Pioneer Lawmakers Recall

A BOATLOAD OF COINS

The small boat, heavily loaded with silver coins, steered a zigzag course among the floating ice cakes on the Mississippi River into the Burlington shore.

The boatload of coins, belonging to an unknown capitalist, was headed to the coffers of the United States government in exchange for Iowa land. The year was 1838. Burlington was the capital of the new territory called Iowa.

Travelers converged on Burlington from every direction for that first land sale in Iowa. On hand in force were settlers and squatters, grimly determined not to have their land sold out from under them.

Such exciting events in early Iowa history were recalled last March 23 when the Pioneer Lawmakers Association of Iowa met in the 36th biennial session of the association in Des Moines. U. S. Senator B. B. Hickenlooper was the speaker of the day.

More than forty association members gathered in the State Historical Building to discuss Iowa's past and present, and to renew old friendships.

Association membership is limited to persons who served in the Iowa Legislature, or as state officials or judges, 20 or more years ago.

The Honorable Ray Yenter, association president, still is an active state official. He is deputy state auditor. He served as Johnson County state representative from 1921 through 1925 and as state insurance commissioner from 1926 to 1931.

Addressing the morning session of the association in the historical building, Mr. Yenter related the story of the first land sale. Reading from an old Pioneer Lawmakers journal, Mr. Yenter disclosed how tense the situation was.

> "It was an occasion of extraordinary interest to two classes of people, the settlers or squatters upon the lands, and the speculators or land grabbers who were ever ready to take advange of the poverty of the settler and either lend him money at 50 per cent or buy his home from un-

> der him. . . Men who had braved the experiences incident to frontier life to secure their homes, found the lands brought into market and about to be exposed to public sale without the means to pay for them. Noted capitalists had come from . . . New York . . . Illinois . . . and Ohio . . . who at that sale lent more than one hundred thousand dollars to settlers at the rate of fifty per cent. The Mississippi was full of floating ice, and we remember standing upon the bank when one of these capitalists was crossing in a small boat, loaded down to the water's edge with silver coin which was soon to go into Uncle Sam's coffers in exchange for lands.
>
> The squatters or settlers from every acre exposed to sale attended this land sale in force. They came . . . to Burlington by boat, by wagon, on horseback and on foot, any way indeed to get there . . . They were banded together like a band of brothers, prepared to stand by each other, as they did, to the last. It was a dangerous undertaking for any land-grabber to attempt to bid against any of the hardy honest settlers, and yet we remember one of the bold speculators, a citizen of Iowa, ventured upon the hazard, when no sooner did he overbid the bidder appointed, as each township had one for its settlers, than he was "knocked down and dragged out" and but for the timely interference of those interested in the preservation of public order his life would have been the forfeit. His bid, by his order was cancelled, his life preserved and he rushed away . . . no further disturbance occurred.[1]
>
> The first Legislature of the territory of Iowa convened at Burlington on the 12th day of November, 1838. It was composed of thirteen members of the Council and twenty-six of the House.
>
> Of these members . . . only three had any legislative experience . . .
>
> Of the thirty-nine members the larger number, to-wit, twelve, were farmers, nine lawyers, and nine merchants—or storekeepers as they were called at that day—three were miners . . . two doctors. . . two mechanics, and two surveyors.[2]

The assembling of the legislature of 1858 at the new capitol in Des Moines, on the 11th of January, was the begin-

[1] T. S. Parvin, "Glimpses of Early Iowa, or Recollections of Territorial Times," *Pioneer Lawmakers Association of Iowa, Reunion of 1892* (Des Moines: 1893), pp. 29-30.

[2] *Ibid,* pp. 30-31, 34.

ning of a new era in our state government, which gradually opened the way to great material prosperity. The constitution of 1846 under which Iowa was admitted into the union, was in many respects an admirable instrument, which, but for a few unwise provisions, might have endured through the nineteenth century. Its fatal errors were:

First—An absolute prohibition of banks, or the issue of paper currency by persons, associations, or corporations of any description.

Second—Limiting the compensation of members of the General Assembly to $2 per day for the first fifty days, and to $1 a day for the remainder of the session.

Third—Providing that the supreme judges should be chosen by the General Assembly, instead of by the legal voters of the state.

Fourth—Limiting suffrage to white male citizens.

The effect of the absolute prohibition of Iowa banks to issue money, instead of protecting the people from losses by bank failures, as was the design of its authors, was in practice disastrous to business enterprise, and to the people whom it was intended to benefit. Gold and silver, the only legal money, could not be obtained in sufficient amounts to transact any considerable portion of the ordinary business, and grain buyers, merchants, and private bankers found it necessary to procure from other states, the bank bills to supply the deficiency. These bills were practically irredeemable in gold or silver, being far from the banks issuing them, and were in most cases issued under laws that required no adequate security for their redemption.

The State of Iowa exercised no control over that sort of currency, and had no law at that time prohibiting its circulation. Gold and silver were hoarded, and the state soon became flooded with the most utterly worthless paper money that ever was issued in any country. Irresponsible banks from Maine to Florida, from Canada to Texas, sent their finely engraved promises to pay, to Iowa brokers, bankers, and produce buyers. The discount allowed was sufficient to silence all scruples of the consignee, and they did a thriving business

in exchanging these bank bills for wheat, pork, beef, corn, barley, and potatoes, as rapidly as possible.

Bank note detectors were in better demand than Bibles, while gold and silver were hidden away in old stockings, to be fished out only to buy land, or pay taxes. Bank failures were so frequent that no one felt safe in holding their bills overnight. The losses became innumerable, and the demand for sound home banks was irresistible.

The only recourse to them was a change in the constitution and a convention was ordered by the Legislature of 1856. The convention assembled at Iowa City on the 19th of January, 1857, and framed the present Constitution. Some of the important changes were:

First: Reducing the term of the governor from four to two years.

Second: Providing for the election of a lieutenant governor who should be president of the Senate.

Third: Providing for a state board of education to consist of the lieutenant governor and one member to be elected from each judicial district in the state, to have entire control of all public schools and State University legislation.

Fourth: Raising the limitation of state indebtedness from $100,000 to $250,000.

Fifth: Authorizing the establishment of a state bank and branches, and also a general banking law, provided a majority of the electors at a general or special election shall approve of the acts of the General Assembly for the establishment and management of such banks.

Sixth: Requiring all bills passed by the General Assembly to receive the votes of a majority of the members elected to each branch. Increasing the pay of members to $3 per day.

Seventh: Providing for the election of judges of the Supreme Court by the people.

Eighth: Permanently locating the Capital of the State at Des Moines, and the State University at Iowa City.

Ninth: Submitting to a vote of the people a proposition to strike the word "white" from the article on the right of suffrage.

Under such changes in the organic law of the state, the

Seventh General Assembly convened at the new capital to enact, revise, and adapt the laws of the state to the new constitution.

Now, there are some comments about the living conditions in Des Moines at the time of this, which I believe might be interesting and which I will read.

> Des Moines was at that time a little shabby frontier town of less than 3,000 inhabitants. It was remote from railroads, and reached only by stage coach or private conveyance. The new State House had been located on the east side of the river a mile or more from the hotels, and the streets leading to it were, for a long distance, simply wagon tracks made through a long stretch of low, swampy river bottom, and up a steep ungraded hill, where the yellow clay soil rolled up on the wheels of the vehicles which tried to fathom the depths of mud, like the prairie sod from a huge breaking plow. One long straggling walk of native lumber boards, warped and slippery, could be seen strung out lonesome and wabbling in the direction of the new brick capitol. The speculators in real estate, who had built the state house on the then desolate hill in the distance, far from every accommodation a rude frontier town possesed, had hastened to plat into lots, streets and alleys, a vast region of swamp, woodland, and cultivated farms. Prospectively they were gazing anxiously for a mighty "boom" which should lift them from poverty into millionaires. But the crash of 1857 was lowering over the entire country, and the practical problem of bread and butter was, for the time, absorbing their chief attention and entire available resources. But they were liberal, broad-gauged, hospitable and hopeful people. They had lived through the hardships of pioneer life, and now the capital of the state had come to them (not without a mighty lift on their part), and "sellers" like, they could "see millions in it!"[3]

But all of history is not confined to that vast expanse of time that occurred before the memory of men living today. And so it was that former Congressman Paul Cunningham gave the assembled Pioneer Lawmakers his personal recollections of events that occurred during his term as member of the House of Representatives of Iowa (1933-1935.) He said:

[3] Ex-Lt. Gov. B. F. Gue, "The Seventh General Asembly," *"Sixth Reunion of the Pioneer Lawmakers Association of Iowa* (Des Moines: 1898), pp. 86-88.

This is my first opportunity to attend one of these meetings, and if in the future I enjoy the renewal of as many fine friendships as I have this morning I hope I will be able to attend a great many more.

I anticipated, when I was asked to make a few remarks, that this would probably be reminiscences. This morning I made a few notes, and now that I am here I am going to ask your indulgence to deviate for just a moment and go outside the State of Iowa to relate an incident, an incident at which I believe Congressman Karl LeCompte was present at the time it was stated.

I am saying this because of the remarks of our Governor, remarks of my friend Earl here, and the paper you just heard, because I am one of those who believe that we will always have an Iowa, regardless of what the legislators do.

This happened I don't know how many years ago. I know in the House in Washington we had a very controversial measure up, and I believe it passed by a small majority that evening. A number of us were having dinner together, and one of these members was a Democratic member from Ohio who had supported his own President on this piece of legislation but apparently did not agree with it, or agree with the legislation, and he made this remark:

"No other country in the world could exist, could stand up, if they did the crazy things that we do here in America, that we did just today over there in the House."

And I said, "Why, Mike?"

"Well," he said, "we are just crazy, that's all."

"Well," I said, "what are you going to do about it?"

"Why, nothing at all. I think it's the most wonderful thing in the world. That's why we are a strong country. I wouldn't change it for anything."

You know, I have thought about that often. Why are we great? It is because we have these differences in our legislative bodies. I will go to bed worried about my country when the members of the legislative body, state or nation, all go in one direction.

Rev. Marken can correct me if I am wrong. I believe the Bible says: "Iron strengtheneth iron." You cut diamonds with diamonds. It's the competitive spirit, putting one mind and one thought against another, that has made Iowa great and has made the nation great. Read your history of Iowa, and of the nation, and you have that very thing.

So, when I sit and watch television, listen to the radio

and read the paper, if I don't stop and think of the days I served over here I am liable to think Iowa is going to pot. What has happened over there? Maybe they ought to adjourn and go home.

And then I get to thinking: Why, that happened 25 or 30 years ago when I served there, but Iowa is better today than it was then; it will be better tomorrow than it is today. I think it's the healthiest sign that ever happened.

I believe it was Einstein that said: "Once everything goes in one direction, it's oblivion; we blow up." Isn't that true politically? That's why, as I have heard Joe Martin say so often, "The wonderful thing about America is the two-party system." We have got to have two parties. We have got to be opposing each other to get something good.

I see you are interested in that. I am going to recite a story I heard told by, I don't know, some Legion man at a Legion meeting I attended once, about an engineer who built a wonderful bridge, and someone was questioning him about it: How much weight would it stand? Would it stand five tons? Oh, yes. Twenty tons? Oh, yes. A hundred tons? Oh, yes. Well, is there anything it won't stand? Oh, yes, one thing, the rhythmic beat of marching feet all going one way. That's the greatest thing that could happen to America.

So if you will pardon that digression, I wanted to start off with that before reminiscing.

I was first elected to the Legislature in 1932; sworn in, as I recall, the first or second week in January 1933; and the first problem we had to deal with was the farm problem. The farmers marched in on us one day, 3,000 strong. I want to give credit to Gov. Clyde Herring who did a masterful job that day. He heard from a newspaperman that the farmers had met over in the Shrine Temple, and an inflammatory speaker had said, "Go over there and take charge of that State House. It's yours." And so they marched, and on the way over they were infiltrated with what I call some of the "river front element" in Des Moines, because when one man in the gallery yelled at me, I looked up at him and it was John Nordquist, and I happened to know that he didn't know a cow's tail from its head, but he was in there yelling for the farmers.

That was a very dangerous day. I have read in Eastern publications about the day the farmers marched in on us, and it gets bigger and bigger each time it is written. I imagine the next time I read it they will be toting six-shooters. Everybody has mentioned pitchforks. I didn't see

any pitchforks, but I have heard that some of them had them and they were parked outside.

This much I do know. I was barred from going out to a commitee meeting. I went to go out, and I said, "I want to go to a committee meeting." Several of these big fellows linked their arms and said, "No, our orders are: Nobody out."

Well, there we were. Thank the Lord there was a lavatory inside the chamber that afternoon, because we were there all afternoon. Every member of that House and Senate who was there in that joint meeting, including the Governor, was a prisoner for four hours.

I want to give credit to the Governor, for by the time the farmers arrived we were all there ready to meet them. He invited them in and asked, "Do you have any speakers yon want us to hear?"

We listened. Nobody said a word. Finally they talked themselves out and went home, and then we went about our own business and did as we pleased, and we passed a pretty good mortgage moratorium law. I think I was one of the committee of eight that worked some five or six days and nights to get it ready, and it did a lot of good.

There was opposition then from both parties. One man said, "It will not stand up, it's unconstitutional." In our committee meeting one night over in town in a hotel room two of the members of the committee drawing it up practically got into a fist fight. They couldn't agree on it. Yet they did agree, we did come out, and in spite of everything that was said about it not being constitutional, it did not go to the Supreme Court.

I said I didn't see pitchforks, but I did see some ropes, and I recall a club or two. Two or three fellows came around to the west side of the chamber back where we were. I occupied Seat 56 and J. P. Gallagher was right in behind me. It was pretty crowded in there. The place was filled. One of the fellows had a rope wound around his body, another was swinging a rope over his shoulder, and one fellow was carrying one like a coiled lasso.

We got to visiting with those fellows—they were really good fellows. Finally one of us said, "What are you going to do with those ropes?" "Oh, we're going to hang Arch McFarlane." J. P. Gallagher said, "Well, go ahead. There he sits right over there."

You know, they looked at us in consternation, and finally they started to laugh. It broke the tension. They didn't want to hang anybody; they just wanted to make a show.

We also passed the Highway Patrol bill. I remember I got the first ticket ever issued, the first evening they were out. Never got one since.

And we passed the Old Age Assistance Law. I recall that very well. Pat Donlon was the author of it. He didn't want to bring it out. Terrible letters were coming in from distressed people. A lot of us told him, "Bring your bill out, Pat. We will put it through for you." We finally did. It was a bundle of hay, but what is it today? It's worth something.

A teacher's pension. Believe it or not, there was a teacher's pension passed then. I was the author of it. Let me tell you a little something about that.

A man no longer living brought the bill to me, representing the Des Moines School Board. He brought it to me at exactly 4:30 in the afternoon on the last day to introduce bills, and the deadline was 5 o'clock. There were about 60 typewritten pages and he wanted me to introduce it. I said, "Why, I don't have time to read it in 30 minutes. How can you ask me to introduce it?" "Oh," he said, "that's all right, I don't expect you to read it. I don't even expect you to get it through. I don't expect you to do anything about it."

I did introduce it. It came out printed the next morning. I got to reading it. I found out I had a good bill. We put it through, and now they have got it state-wide.

Then I was there when the state tax, sales tax, net income tax, corporate net income tax bill was first passed. That was passed in a special session, one of the longest we ever had, about 130 or 140 days, which convened in the fall of '33 and ended in the spring of '34. I was a member of the committee appointed by the Speaker of the House and there were some from the Senate and the Governor had some representatives, and the late Judge Bill Riley was sort of an ex-officio chairman, representing the Governor. We met for 17 days in the summer of '33 at the Fort Des Moines Hotel working out that that is now law, enlarged and made better in many ways. I remember that J. P. Gallagher called it the three-headed calf, and it was predicted that it would bring ruin to the state, and many came in there with the idea of tax revision and it ended up with more tax addition than tax revision, and of course that is what generally happens. But we are still here.

And then I recall I was a member of a House-Senate joint committee to investigate the sale of warrants to a Des Moines bond man, and there was some charge that

there was collusion between him and the Governor, both being of the same party, and there was quite an investigation.

I was appointed as a Republican member of that committee and we worked on it for some days. And what did we find? We found that only one bond man would bid on those warrants, and that all the ones who were complaining, after we got all the testimony in, were bankers and lenders who were afraid to take them. They were afraid of the condition of Iowa, and didn't have enough confidence in the future of Iowa to take them. But one man did, and he made money on them. Then they wanted an investigation. Well, that one virtually blew up in their faces.

I recall the mortgage moratorium that I mentioned before. There were eight, and it required eight signatures to bring in the conference report, or this special committee report; they all had to sign.

All the other seven of us would be ready to sign and this one fellow would have a thought and wouldn't sign. He would go out and come back with a new idea. We would get to talking and he would go out again, come back and have a new idea and then we would have a session for four or five hours more and we would come up with a satisfactory matter and again he wouldn't sign. After four or five times the clerk of the committee or someone got the idea that he would slip out and follow him to see who he talked to. Well, he found out.

He came back, and so when he came back the next time some of us said to him: "Do you think so and so will agree with this now?" He signed it, and there was nothing more.

I want to say in closing now that one of the nicest things about serving in the State Legislature, or any legislative body, is the friendships you make. And they are real friendships, I have found. When I was serving there and I would differ with people and vote contrary to them I would be inclined to go home, and even when the session ended, feeling that certain people didn't like me.

You know, that isn't true at all. That means nothing after you are out. That's what makes America great.

I had the most delightful experience in regard to that. One man and I seldom voted alike. It seemed that he opposed nearly every bill that I brought up; and I got the impression that he just didn't like me, he wouldn't be for me.

So, some years later I announced for Congress, for the Primary, and I thought that I would go over to see the men I had served with. They were all fine men and they

all gave me a lot of quiet help, quiet assistance. But this one man, a Republican, I thought, there would be no use in seeing him, he would be against me.

Do you know, that after my announcement he was the first one to come to my home. It was on a Sunday afternoon with his wife, and he wanted to know what he could do for me. And this is the amusing part: He was very much of a dry himself, and opposed all liquor bills. Now I am talking about people who are gone and I know they won't object if I tell this. He had people for me to see in every town and every township in his county that would be helpful to me.

He told about one particular town. He said, "When you go to that town go and see Mrs. so-and-so; she is a member of the W.C.T.U.; and you go and see this lady, who is a strong church lady; and then you see this one and that one. And when you are all through, just when you are ready to leave town, go into so-and-so's tavern, introduce yourself to the owner, buy a bottle of beer and get out of town as fast as you can.

In a welcoming talk to the association, Gov. Norman A. Erbe told the veteran lawmakers: "We look upon your past experience in the legislature as one we can point to with pride for providing the firm foundation on which we try to continue to build each two years when the legislature comes back. I congratulate all of you for doing the tremendous job that you did."

Former State Senator Earl C. Fishbaugh, Jr., told the group: "As pioneer lawmakers, we have a particular interest in preserving the ideals of good government in this state. I believe that we should rededicate ourselves to the principles of good government and also to an appreciation of those men in Iowa who have made good government possible, in the past, at present and in the future."

In another address, former State Senator DeVere Watson said that serving in the legislature "probably is the greatest postgraduate course a person can take."

"I don't care how much formal education or lack of it you have had," Senator Watson added, "when you graduate from that legislative school over there of human equation and humanness, you are a greater person."

Henry W. Burma, former speaker of the Iowa House, declared that Iowa "has a selling job to do" to keep young peo-

ple from leaving the state. He said higher wages and salaries elsewhere are not the only answer. Other states have done a good "selling job" and showed big population gains in the 1960 census, he reported.

Judge Martin D. Van Oosterhout of the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals said serving in the legislature "is not a good way of making money." He is a former state representative. "But being in the assembly," he added, "is a nice way to keep informed on what is going on and to know the people who are leading the state at the time you are there, and for many years to come."

Secretary David Dancer read the report giving the names of the twenty-two members of the association who had died since the preceeding session two years earlier.

During the afternoon program, before a joint session of the Senate and House in the Iowa House chamber, State Senator J. T. Dykhouse pointed out that nine members of the current legislature were pioneer lawmakers. Senator Dykhouse himself was one of the nine. He said both old elements and new ones are ever-present in the progress of lawmaking.

"Some of our problems, such as roads, schools and public welfare are the same as they were in the past," he said, "but, as was true formerly, we are constantly entering into new fields of public activity made necessary through progress."

State Representative William Darrington said in another talk: "It is reasonable and right to turn back the pages of time and study what we have so that we might better chart our course for the future."

State Representative Scott Swisher told the session how the laws of Iowa were compiled in the historic document known as the Code of 1897.

Senator Hickenlooper, the principal speaker of the occasion, is an Iowan with a long career of public service.

He served as Linn County state representative in 1935 and 1937 and as lieutenant governor of Iowa from 1939 to 1943. He was governor of Iowa from 1943 to 1945 and has been one of the state's U. S. senators since 1945. In his address before the joint session, he said in part:

> I have said repeatedly in this chamber and in the Senate Chamber, that there is no public service that exceeds, and

practically none that could possibly excel, the public service in the lawmaking body of one's own state, because here in these chambers is the representative heart and fiber of American freedom and of individual responsibility; and in these chambers is represented the obligation which citizens assume and discharge in their mutual responsibility to their fellow man.

I think one of the most outstanding things in the difference between our own country and so many—in fact almost all—of the other countries in the world is that under our system in America we pioneered the method by which a neighbor voluntarily assumed a part of the responsibility for his own neighbor's welfare, and, with each neighbor joining together to release a little of his own personal sovereignty, in the interest of the common good, we built our communities, we built our cities, our towns, our townships, we built our counties, we built our states, and we have been busy constructing the fabric of the Federal Government.

We have realized as an inherent and an integral part of the American system that only such community and common responsibility can make for a self-governing and self-responsible whole. Only by the assumption of such responsibility can government and its power remain lodged in the people and not slip away to some centralized autocracy or bureaucracy, by whatever name one may care to call it.

Now, a legislative body requires dedication and service. Certainly in our legislative bodies, as we know them in this part of the United States, it is not a profit-making venture. The compensation has never been adequate money-wise, and therefore the compensation that comes is the reward of service conscientiously done.

This body constitutes a forum of strong convictions, and may it ever continue to be so. Those strong convictions result from the friction of the ideas of the people that we represent and the people of whom we are a part; and this body, the governing body of a sovereign state, defends the ramparts of our federal system of government.

Most of us don't think often enough about the federal system of government which we have in this country. In the main it is unique. There is no other government in the world exactly the same as ours. We are a system where sovereign states have united in a federation for the common good, and under the basic concept the states and the people found it expedient—and we have found it well over the years—to delegate voluntarily *some* of their

sovereignty and *some* of their control to a centralized government so that the whole nation could unite and receive the benefits of common and united effort when occasion demanded it.

Now, we are a republic in this country, in basic form, but within that republic are the instrumentalities and forms of democracy. The two are interlocked. But basically we have never strayed away from the federated system of independent states which are indeed sovereign.

And that is a thing that is most difficult to explain to people of other governments. They don't have the concept of the extent of basic sovereignty which the states of our nation possess. Oh, they understand the dictionary definition of sovereignty, but they don't understand its attributes and how it works.

And the interesting thing is that most other governments in this world today are not governments in which the power essentially and completely springs from the people, but even the more free governments in other parts of the world possess a combination of authority coming down from government and authority coming up from the people and meeting in some mysterious central place in their system.

The reason that power comes down from government in many of these countries is that they have come from autocracies where the people have finally revolted and seized from the central autocracy the powers which they possess, but the central autocracy still retains some of the old forms.

We in this country built from the bottom. We in this country constructed on the basis that the individual is free and sovereign, that his dignity is the controlling thing that must move men in the advancement of their social and political forms.

Our country in its broadest concept is a revolutionary type of government; not necessarily the armed, violent type of revolution, but from the economic and social point a continually developing and revolutionary system and type of government.

And because it is revolutionary, so far as the necessity is concerned for change to meet the legitimate demands and the legitimate aspirations of the people, and the legitimate service which the people have a right to demand in a growing economy—because it is revolutionary, a danger lurks in our system. We are in an era and a a period where that danger confronts us.

We have always had problems in this country. We had

the same problems 40, 50, even 100 years ago that we have today. We have the problems of taxation, we have the problems of public service, we have the problems of of the province of the states so far as the cities and towns are concerned, so far as the people are concerned, so far as the counties are concerned. But as we have grown in complexity, those problems grow; and while the basic problems may be roughly the same, the details are different indeed, and the details are much more complex today than ever before in our history. And therefore they call for discernment, they call for analysis, and they call for clear thinking.

I said a moment ago that as a revolutionary system—that as a system of change, of progress, of advancement, of rolling with the punch, if you please—as a revolutionary system we constantly face a danger; and that major overall danger, in my opinion, is the danger of slipping in times of emotion or times of stress and strain or times of emergency, of slipping back away from the system of responsibility in the individual and in the local communities into a system where we inadvertently or ineptly yield the power, which was so bitterly won, to a central government and to a bureaucracy which in turn can then inflict that power back upon the people.

Now manifestly we can't run government today, we can't have taxes today, we can't have the method of operation or lack of operation today that served us 75 years ago. Manifestly we have to keep abreast of the times. But at the same time and by the same token it is the duty and the responsibility of those who make up our system to see that in meeting these changes, in delegating from time to time to either the state government or the federal government the responsibility for doing certain things that can't be done locally to the best advantage of the people, we don't chip away at and abandon that basic responsibility which is fundamental in the American system.

Now, the interesting thing today is that, with all of the tensions in the world, with all of the uprisings of nations in other continents who seek and who acquire self-determination—I can't necessarily say freedom in every case, but who seek and acquire self-determination or sovereignty—in almost every instance, and I think it is probably fair to say in every instance, those countries who have this self-determination today are in the great struggle of history to divest themselves and to dilute themselves from the centralized governments that have been op-

pressing them throughout the years. They are moving toward our fundamental, and sometimes I think we are moving away from our fundamental toward centralization. In that field and that area of responsibility of analysis, the responsibility for calmness, is so important in our legislative bodies, and it is even more important in the thinking and the minds of the people.

Now, I need only go back a few years to illustrate what I am trying to say. Most of us remember the depression of the late 20's and the early 30's. We remember that during that time economic distress was widespread in this country. And under the emotion of economic distress people turned, or were invited to turn, to the central government, and in that period many powers never before possessed by the central government were turned over to it in the hope that it would relieve a temporary distress.

Most of those powers that were turned over in time of emergency have never been returned to the people, and today many of the restraints, regulations and restrictions—yes, and most of the taxes for that matter, result from the fact that that power was lodged in the central government then, in time of emergency, under the guise of emergency, and never returned to the responsibility of the people.

Now again we find that our country is allegedly in some kind of a recession. Again we are asked for emergency legislation. But the strange thing about emergency legislation is that once it is given it very seldom dislodges itself within the period that we anticipate when we give it.

In that area, as I mentioned a moment ago, we as people, we as legislators, must exercise the greatest care that we do not, under the guise of emergency, unduly award to central government, which is remote and which does not contain the warmth and the association which goes with intimate contact with the people, power which oversteps and goes beyond that which is necessary to serve the people, and which may in effect get over the boundary and into an area in which the people will serve the government.

It is a difficult balance to maintain. I think no one can write a book in which it is outlined in all its details. But it is a balance which must be maintained in the inherent common sense of the individuals and the people who are responsible for it.

Now, we have heard a great deal—and I say this without any disparagement—about new frontiers these days,

whatever that means. I am not quite certain. And I don't mean to say that we should not continue exploration and advancement; of course we should. But again I warn you that in exploring so-called new frontiers we must not be deluded by will-o'-the-wisps. The targets which we set for ourselves must be real and not chimerical.

When our pioneers moved westward in the settlement and the development of this country they moved toward new horizons. They didn't necessarily move toward new frontiers, but they moved toward new horizons where the basic principles that they were determined to maintain could be maintained and could be exercised. And it was the jealousy with which they guarded those principles that laid the strong foundation for the eventual success of our great country as a federal union.

The principles which guided and stimulated those people who developed this country as they moved toward these new horizons in our early days were so aptly set out by the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which, in effect, says that powers not delegated to the central government in Washington are reserved and retained by the states and by the people. They never forgot that. They never forgot that the person, the individual, was sovereign. They never forgot that they and the states were the basic sovereignty of our country.

Let's be sure that in our exploration we don't forget that fundamental which is the basic pillar of our structure in government.

It is so easy to say, "Let's get state money," "Let's get federal money." And it is so easy to forget that there is no state money, that there is no federal money; but there is the money of the individual that he pays in taxes to support his government. And the references to state money, the references to federal money, only refer to money that has been taken away from the individual, that has been paid by the individual to his government, and in return may be used by his government either for the benefit of the country, or for its detriment, depending upon the interpretation.

But that is a great danger that is facing us today, and has faced us for some years, the constant effort on the part of many to shuck off the responsibilities which the individuals in the local communities should exercise to the limit of their capacity, to shuck off those responsibilities onto the mysterious Federal Government; and as rapidly as you do that you find that bureaucracy is willing to assume that authority, is willing to take it over,

and is willing to begin to govern you to that extent, rather than to be governed by you.

Manifestly the national government, whether we like it or not, has been forced, in our own interest and in our own preservation, into the leadership of the free world—manifestly government must do many things today that it never did before, and probably tomorrow it will have to do many things that it is not doing today. We face today as tense an international situation as we have ever faced in our history, and it is entirely possible that that tension may be greater, and that the threat may be greater today than ever before in history, because of the bitter conflict between two great opposing ideologies: freedom on the one hand, as represented by the free nations of the world; autocratic communism, and the slavery of the individual, on the other, as represented by the Kremlin.

Those two ideologies are determined each to prevail. One will not prevail in the long run.

We are determined that the philosophies of freedom will prevail, and I am thoroughly convinced, just as examples in the past few years have shown time after time, that if we as a representative of the free nations of the world, and our associates and our allies, stand free and vigorous in resisting the encroachments of communism, then communism cannot prevail; but if we as a free nation, and if our allies as free nations, yield or fail to show that vigor which is essential in the face of this encroachment of slavery, then the alternative of firmness is surrender and destruction. Let us never forget that.

Oh, I know many times we say it can't happen, it won't happen; we are great, we have strength, the free nations will never let slavery and autocracy capture them. All I have to point to today is that other nations have been captured, other nations have been enslaved by communism and its allied philosophies, other nations have lost that freedom which they once had; and we cannot, by neglect, refuse to recognize that possibility. We cannot through neglect weaken ourselves to the point where, as the Communists say, capitalism and democracies will fall like ripe fruit from a tree if you give them just enough time. We must exercise the responsibilities of our freedom, we must exercise that responsibility for the generations to come.

Now I will not take the time today to discuss any details of the international situation that faces us, other than to say that in Laos, in Berlin, in Africa, in many parts of the world today humanity is boiling. Rightly or wrongly,

that foment—and ferment, if you please—is occurring. The struggle now and in the foreseeable future will be the struggle to see whether that change and that alteration will be guided along the basic lines of freedom and human dignity and responsibility, or whether it will be captured by the philosophies of communism and autocracy.

Those things are facing us today. They face every citizen. They are not alone the responsibilities of the Government in Washington. Those are the responsibilities of you and me as citizens. Those are the responsibilities of free men and free women every place.

The association elected the following officers for the 1961-63 biennium:

President, Stanley Hart, Keokuk; vice president, Henry Burma, Allison; secretary, David Dancer, Des Moines; vice presidents by districts—First: Walter Dietz, Walcott; Second: Ed Vrba, Cresco; Third: E. P. Donohue, New Hampton; Fourth: A. E. Augustine, Oskaloosa; Fifth: Blake Willis, Perry; Sixth: Robert Blue, Eagle Grove; Seventh: R. G. Moore, Dunlap, and Eighth: J. T. Dykhouse, Rock Rapids.

The journals and records of the meetings of the Iowa Pioneer Lawmakers Association are available for public view at the Office of the Annals in the Historical Building at Des Moines.

The Editor of the Annals requests that material of historic interest pertaining to Iowa or Iowans, such as letters, diaries, family histories and general manuscripts be sent to the Office of the Annals, Iowa State Department of History and Archives, Des Moines, Iowa.

The present large and continuously growing collection of Iowa history has been largely due to the interest and efforts and to the contributions of material by the citizens of Iowa. It is the responsibility and privilege of all to preserve the heritage of the past.—Ed.