forgotten. I know from practical experience as Governor of the most populous State of the Union that in many instances a different attitude on the part of the President would have brought about much closer cooperation between Washington and my State Capitol, and this without a single interference with the rights of the States. It is entirely possible, it is practical for the President to solve and to simplify many governmental problems by contact and discussion with the Governors of the several States. For the last four years I have also been a member of the executive committee of the Conference of Governors. And the thought of many of my fellow Chief Executives coincides with mine - that great opportunities for constructive action, for cooperation, for getting rid of red tape, and mutual effort have been overlooked entirely by the present national administration.

That is one of the many reasons why I greatly hope that if I am elected I will know that my long-time associate and friend, Lieutenant Governor Lehman, is directing the affairs of the State of New York. Colonel Lehman is eminently qualified for the governorship. Governor

Smith knows, and I know from long experience, that discharging the duties of the office of Governor of the State of New York is no easy task - that it calls for wide experience, that it calls for wide knowledge of the State and its problems.

The voters are going to elect Colonel Lehman because they apply to him the two simple words, "best qualified". You and I know that he is familiar with every section of the State, with every institution of the State, with every department of the State, and furthermore he has an intelligent understanding of the relationship between the Legislature and the office of Governor.

In leaving the Governorship I want to see the office of Governor held by one who has the courage to be his own master, but who at the same time thinks of the public good in the same broad terms as Governor Smith and myself.

At the same time, I want to urge upon you, very simply but with great feeling, the high importance of re-electing Senator Robert F. Wagner. In his case it is not alone the interests of the State of New York which are involved. He is known throughout the nation as a Senate leader who has made himself an expert on that vital subject of relief for the unemployed. I shall need him in Washington.

The lessons of this campaign are plain enough. I am confident that the overwhelming majority of the voters of the nation seek unity, seek ordered progress, seek the security that comes from these things. These are what the people expect from a united Democracy, and from a leadership that is committed to progress through action.

Help us keep the faith. Help us to fight the good fight.  
Help us to attain the goal.

ADDRESS OF  
GOVERNOR FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT  
ACADEMY OF MUSIC,  
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK  
November 4, 1932.

I have returned to the State of New York to spend the last four days before Election among my neighbors and it is to me a happy homecoming. I have visited thirty-seven states, traveled thousands of miles, and I cherish with <sup>a</sup> deep feeling of appreciation the courtesy and enthusiasm with which literally millions of my fellow-Americans have greeted me.

I have returned with the first-hand knowledge that the Nation in every part is stirred by a great human crisis. The outpourings of humanity in the great cities, and in the agricultural communities brought to me an even deeper realization of the responsibility I face.

Because of what I have seen, I have been scrupulously careful to make no idle promises, to raise no false hopes, and at the same time to engage in no personalities, no unfair innuendoes, no baseless charges against the President of the United States.

In simple terms I have attempted to say to the people of this country that the way out of disaster and depression is a battle to be fought by the people;

that the task of rebuilding must come from the resolute action of millions of men and women who belong to all parties; but at the same time, that leadership is essential to provide for them, plans of action and to keep vividly before them the definite objectives.

Leadership looking to action is the greatest issue to be decided on Election Day. If the voters of the United States are content with the President's slogan "it might have been worse", they will give him the opportunity to pursue his present policy of merely preventing things from getting worse. If, on the other hand, they are unwilling to stop there, and believe that vigorous leadership and planned action will make things better, then the Democratic National ticket will receive an overwhelming mandate in every section of the land to proceed with the task.

I have oultt, as the weeks have passed, a program of action for the Federal Government, - no Utopia to delude us again with the thought of magic things still hidden, - just around the corner, - no glittering generalities to make us believe that all has been done



that could have been done; and above all, thank God, no gospel of fear and panic to sweep away the fine patience and sane courage that I have seen everywhere.

Instead, I have offered the practical common sense of the Democratic platform, a document which will live in history as a model for brevity and clarity - a document which by contrast with the thousands of words of bombast, of evasion and of deception in the Republican platform, <sup>has</sup> set the keynote for the whole campaign and started four months ago, <sup>that great</sup> ~~the~~ surge to Democracy which will result in a victory that will be heard around the world on Tuesday next.

I have pointed out and driven home by straight argument, based on undisputed facts, that the administration of government under the present leadership in Washington has been distinguished by destruction, delay, deceit and despair.

When I think of the innumerable people I have seen in this campaign, patient, steadfast,

though bitterly hurt in the collapse of our economic life, I feel that to take advantage of their deprivation to spread among them a gospel of fear is about the most reprehensible act of a campaign that has yielded many examples of unscrupulous appeals for votes. The businessmen of the country, battling hard to maintain their financial solvency and integrity were told in blunt language in Des Moines, Iowa, how close an escape the country had some months ago from going off the gold standard. This, as has been clearly shown since, was a libel on the credit of the United States.

No adequate answer has been made to the magnificent Phillipic of Senator Glass the other night, in which he showed how unsound was this assertion. And I might add, Senator Glass made the devastating challenge that no responsible government would have sold to the investors of the country, securities payable in gold, if it knew that the promise, yes, the covenant, - embodied in these securities, was as dubious as the President of the United States claims it was.

Of course<sup>e</sup> the assertion was unsound. In the reiterated apologies for it that have come from the Administration, many words have been added, like leaches to suck from the original statement its deadly meaning. But this Administration is not content with adding words to make a bad case look good. It also knows how to take words away to make a bad case look better.

One of the most commonly repeated misrepresentations by Republican speakers, including the President, has been the claim that the Democratic position with regard to money has not been made sufficiently clear. The President is seeing visions of rubber dollars. That is only a part of his campaign of fear. I am not going to characterize that statement. I merely present the facts.

The Democratic <sup>platform</sup> ~~policy~~ specifically declares, "We advocate a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards." That is plain English.

In discussing this platform on July 30th, I said, "Sound money is an international necessity; not a domestic consideration for one nation alone."

Far up in the Northwest at Butte, I repeated the pledge of the platform, saying, "Sound currency must be maintained at all regards."

In Seattle I reaffirmed my attitude on this question. The thing has been said, therefore, in plain English three times in my speeches. It is stated without qualification in the platform and I have announced my unqualified acceptance of that platform.

So much for that misrepresentation!

I cannot take the time to give adequate attention to the entire range of the President's panic-stricken recital. It would be a dreary though amazing record. We are able, however, to determine the quality of a candidate's representation to the country by the process of sampling. I have given you one sample. I shall add another. The President at Madison Square Garden on last Monday night, not only misrepresented me, but misquoted himself.

The President stated:

"In my acceptance speech four years ago at Palo Alto I stated that:

'In America to-day we are nearer a final triumph over poverty than in any land. The poorhouse has vanished from among us; we have not reached that goal, but given a chance to go forward we shall with the help of God, be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this nation.'

"Our Democratic friends have quoted this passage many times in this campaign. I do not withdraw a word of it..."

No more surprising statement has been uttered by a man occupying the highest office in the gift of the American people. No Democrat has ever quoted that passage because no such utterance was ever made by the President in his acceptance speech at Palo Alto.

Democrats and many others have quoted the statement made by the President in his Acceptance Speech four years ago as it appears in the Republican campaign book of 1928, and also in the book entitled "The New Day", which contains the campaign speeches of President Hoover.

As presented in these official books the President said,

"We in America today are nearer to the final triumph over poverty than ever before in the history of any land. The poorhouse is vanishing from among us. We have not YET reached the goal, but, given a chance to go forward with the policies of the last eight years, and we shall SOON with the help of God be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this nation."

I beg you to observe how the President has misquoted himself. First, he has eliminated the word "YET",

which indicated that the millenium was soon possible.

Second, he has eliminated the word "SOON", which gave to the people the hope that his election would accomplish its arrival.

Third, he has eliminated the words "WITH THE POLICIES OF THE LAST EIGHT YEARS," which were then used to indicate that the arrival of the millenium would be brought about only by a continuation of the policies of the Republican administrations preceding him.

Certainly, I subscribe, and all citizens will subscribe, to the ideal expressed by President Hoover in his speech at Madison Square Garden Monday night. But we do not subscribe to the absurd promise of Candidate Hoover in 1928, nor can we understand how the candidate has in this amazing way misquoted himself.

I cannot completely recount the extent to which this Administration has misinterpreted the facts in order to retain its power. I pointed out the fallacious and ruinous business administration that has characterized its budget transactions. After the President and Secretary of the Treasury had purported to answer my arguments, a staid and impartial business journal, the Annalist, justified what I had said in the following words:

"Specifically, and foremost, the Federal budget is in a shocking state. The Washington administration knew quite well that it was not even 'substantially' balanced, when Congress adjourned last June. The actual deficit for the current fiscal year, amounting now in the middle of the

fourth month to seven hundred millions or more, has been concealed as far as possible by the Administration. Returns from new taxation have discredited practically every forecast made by the Treasury."

This conservative and dependable Journal likewise speaks of the unreliability of the President's utterances with regard to other subjects. It says that in his eleventh hour campaign he has made "loose, if not completely misleading, references to recent and current records." It speaks of inaccuracies in his statements with regard to building contracts and freight loadings; moreover, it challenges the assertion of the Federal Reserve Bulletin about a decrease of hoarding; and finally, it publishes an article with something close to editorial endorsement, which sadly upsets the sweeping assertion that the depression began **abroad**. This feeble alibi I destroyed in my Louisville speech. So far as I know, the Administration has failed to controvert me.

I have said that the present administration has abandoned even the historic principles of the Republican Party.

What, for example, would William McKinley, James G. Blaine, or William Howard Taft, if they were alive today, say to the insistence of President Hoover that reciprocal tariffs are unworkable, and unsound? They advocated such reciprocal tariffs.

I note once more that the President ridicules a tariff commission set up in harmony with the principles laid down by President Theodore Roosevelt, and enacted into law by President Wilson. I proposed that kind of a tariff Commission in my Sioux City speech six weeks ago: And I wonder if President Hoover has ever read the address of President Roosevelt at Sioux Falls on September 3, 1910 where President Roosevelt proposed as a way to end Tariff log-rolling in the Congress, the very measure that President Hoover now declares,-- will encourage log-rolling.

I wonder too if the President thinks that the country is satisfied with the present method of operation of the tariff commission?

During two long years, President Hoover's Tariff Commission has investigated the duties upon only 73 commodities, -- 73 out of many thousands. 18 schedules were reduced and 13 were increased, and it is worth noting that among the articles investigated the Tariff Commission has busied



itself with pipe organs, peppers, egg-plants and bicycle bells. A careful estimate shows that at the present rate of progress President Hoover's Tariff Commission will complete its examination of schedules and report upon them by the year 2005!

At Pittsburgh I stated that there must be a reduction in the cost of government and set forth in detail the means by which it could be accomplished. Indreply the President states it cannot be done. The people of America demand a reduction of federal expenditure. It can be accomplished not only by reducing the expenditures of existing departments but it can be done by abolishing many useless commissions, bureaus and functions, and it can be done by consolidating many activities of the government.

The people of the State of New York well know the efficiency that can come through reorganization of government departments. The long fight of Governor Smith with a Republican Legislature ended in a constitutional amendment which brought about this end. The same kind of reorganization ought to be effected in Washington. Many bureaus overlap that should be merged or consolidated. It is not necessary to create a new commission to secure the information necessary for this reform. Such information has been in the process of collection in Washington for 22 years. What is needed in this, as in many other things, is the will to do. There is no need for delay in this matter. The President has power

under the law to recommend to Congress the abolishment of bureaus, and the absolute power to consolidate certain specific bureaus. He has done nothing. In the process of consolidation, I propose to apply the lessons of economy and efficiency that we learned so well in the State of New York and through the striking experience of reorganization in other states of the Union. I am convinced that through such reorganization there can be a very substantial reduction of expenditures.

While I am on the subject of government, I want to repeat what I have suggested before -- that of late years, and especially during the administration of President Hoover, the relationship between the Federal Government and the State governments has been almost wholly forgotten. I know from practical experience as Governor of the most populous state of the Union that in many instances a different attitude on the part of the President would have brought about much closer cooperation between Washington and my state capitol, and this without any interference with the rights of States. It is entirely possible and entirely practical for the President to solve and to simplify many governmental problems by contact and discussion with the Governors of the several states.

For the last four years, I have also been a member of the Executive Committee of the Conference of Governors.

And the thought of many of my fellow chief executives coincides with mine -- that great opportunities for constructive action, for cooperation and mutual effort have been overlooked by the present national administration.

This is one of the many reasons why I greatly hope that if I am elected I will know that my long-time associate and friend, Lieutenant Governor Lehman, is directing the affairs of the State of New York as its chief executive. Colonel Lehman is eminently qualified for the governorship. Governor Smith knows, and I know from long experience, that discharging the duties of the office of Governor of the State of New York is no easy task -- that it calls for wide experience, and wide knowledge of the state and its problems.

The voters are going to elect Colonel Lehman because they apply to him the two simple words, "best qualified". You and I know that he is familiar with every section of the state, with every institution of the state, with every department of the state, and furthermore he has an intelligent understanding of the relationship between the Legislature and the office of Governor.

In leaving the governorship I want to see the office of Governor held by one who has the courage to be his own master, but who at the same time thinks of the public good in the same broad terms as Governor Smith and myself.

ADDRESS OF  
GOVERNOR FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT  
ACADEMY OF MUSIC,  
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK  
November 4, 1932.

I have returned to the State of New York to spend the last four days before Election among my neighbors and it is to me a happy homecoming. I have visited thirty-seven states, traveled thousands of miles, and I cherish with <sup>a</sup> deep feeling of appreciation the courtesy and enthusiasm with which literally millions of my fellow-Americans have greeted me.

I have returned with the first-hand knowledge that the Nation in every part is stirred by a great human crisis. The outpourings of humanity in the great cities, and in the agricultural communities brought to me an even deeper realization of the responsibility I face.

Because of what I have seen, I have been scrupulously careful to make no idle promises, to raise no false hopes, and at the same time to engage in no personalities, no unfair innuendoes, no baseless charges against the President of the United States.

In simple terms I have attempted to say to the people of this country that the way out of disaster and depression is a battle to be fought by the people;

May I also urge upon you the high importance of re-electing Senator Robert F. Wagner. In his case it is not alone the interests of the State of New York which are involved. He is known throughout the nation as a Senate leader who has made himself an expert on that vital subject of relief for the unemployed. I shall need him in Washington.

The lessons of this campaign are plain enough. I am confident that the overwhelming majority of the voters of the nation seek unity, seek ordered progress, seek the security that comes from these things. These are what the people expect from a united Democracy, and from a leadership that is committed to progress through action.

Help us keep the faith. Help us to fight the good fight. Help us to attain the goal.

*Franklin D. Roosevelt*  
: : : : :

ADDRESS OF  
GOVERNOR FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT  
ACADEMY OF MUSIC,  
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK  
November 4, 1938.

I have returned to the State of New York to spend the last four days before Election among my neighbors and it is to me a happy homecoming. I have visited thirty-seven states, traveled thousands of miles, and I cherish with <sup>a</sup> deep feeling of appreciation the courtesy and enthusiasm with which literally millions of my fellow-Americans have greeted me.

I have returned with the first-hand knowledge that the Nation in every part is stirred by a great human crisis. The outpourings of humanity in the great cities, and in the agricultural communities brought to me an even deeper realization of the responsibility I face.

Because of what I have seen, I have been scrupulously careful to make no idle promises, to raise no false hopes, and at the same time to engage in no personalities, no unfair innuendoes, no baseless charges against the President of the United States.

In simple terms I have attempted to say to the people of this country that the way out of disaster and depression is a battle to be fought by the people;

that the task of rebuilding must come from the resolute action of millions of men and women who belong to all parties; but at the same time, that leadership is essential to provide for them, plans of action and to keep vividly before them the definite objectives.

Leadership looking to action is the greatest issue to be decided on Election Day. If the voters of the United States are content with the President's slogan "it might have been worse", they will give him the opportunity to pursue his present policy of merely preventing things from getting worse. If, on the other hand, they are unwilling to stop there, and believe that vigorous leadership and planned action will make things better, then the Democratic National ticket will receive an overwhelming mandate in every section of the land to proceed with the task.

I have built, as the weeks have passed, a program of action for the Federal Government, - no Utopia to delude us again with the thought of magic things still hidden, - just around the corner, - no glittering generalities to make us believe that all has been done

that could have been done; and above all, thank God, no gospel of fear and panic to sweep away the fine patience and sane courage that I have seen everywhere.

Instead, I have offered the practical common sense of the Democratic platform, a document which will live in history as a model for brevity and clarity - a document which by contrast with the thousands of words of bombast, of evasion and of deception in the Republican platform, <sup>has</sup> set the keynote for the whole campaign and started four months ago, ~~the~~ <sup>that 9-1-18</sup> surge to Democracy which will result in a victory that will be heard around the world on Tuesday next.

I have pointed out and driven home by straight argument, based on undisputed facts, that the administration of government under the present leadership in Washington has been distinguished by destruction, delay, deceit and despair.

When I think of the innumerable people I have seen in this campaign, patient, steadfast,



though bitterly hurt in the collapse of our economic life, I feel that to take advantage of their deprivation to spread among them a gospel of fear is about the most reprehensible act of a campaign that has yielded many examples of unscrupulous appeals for votes. The businessmen of the country, battling hard to maintain their financial solvency and integrity were told in blunt language in Des Moines, Iowa, how close an escape the country had some months ago from going off the gold standard. This, as has been clearly shown since, was a libel on the credit of the United States.

No adequate answer has been made to the magnificent Phillipic of Senator Glass the other night, in which he showed how unsound was this assertion. And I might add, Senator Glass made the devastating challenge that no responsible government would have sold to the investors of the country, securities payable in gold, if it knew that the promise, yes, the covenant, - embodied in these securities, was as dubious as the President of the United States claims it was.

Of cours<sup>e</sup>, the assertion was unsound. In the reiterated apologies for it that have come from the Administration, many words have been added, like leaches to suck from the original statement its deadly meaning. But this Administration is not content with adding words to make a bad case look good. It also knows how to take words away to make a bad case look better.

One of the most commonly repeated misrepresentations by Republican speakers, including the President, has been the claim that the Democratic position with regard to money has not been made sufficiently clear. The President is seeing visions of rubber dollars. That is only a part of his campaign of fear. I am not going to characterize that statement. I merely present the facts.

The Democratic <sup>platform</sup> ~~policy~~ specifically declares, "We advocate a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards." That is plain English.

In discussing this platform on July 30th, I said, "Sound money is an international necessity; not a domestic consideration for one nation alone."

Far up in the Northwest at Butte, I repeated the pledge of the platform, saying, "Sound currency must be maintained at all regards."

In Seattle I reaffirmed my attitude on this question. The thing has been said, therefore, in plain English three times in my speeches. It is stated without qualification in the platform and I have announced my unqualified acceptance of that platform.

So much for that misrepresentation!

I cannot take the time to give adequate attention to the entire range of the President's panic-stricken recital. It would be a dreary though amazing record. We are able, however, to determine the quality of a candidate's representation to the country by the process of sampling. I have given you one sample. I shall add another. The President at Madison Square Garden on last Monday night, not only misrepresented me, but misquoted himself.

The President stated:

"In my acceptance speech four years ago at Palo Alto

I stated that:

'In America to-day we are nearer a final triumph over poverty than in any land. The poorhouse has vanished from among us; we have not reached that goal, but given a chance to go forward we shall with the help of God, be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this nation.'

"Our Democratic friends have quoted this passage many times in this campaign. I do not withdraw a word of it..."

No more surprising statement has been uttered by a man occupying the highest office in the gift of the American people. No Democrat has ever quoted that passage because no such utterance was ever made by the President in his acceptance speech at Palo Alto.

Democrats and many others have quoted the statement made by the President in his Acceptance Speech four years ago as it appears in the Republican campaign book of 1928, and also in the book entitled "The New Day", which contains the campaign speeches of President Hoover.

As presented in these official books the President said,

"We in America today are nearer to the final triumph over poverty than ever before in the history of any land. The poorhouse is vanishing from among us. We have not YET reached the goal, but, given a chance to go forward with the policies of the last eight years, and we shall SOON with the help of God be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this nation."

I beg you to observe how the President has misquoted himself. First, he has eliminated the word "YET",

which indicated that the millenium was soon possible.

Second, he has eliminated the word "SOON", which gave to the people the hope that his election would accomplish its arrival.

Third, he has eliminated the words "WITH THE POLICIES OF THE LAST EIGHT YEARS," which were then used to indicate that the arrival of the millenium would be brought about only by a continuation of the policies of the Republican administrations preceding him.

Certainly, I subscribe, and all citizens will subscribe, to the ideal expressed by President Hoover in his speech at Madison Square Garden Monday night. But we do not subscribe to the absurd promise of Candidate Hoover in 1928, nor can we understand how the candidate has in this amazing way misquoted himself.

I cannot completely recount the extent to which this Administration has misinterpreted the facts in order to retain its power. I pointed out the fallacious and ruinous business administration that has characterized its budget transactions. After the President and Secretary of the Treasury had purported to answer my arguments, a staid and impartial business journal, the Annalist, justified what I had said in the following words:

"Specifically, and foremost, the Federal budget is in a shocking state. The Washington administration knew quite well that it was not even 'substantially' balanced, when Congress adjourned last June. The actual deficit for the current fiscal year, amounting now in the middle of the

fourth month to seven hundred millions or more, has been concealed as far as possible by the Administration. Returns from new taxation have discredited practically every forecast made by the Treasury."

This conservative and dependable Journal likewise speaks of the unreliability of the President's utterances with regard to other subjects. It says that in his eleventh hour campaign he has made "loose, if not completely misleading, references to recent and current records." It speaks of inaccuracies in his statements with regard to building contracts and freight loadings; moreover, it challenges the assertion of the Federal Reserve Bulletin about a decrease of hoarding; and finally, it publishes an article with something close to editorial endorsement, which sadly upsets the sweeping assertion that the depression began **abruptly**. This feeble alibi I destroyed in my Louisville speech. So far as I know, the Administration has failed to controvert me.

I have said that the present administration has abandoned even the historic principles of the Republican Party.

What, for example, would William McKinley, James G. Blaine, or William Howard Taft, if they were alive today, say to the insistence of President Hoover that reciprocal tariffs are unworkable, and unsound? They advocated such reciprocal tariffs.

I note once more that the President ridicules a tariff commission set up in harmony with the principles laid down by President Theodore Roosevelt, and enacted into law by President Wilson. I proposed that kind of a tariff Commission in my Sioux City speech six weeks ago: And I wonder if President Hoover has ever read the address of President Roosevelt at Sioux Falls on September 3, 1910 where President Roosevelt proposed as a way to end Tariff log-rolling in the Congress, the very measure that President Hoover now declares,-- will encourage log-rolling.

I wonder too if the President thinks that the country is satisfied with the present method of operation of the tariff commission?

During two long years, President Hoover's Tariff Commission has investigated the duties upon only 73 commodities, -- 73 out of many thousands. 18 schedules were reduced and 13 were increased, and it is worth noting that among the articles investigated the Tariff Commission has busied

itself with pipe organs, peppers, egg-plants and bicycle bells. A careful estimate shows that at the present rate of progress President Hoover's Tariff Commission will complete its examination of schedules and report upon them by the year 2005!

At Pittsburgh I stated that there must be a reduction in the cost of government and set forth in detail the means by which it could be accomplished. In reply the President states it cannot be done. The people of America demand a reduction of federal expenditure. It can be accomplished not only by reducing the expenditures of existing departments but it can be done by abolishing many useless commissions, bureaus and functions, and it can be done by consolidating many activities of the government.

The people of the State of New York well know the efficiency that can come through reorganization of government departments. The long fight of Governor Smith with a Republican Legislature ended in a constitutional amendment which brought about this end. The same kind of reorganization ought to be effected in Washington. Many bureaus overlap that should be merged or consolidated. It is not necessary to create a new commission to secure the information necessary for this reform. Such information has been in the process of collection in Washington for 22 years. What is needed in this, as in many other things, is the will to do. There is no need for delay in this matter. The President has power



under the law to recommend to Congress the abolishment of bureaus, and the absolute power to consolidate certain specific bureaus. He has done nothing. In the process of consolidation, I propose to apply the lessons of economy and efficiency that we learned so well in the State of New York and through the striking experience of reorganization in other states of the Union. I am convinced that through such reorganization there can be a very substantial reduction of expenditures.

While I am on the subject of government, I want to repeat what I have suggested before -- that of late years, and especially during the administration of President Hoover, the relationship between the Federal Government and the State governments has been almost wholly forgotten. I know from practical experience as Governor of the most populous state of the Union that in many instances a different attitude on the part of the President would have brought about much closer cooperation between Washington and my state capitol, and this without any interference with the rights of States. It is entirely possible and entirely practical for the President to solve and to simplify many governmental problems by contact and discussion with the Governors of the several states.

For the last four years, I have also been a member of the Executive Committee of the Conference of Governors.

And the thought of many of my fellow chief executives coincides with mine -- that great opportunities for constructive action, for cooperation and mutual effort have been overlooked by the present national administration.

This is one of the many reasons why I greatly hope that if I am elected I will know that my long-time associate and friend, Lieutenant Governor Lehman, is directing the affairs of the State of New York as its chief executive. Colonel Lehman is eminently qualified for the governorship. Governor Smith knows, and I know from long experience, that discharging the duties of the office of Governor of the State of New York is no easy task -- that it calls for wide experience, and wide knowledge of the state and its problems.

The voters are going to elect Colonel Lehman because they apply to him the two simple words, "best qualified". You and I know that he is familiar with every section of the state, with every institution of the state, with every department of the state, and furthermore he has an intelligent understanding of the relationship between the Legislature and the office of Governor.

In leaving the governorship I want to see the office of Governor held by one who has the courage to be his own master, but who at the same time thinks of the public good in the same broad terms as Governor Smith and myself.

May I also urge upon you the high importance of re-electing Senator Robert F. Wagner. In his case it is not alone the interests of the State of New York which are involved. He is known throughout the nation as a Senate leader who has made himself an expert on that vital subject of relief for the unemployed. I shall need him in Washington.

The lessons of this campaign are plain enough. I am confident that the overwhelming majority of the voters of the nation seek unity, seek ordered progress, seek the security that comes from these things. These are what the people expect from a united Democracy, and from a leadership that is committed to progress through action.

Help us keep the faith. Help us to fight  
the good fight. Help us to attain the goal.

*Franklin D. Roosevelt*  
: : : :